

NOTES:

The lowercase C will have to be put in for McKelvey's  
identifiers. -- Lynn

THE EMPIRICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THEORETICAL MODELS  
A PROPOSED WORKSHOP FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Monday, July 9, 2001

4201 Wilson Boulevard

Room 1235

Arlington, Virginia

INVITED PARTICIPANTS:

Jim Granato, Co-Moderator, National Science Foundation  
Frank Scioli, Co-Moderator, National Science  
Foundation

Christopher Achen, University of Michigan

John Aldrich, Duke University

James Alt, Harvard University

Norman Bradburn, National Science Foundation

Henry Brady, University of California, Berkeley

William Butz, National Science Foundation

Cheryl Eavey, National Science Foundation

John Freeman, University of Minnesota

William Keech, Carnegie Mellon University

Richard McKelvey, California Institute of Technology

Rebecca Morton, University of Houston

Carl Simon, University of Michigan

H. Peyton Young, Johns Hopkins University

Dina Zinnes, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

ALSO PRESENT:

Dan Newlin

Greg Price

Phil Rubin

Miron Straf

\* \* \* \* \*

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. SCIOLI: Okay, I got the report from Dina and she's the only one I trust that nothing untoward happened at dinner. And I -- we appreciate that here at the National Science Foundation because it always goes directly to Dr. Bradburn.

MR. ALT: We appreciated you guys paying for the opera singer. (Laughter) But you were the opera singer.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, I certainly (inaudible) at it.

MALE SPEAKER: We have it on the original.

MALE SPEAKER: You do not need to sign this.

MR. SCIOLI: Norman will be with us until 9:30 a.m., until he feels like leaving. And we're -- let's see, I thought I saw Tom Dierwald in here, but I guess he's --

MALE SPEAKER: He just left.

MS. EAVEY: He came in --

MR. SCIOLI: He skipped out again.

MS. EAVEY: -- and said hi to John and then took off.

MR. SCIOLI: Okay.

MS. EAVEY: Minnesota connections.

MALE SPEAKER: Great for everyone.

MS. EAVEY: I know.

MALE SPEAKER: We apologize.

MR. SCIOLI: Jim, where did we want to lead off with this morning?

MR. GRANATO: Cheryl, did you want to mention something?

MS. EAVEY: Sure. I was a good girl and pulled off a couple of announcements off the Web for you guys, both from the mathematical sciences. They have a postdoctoral of research fellowship program, which is designed to permit participants to choose research environments that will have maximal impact on their future scientific development. They have two categories of awardees: research fellowships and research instructorship. And we can investigate this further if we think it might be a model for some things proposed here today.

Bigger is vertical integration of research and education in the mathematical sciences. It's an innovative educational program in which research and education are integrated. And --

MR. ALT: That's a novelty.

MS. EAVEY: (Laughs) And in which undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and faculty are mutually supportive. Goals are to prepare undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows for a broad range of opportunities available to individuals with training in the mathematical sciences and to encourage

departments in the mathematical sciences to initiate or improve education activities that lend themselves to integration with research. In order to apply for this each proposal must have a coherent plan for the vertical integration and it needs to have a graduate traineeship program and undergraduate research experience program, and a postdoctoral fellowship program. And again, we can, you know --

MS. ZINNES: Cheryl?

MS. EAVEY: Yes, Ma'am.

MS. ZINNES: I'm actually participating in one of those this summer.

MS. EAVEY: Good.

MS. ZINNES: Didn't realize that that's what that was.

MS. EAVEY: What it was.

MS. ZINNES: But it is -- in the math department, it is going across all levels. And if anybody wants to hear about it, it's actually based on Peyton Young's book, "An Evolutionary Game Theory."

MS. EAVEY: Wow.

MS. ZINNES: So it's interesting. So if anybody wants to hear about that, I'll be glad to describe it.

MS. EAVEY: Great, a resource. And given that education's going to be a primary topic for today, Frank and Jim and I thought it would -- might

be good just to sort of clarify our position on it.

And the foundation as a whole supports, actively supports the integration of research and education. The way our programs have supported it in the past is primarily through the funding of undergraduate students and graduate students on research proposals. We haven't done much beyond that. There was one small training activity that Political Science and MMS jointly funded, and that was actually against the recommendation of the MMS Advisory Panel.

So what you've seen in this directorate is a focus more on education, in part because of limited funds. We're a very small --

SPEAKERS: More on research.

MS. EAVEY: I'm sorry, did I say education?

SPEAKERS: Yeah.

MS. EAVEY: Thank you. I'm so glad you guys know what I'm meaning. (Laughter)

MR. SIMON: We're educating you.

MS. EAVEY: That's a good thing.

MALE SPEAKER: We have the code book here.

MS. EAVEY: You have the code book.

(Laughter) With me it's always good to have a code book.

-- because of limited funds. The other directorates have larger budgets. They've been able to expand. I don't think it's unreasonable to propose



these sorts of alternatives to us. If there was support at higher levels in various forms, you know, there's the potential of doing something new and different. (Laughter) But just understand -- sort of understand where we're coming from in terms of the constraints we've had in the past, the uncertainty of the future, but also the possibilities that the future may hold. Does that sound reasonable, Jim and Frank?

MR. SCIOLI: Yes, it does. And I think that certainly we're envisioning the infrastructure activities in the programs and in the directorate, as Norman said yesterday. I mean, you know, that's, again, a very broad umbrella. Given that the way we concluded yesterday afternoon, I'm sure that it would not be off-limits or out of bounds -- excuse me -- to think of education as a fundamental component in this EITM activity, if you feel that's where the first line of offense should be. So while we don't typically do education activities, certainly -- well, to say that in this room would be foolhardy because the programs support undergraduates through research experience for undergraduates, we support graduate students. We don't support -- at present, we don't support postdocs, but we certainly heard MMS have. But all of those activities are certainly on the table.

I was thinking last evening the IGERT opportunity is one that we might explore, also. IGERT

is a -- is the kind of a program that I think could incorporate the link between formal and empirical, especially -- excuse me -- if it were an activity that had to include mathematicians, statisticians. I think that would strengthen the social and behavioral sciences component of that considerably. Does that square with your understanding, Cheryl?

MR. BRADBURN: Could I just add, in case there's any doubt about higher-ups, the foundation as a whole is extremely concerned about the future generation of science, scientists, and engineers in all fields, not just in ours. And I am particularly interested in providing opportunities to increase the -- and generally, let's say the quantity of sophistication of social scientists. So I'm supportive of a whole range of kind of programs to try to upgrade the -- all the field, I mean, not just political science, but this is true across all fields. So the kinds of recommendations that you make are the kinds of things that you think would be most useful or very influential, shall we say.

MR. ALDRICH: Do you see us in the math initiative as --

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. Oh, yeah, we --

MS. EAVEY: I see us in the (inaudible).

MR. BRADBURN: No, no. We're budgeting both -- I mean, we had money this year, but -- we didn't

get it, but we may still end up getting it to participate in the -- and we're certainly budgeting for next year to be in the thick of the math. And there's pressure on the math side since it isn't an initiative in the way these have -- the terms has come to be administered around here, but still pressure for them to use the extra money they are getting, which is \$20 million in 2002, at a minimum at least, to do interdisciplinary -- I mean, to do our vocations kind of things.

MS. EAVEY: We've already got those picked out --

MR. BRADBURN: Okay.

MS. EAVEY: -- and we're not in.

MR. BRADBURN: Not in that one?

MS. EAVEY: No. They're going to highlight some existing relationships they have with DARPA and NIH and geo and science. But assuming there is a 2003 and it's bigger, there's some fascinating possibilities for our sciences. There's a lot of potential, it just needs to get the money in there.

MR. ACHEN: I think it might be worth saying here actually that I think there's a consensus listening to people that this is a very high priority item for the social sciences, what we're doing here. We don't have a bunch of 23-year-olds around the table who will gush, but I think, for a lot of us, we've

been waiting 10 years for this to happen and --

MS. ZINNES: Twenty.

MR. ACHEN: Yeah. (Laughter) There we go. And finally, coming to a meeting where it looks like it might have the resources it has so desperately needed for so long is an exciting prospect for everybody here that I've talked to, and they can speak for themselves. But I just -- I think that among the set of priorities that are likely to affect political science, it's hard for me personally to imagine anything else that's more worthy of NSF support.

MS. ZINNES: Well, at one and the same time, I'd have to say if I seem a little bit cool about it it's because I've been here a number of times before. (Laughter) And I have written proposals and I've been turned down and I've tried and tried and tried, and it's exactly along these lines and I'm very excited about the possibility. But on the other hand, my reservations are such that, you know, I know what the odds are and so, you know, I'm concerned about, you know, spinning our wheels and spending lots and lots of time on things.

MR. SCIOLI: I don't want to discuss any personal cases, but --

MS. ZINNES: No, don't do that. (Laughs)

MR. SCIOLI: -- at times, we have tried to advise scholars interested in this topic to go to the

math directorate with some interesting and exciting ideas. And even well-written, strong arguments are sometimes not favorably received in that directorate. But one might look at this as a kind of a different opportunity where we're positioned a little bit different in terms of being at the table when these activities are discussed, suggesting panelists. As I said yesterday, that's kind of a whole new ball game. We hadn't had a lot of luck with the education directorate because -- is that an understatement?

MS. EAVEY: No, I'm just agreeing.

MR. SCIOLI: Because we haven't been at the table when those resources are divvied up. But when it's a foundation-wide activity, as I mentioned yesterday, you know, Bill has always tried to get seasoned people who know what the internal rules of the game are, so that you'll have a Cheryl or a Tom Dierwald or someone who knows what kind of arguments to make in a multidisciplinary group and to be aware -- alert of the fact that, you know, it's not inconceivable that you'd have a mathematician say, well, you know, this person teaches political science. But -- so those days, hopefully -- and/or economics, I mean, we're not targeted, don't get me wrong, under any circumstances.

MALE SPEAKER: Lucky Dan's on vacation.

MR. SCIOLI: He'll be up. He'll be up. He

heard there were rumblings about economics yesterday and he promised to make an appearance. I'm just holding my breath and maybe he won't get here till about 11.

MR. GRANATO: One thing if we're going to talk education first, I think given the limited resources we have in the program, it may be better to focus on graduate students, junior faculty, and even senior junior faculty in terms of retraining. So I'd like to start off thinking about ideas and with that in mind. And I'm going to go up to the easel and start writing things down.

MR. BRADBURN: While you're on your way, could I -- you didn't mention yesterday, I don't think, the career program.

MS. EAVEY: I don't think we explicitly mentioned (inaudible).

MR. BRADBURN: And I would just point out that the -- I've picked up, as I go around the world, the belief that political scientists haven't done well, and I don't know if it's because they don't apply or whatever, with a career program, although I know there was one this year. This is a program for young faculty, nontenured, in the first appointment they can't be more than 8 years, past 6 --

MS. EAVEY: That sounds about right.

MR. BRADBURN: No, I think it would -- I

think it'd be -- the biologists pressed, this is the danger of postdocs. I think it was 8 years past the Ph.D., but, anyway, something like that. And there was an emphasis on integrating education and the research, but these are very prestigious -- or they also carry \$50,000 a year. They're 5-year awards and they carry \$50,000 -- a minimum of --

MS. EAVEY: Minimum.

MR. BRADBURN: Minimum of 50,000 a year.

And so -- well, this would not -- relative to retraining, it would be a way for people who are good, young people of the kind that you want to exemplify. We could get a few Kerr (phonetic) Awards for people like that. That would give a kind of modeling, a lead effect kind of thing.

MS. EAVEY: There are also candidates for PECASE, the Presidential Early, something, Award.

MR. BRADBURN: Which is now just honorific actually.

MS. EAVEY: Really?

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah. They don't -- doesn't have any extra.

MR. BUTZ: But it is extremely honorable.

MR. BRADBURN: Extremely honorific, yeah. That's right.

MS. MORTON: Is this the same thing that life Jeff Banks had?

MALE SPEAKER: No, he did not have it.

MR. BRADBURN: Steve Levitt had one, if you know Steve.

MR. BUTZ: Barbara Carimeno (phonetic) said UCLA as one, just go it, and I -- is it Jim Oliver (phonetic) at Princeton?

MR. ALT: Jeff Banks had the Presidential Young Scholar Award.

MR. BRADBURN: Yeah, that's the -- that's -- it's the same. It's morphed into --

MR. ALT: That goes back to when they had money?

MR. BRADBURN: Right. Well, now they've all got money.

MS. EAVEY: That's before they were tied together.

MR. BRADBURN: They're only one then, one on each kind of field; now there are many. And from the many, one is selected to be a PECASE, or more than one actually. It depends on how many there are at the time.

MR. BRADY: Should we just start giving you our three ideas? Is that okay? Could we --

MR. GRANATO: That's great.

MR. BRADY: Just a general comment. I broke them up into substantive approaches and process procedural approaches, and I'm just choosing from



process procedural because it seems to me the substantive stuff is stuff we want to do, it's where we want to go to, but it's -- I think it's the process procedural stuff that gets us there.

MR. GRANATO: Can I interrupt for a second? What you have there for the substantive issues, we're going to put that in the report, so it'll be part of that. So that won't be ignored.

MR. BRADY: Right. Yeah, and I think that could be -- well, first -- my first idea is a summer program of some sort, ranging from conference to camps. And I'm not sure exactly how to formulate it, but maybe the general thing to say is some kind of summer thing. And that thing would have as themes stuff like microfoundations, macro models, experimental techniques, maybe competition on topics, I mean, these are all some of the substantive things.

I would love to do something where I was thinking, gee, I should reflect on how I've at times developed some quasiformal models and tried to test them, and what did I try to do when I did those things? This is very much precipitated by Chris' memo where he talks about, well, maybe it's not a direct thing. I can remember some stuff where I've taken a model and directly tested it and I can think of cases where I've developed a model and then later said, well, I can't directly test that, but here's some sort

of ways to think about it. And that would be, I think, interesting to put those thoughts together and maybe people might learn something from it. So number one's a summer program.

MR. ALT: Henry? Just a second.

MR. BRADY: Yeah, go ahead. You want me to stop there for a minute.

MR. ALT: I mean, I think that's -- that was number one on my list, too. Should we -- can we come back to you for two and three and talk a bit about this one --

MR. BRADY: Sure. Sure.

MR. ALT: -- just to --

MR. BRADY: That's fine, yeah.

MR. ALT: I mean, that's a question to the group as to how you'd like to --

MR. BRADY: The other people rate that highly, I guess, is the (inaudible).

MS. ZINNES: Yes, definitely.

MR. ALDRICH: You had said summer programs or small conferences, and you sort of blurred those two together.

MR. BRADY: Well, I wanted -- I was trying to get a big coalition here. (Laughter) But let's start with something and then we can talk about the specifics, but maybe the general principle is where we start.

MR. MCKELVEY: But I mean, I think these are really two separate things in terms of how you --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MR. BRADY: I disagree.

MR. ALT: I would say think of it as a unified program, think of it as having a didactic or teaching element, and a research presentation element like the (inaudible) session or sessions in it. I think that's exactly (inaudible) not a very narrow thing, but a broader thing. As an administrative issue, I would keep it separate from the PMG summer meetings initially, but have a goal, I would say, of merging them after 5 years by the time this thing, which is more focused on what I would call articulation and testing of formal models, is ready to stand on its own two feet as -- you know, and not get -- if you guys have 130 people coming, you know, our first little tranche of 25 would get swamped and lost.

MALE SPEAKER: Absolutely.

MR. ALT: So build it up. I figure you can do this for, you know, between 50 and 100K a year for the first sort of 3 to 5 years, and then, you know, see how it's going. It'll -- as it grows, it gets more expensive. That's why there's that huge range of funding, but, you know, I would think 50K a year.

MR. FREEMAN: This is my first item, also, but I guess the question I would ask is why can't you

just call Hank Ketowood (phonetic) and have Michigan do this? You know, what is it that we have to offer that's distinctive?

MR. ALT: Well, I don't -- I think what you're trying --

MR. FREEMAN: On the ICPSR.

MR. ALT: But you lose if you do that. I mean, I wouldn't do it at Michigan. I'd do it at the methodology group if I wanted to do it in a bigger, more supportive group. It is precisely the fact that you're trying to foster community, build a little identity, get people knowing and talking to each other, interacting and exchanging in a group where the focus stays relentlessly on the theme of articulation and testing of formal models. If you put it in Michigan, people come back in the evening and say, well, it was an interesting lecture on regression I sneaked off and went to today, and the whole point of the focus of summer programming (inaudible).

MS. MORTON: Well, one model that kind of captures the idea of having a conference in teaching and -- I mean, I haven't been to it in a long time, but the -- but at Stony Brook, you know, they have those game theory things during the summer. And they have sometimes conferences and then they have week-long teaching things, and I at least went one time where there was a week-long teaching. And then there

was a -- then there are conferences that are different, like there might be one general game theory.

And so that kind of would combine where you could have -- but I think Jim's right. If you just say, well, we're going to do it in Michigan in the context of the big Michigan program, it will get lost and people won't stay focused. And if you did it this way where you have, like, a week-long teaching so maybe somebody would come take the class and then stay for the conference and see some papers and -- so you get a mixture of teaching of, you know, how to do these things from, you know, some basic stuff with some seeing, oh, this is what people are doing now, the most exciting all mixed together. And I think that the Stony Brook thing, the game theory, is way -- it's often way too high-level for many (inaudible) of math, but, I mean, at least -- but, you know --

MR. YOUNG: Well, it has -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ALDRICH: I sort of oppose the sort of Michiganish kind of thing because then it's a core issue. You take it once as a graduate student, it's a (inaudible) nugget, and then you go into something else as opposed to possibly -- well, I (inaudible) the Stony Brook game theory analogy, too, yeah, as something that's understandable. But having it as an ongoing dialogue where people can come and expect to

get papers and learn and talk to, you know, empiricists who they'll be regularly talking with, you know, theorists over time and vice versa, I think is a much better way to go.

MR. YOUNG: Well --

MR. ACHEN: Actually the first meeting of the methods group was held at Michigan with Michigan money and we worked very hard -- or it was they at that point, not -- I wasn't there. But they worked hard to separate it from the summer program because they thought that was important. So I'm -- I think the Michigan person sitting at the table here -- Carl is off somewhere -- should endorse this idea that it should be separate from the summer program.

MR. GRANATO: What's the duration of your thing? I mean, are you thinking 3 to 4 days or are you thinking -- I heard a month? I mean --

MR. BRADY: Well, I think it needs both a research element and a teaching element and the teaching element means at least courses of a week or probably 2 weeks or something like that. So, you know, I haven't thought much beyond that, but a month -- 2 weeks to a month, something like that.

MR. FREEMAN: The MacArthur model, I think, if I understand it, brings people back together also midyear and they also have a constant dialogue that goes on. They have something that would be of longer

duration so these people wouldn't, as John suggested, show up, talk for a while, and then go home.

MS. EAVEY: It's more of a network type.

MR. FREEMAN: Right, exactly. And they really work to nurture that network and --

MR. YOUNG: Yeah, the network concept is different, though, from this. I -- speaking to the Stony Brook, Stony Brook is an interesting model. What it lacks is a strong teaching component. The teaching component is secondary, but it does have the feature that it's become known as the place to show up to learn about what's current. And so young people, young faculty, graduate students feel almost obliged. You know, if they want to stay on top of game theory they better show up at Stony Brook, and that's exactly I think the kind of image or reputation you want to establish, but that requires an ongoing commitment. It means it can't just be a 1- or 2-year commitment. It's very important that this thing, say, to run for 5 years.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, let me ask this question. You know -- and this is a delicate question. We don't want an Aldrich student to come to this because wouldn't that student get this at Duke?

MS. ZINNES: No, not necessarily.

MR. SCIOLI: Or an Achen student. Okay, so let me hear your thinking on that, or a Zinnes

student.

MR. ALT: Well, it would be precisely the point that you would want them there presenting their papers in the poster (phonetic) session. I mean, my view is this is an abstraction. I can't quite, you know, make -- live properly, but there are many functions, you know, being served here and everyone who goes should be part of at least two of them. That is to say you could be student going there only to learn in the teaching component, but you would also present something; or you might be a more advanced Aldrich student and you might be teaching something and taking something and, hopefully, presenting something as well. But it would seem to me that you're trying to build a group in which there's kind of flows information kind of both up and down and, you know, horizontally, and the whole point is to maximize, you know, all the flow of information, discussion, participation.

MR. BRADY: Well, I even see more advanced faculty members. Like I would love to volunteer to give a talk there so I could stay around and here Dick McKelvey talk, for example. That would be sort of another great benefit, so there's some of that that could happen as well.

MR. ALDRICH: Early on it's really important just to establish it as a, you know -- to have star



attraction power.

MR. BRADY: Right.

MS. MORTON: Also, I think that graduate students -- like, I see this at the methods meetings, that the graduate students who come from programs that have sophisticated methods training, you know, meet and get friendly with the graduate students who come from programs that are very sophisticated and there's a lot of, you know, kind of cross-graduate student interaction that's very, very good for the graduate students. So if you only had graduate students from programs that didn't have people who, you know, could offer that, then they wouldn't get that cross and it's very good for them when they get out. They make contacts and they keep, you know, sort of their peer group that they, you know, are -- follow with the rest of their careers. And it's important that there be graduate students of all levels, I think, there.

MR. BRADY: I think a bunch of collaborations have come out of the political methodology group meetings, long-term collaborations, yeah.

MR. YOUNG: The model that may be closest to this is the Santa Fe Institute Summer Programs, which generally run for, I think, about 4 weeks. And one of the features is that they are competitive. I mean, you know, there is a -- there's a selectivity aspect

to it which enhances the reputation of those things. So students apply, but they also have to be accompanied by a letter or two of recommendation, and then a selection is made. Now actually I think this is very good. It just means that it's something they think is important to have on their C.V. and all of that. It gives the incentive that you need instead of just showing up kind of all in droves.

MR. ALDRICH: That's the way that PMG was about year 3 or 4 or something. You had to write letters of recommendation for the graduate students and -- for the support, and they became exactly like you described it.

MR. SCIOLI: (inaudible) if it were a 4-week course --

MS. ZINNES: Yeah.

MR. SCIOLI: -- as opposed to PMG, which is 3 days or 4 days.

MS. ZINNES: You want to --

MR. SCIOLI: (inaudible) can respond to my point about --

MS. ZINNES: Yeah. I would say that one of the problems we have in -- amongst the modelers in the field is that lots of us don't talk to each other either because we come from rather different traditions. And I think this would help to break down the issue of rational choice versus, XXXHUH?XXX you

know, and help to educate people more as to what that whole thing means and what are some of the other modeling venues that we could be pursuing so that it would open up the field. So I think it'd be very important for Achen students and Aldrich students and Zinnes students to participate in these things so that they can sort of mesh. So I would say absolutely it should include those people.

I'd also say that this business about committing over a longer period of time is absolutely critical. If Cheryl will remember the proposal I wrote several years, we set it up so that the summer workshops would be rotating over -- we talked about a week or two because the money was so sparse. So that, for example, a student who was interested in modeling, who had rather little experience in it, would come let's say for the first summer and get an idea of what goes on in the modeling tradition, what are the different possible things that you can do. Then like, we would put some materials out on the Web, put together some minimodules out of mathematics that they could work under in the year, come back the following year and do a more advanced version. Okay, so you'd have several of these modules going on each summer at various levels.

So perhaps the first summer, you'd just have the most elementary and maybe one more developed

module. And then the second year, you'd have several more that you would add onto that. And in that way you would be constantly increasing the level of sophistication of the students. I mean, we have a lot of students that would really like to do modeling, but who just don't have the necessary background and they don't know how to start. And this is a way to slowly increase.

Now this is -- you know, this is a bit pie in the sky unless you supplement it with things like these Web-based courses that they could then pick up. I mean, for example, in Illinois, there in the math department they've developed a whole number of these interactive modules based on Mathematica, which take different components of mathematics -- differential equations, you know, stochastic processes, et cetera -- and have made them into basic little modules and they're interactive the student sort of plays with it and learns the material -- calculus is one of the star ones there -- and begins to pick up some of those tools.

Now what I said in my memo was we can't become Ph.D.'s in mathematics and we don't need to become Ph.D.'s in mathematics, but we do need enough familiarity so that we can at least talk to the mathematicians and so we know what to ask them, we know how to respond to them and that's what these

little modules would do. And since, you know, the student or the faculty member or whatever could do some of this through the Web, through the course of the year, then it would constantly build so that, you know, you would then have a more educated student the following year come back, do some more.

And I think the idea of combining it with the research agenda is excellent. You know, have a conference. These people could then develop papers where -- you know, based on some of the things that they've been doing. Going back and say, look, I got stuck at this point, what could you help me with here?

Yes, I hope I've answered your --

MR. MCKELVEY: What do you see as the scale of this?

MS. ZINNES: I'm sorry?

MR. MCKELVEY: What do you see as the scale of this? Because one thing that worries me a little bit is that it would get too large. I mean, you know, I think that -- well, I mean there's a couple of problems with that. First of all, the funding problems if it gets too large, but then also I think you lose some of the -- I don't know, some of the sense of community and sense of, you know, the ability of everyone to sort interact with each other. And also --

MS. ZINNES: I didn't always believe in

beginning small, seeing how it works and -- by small I mean, you know, let's not invite 100 people; let's start with, I don't know, 10, 15 (inaudible).

MR. MCKELVEY: I mean, another model that I think is a good one to keep in mind is the -- I think it was the MMSP conferences that Bill Riker ran, which I think were really crucial for the development of formal theory. These were run back in the late '60s, I guess. And, you know, these were a series of conferences run over, I don't know, about 3 to 5 years that were fairly small conferences, maybe about 25 people at each one. It was exactly this sort of format where you had a mixture, you know, some senior faculty members, but then a lot of junior people and graduate students, who -- it was sort of by invitation so that you -- the faculty members would sort of identify students that were sort of really promising.

And these were, I think, excellent conferences. They -- first of all, they developed this sense of community. It'd bring people interested in formal theory together. It developed these sort of long-term -- you know, these relations with other people in the discipline and start collaborative work. And I think they served exactly the kind of function that as to what you're trying to do here. So I don't think it needs to be all that -- you know, that big to do this.

MS. ZINNES: No, but it has -- just has to have a duration.

MR. MCKELVEY: Yeah, I agree. That's really important to bind these things up.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, it can't be a 2-year thing. It can't even be a 3-year, I think it's got to be a 5-year to start with till you really have some sense of how to move.

I think we should also mention the other type of program that's done, I gather something similar to what Riker did, namely the Bueno de Mesquita game theory, a Stanford-based program that went on in the summer. I think it was, what, 2 weeks usually. And that was also another instance in which it was a marvelous networking thing.

It was unlike what you're describing at Stony Brook. It began on a very elementary level, so people with practically no game theory background whatsoever could come, get the beginnings of it, and move on up. And that became a really -- something people looked forward to. Now it also ran out of money, like we did, so all these things stopped dead in their tracks, but that's another --

MR. BRADY: John and I were just talking and with the political methodology group I think once it hit above 40 it started becoming a different kind of experience. So there's a number in terms of size.

MR. GRANATO: Twenty-five to 40? What's the ratio faculty to students?

MS. ZINNES: That's --

MR. GRANATO: Anything optimal? Any suggestions?

MR. SCIOLI: I think that the devil would be in the details for Cheryl and Dan Newlin and we can work on this given -- I mean, fortunately, we have some of these other programs that we can reflect on, the political methodology group in particular. Let's just take this as an excellent number one idea and then we'll get into the details.

MR. BRADY: Let me just say one other thing, though, too, is I would hope that faculty come a little in and out. It's not like everybody has to come for a month. I can imagine people coming for 3 or 4 days doing their thing and then wandering off. There's got to be some core faculty who carry it through the process, but also it'd be good to have people come in and out.

MR. ALDRICH: It seems to me there are two different things being pieced together here. You may want to think of them as two separate -- (inaudible) both, but (inaudible) I think it was two separate components. One is a virtually standard, ordinary kind of conference where people are doing papers and discussing and interacting over that, and that should



be a 3- or 4-day thing. And then a more pedagogical component which may last longer. And then you -- you know, you arrange in advance for the duration of the faculty even if it's, like, one person is there the whole time and people come for maybe -- maybe come for 3 days of teaching. That's another way of doing that, but those are two separate things and I think both of them are very valuable. I think the first is actually the more valuable for getting going on this whole thing.

MS. ZINNES: But the other ingredient here, how about thinking about the conference as being less of a conference in the standard sense and more of a working setting? We do something called the Junior Master Class, which some of you know about, where we bring in -- and we've thought of combining it with the workshop, where we bring in selected graduate students from around the country who have submitted proposals that are modeling proposals. And we invite in several people from other institutions, that is senior masters, who come in and comment on these students' work. And so, you know, the work that they present is not a finished piece of work. It is something that is in process, but they would like some new ideas, different ways of thinking about it, and we try to supply that. We spend several hours on each project so there's plenty of time to really explore it.

We don't even let the student who is doing the project make the presentation. We nab our graduate students to make the presentation so that the project is seen by everybody in a sort of neutral light and then we have people comment on that. So you might do that sort of a thing where it's not necessarily a finished piece of work because we have lots of conferences where we can present modeling papers. It's a question of getting help on how to -- how do I handle this, particularly in the crossover between math modeling in the statistical part. How do I do this here? What data could I collect? What's appropriate research design here? I've thought about it this way, but -- that type of thing.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, remember that we'll work on developing a plan for getting an announcement out, but we have to have a proposal with someone offering a site, offering a teaching component, working out details with regard to salaries, et cetera. But I think the political science program is committed to this.

MR. GRANATO: Henry wants --

MR. SCIOLI: I think we're committed to it for more than -- yeah, we heard what you said about the duration and about the mix. My only comment at the outset was I don't want it to be the kind of a thing where we're making the best graduate students

who have the best skills, you know, kind of spending their time meeting the other best graduate students who have the best skills.

MS. ZINNES: No, but you want a mix.

MR. SCIOLI: Yes. No, absolutely.

MS. ZINNES: You want those best students mixing with the best students that don't have the skills.

MR. SCIOLI: I understand.

MS. ZINNES: So that there's the excitement. That's what I think you really want.

MR. GRANATO: Henry, would you like to go on to the second point?

MR. BRADY: Yeah, well, my second point -- again, I'm doing the broad coalition thing here and I'm not sure exactly where I come down. I think we need something like fellowships for grad students or postdoctoral training, but something right in that area. And maybe we should discuss what our preference would be or maybe we would like to think about trying to do both. I'm not sure where I come down exactly.

MR. SIMON: One way to possibly accomplish that would be to have department -- poli. sci. departments submit theses, Ph.D. -- recent Ph.D. theses, current Ph.D. theses that include both aspects, and also little lists to see how this group fits in with the rest. And departments somehow that

encourage the empirical theory mix would get fellowships for carrying out the process.

MR. BRADY: This was your IGERT.

MR. SIMON: Well, it's not quite the IGERT.

MR. BRADY: Well, yeah.

MR. SIMON: It's very related.

MR. BRADY: Yeah, it's related.

MR. SIMON: It should be thrown out together.

MR. BRADY: You mentioned it in that context, though, yeah.

MS. MORTON: My main concern about the issue -- I mean, I think that this idea is great. My main concern is I really think that it's less harmful for somebody to do this while they're still in graduate school than after they get their degree. And I think this -- even though people do look at how long it takes you to finish, I think that people look at that less than they do the years after you finish. And if you've got time to play around with some extra time training, you can do that while you're working your degree more easily than you can after you get your degree. I mean, it's just, you know -- I'm not against having the postdocs. I'm just saying that I think having something where somebody could still be working on their degree and then take a year out, but like, for instance, after they finish their

coursework, but before they really are starting their dissertation.

MR. YOUNG: Can I throw a wet towel on this or at least a damp one? I think the idea is great in principle. I wanted to relate some things that arose in a similar program with SSRC, sponsored by MacArthur; maybe some of you know about this.

It was exactly the same idea, okay? Fellowships would be provided to, you know, select, really top graduate students who demonstrated that they were going to work, this is in economics now, on topics that were sort of -- fell within a kind of range of unusual topics as defined by the foundation. That is inequality and things like that, that wouldn't normally be top on the agenda of a standard department. So you wanted smart students attracted to topics that are a little bit off the beaten track.

Now I was part of the review committee for these things and I'll tell you what happens. First of all, you name the topic. You know, people around this table and our colleagues are very clever at gaming systems like this. You simply find a way to get another fellowship coming into your department by cleverly naming something so that it seems like it's going to be within the new framework. But actually, when you look at the products ex post, in 90 percent of the cases they probably would have been written

anyway.

Now I'm just saying that this is the reality that one has to face or you have to have some -- if you're going to do it, you've got to have some very serious control mechanisms. And I don't quite know how you set this up. You certainly have to have ex post review as to how is this working. Is it actually accomplishing what we thought it was going to or is it just one more thesis fellowship going to Harvard University kind of thing? Which, by the way, is -- these things also tend to get corralled by the top departments. I mean, this is also clear.

MR. ALT: I want to make -- I want to suggest that we separate the discussion of graduate fellowships from postdocs. I don't have a prejudice against either part. I happen to feel much more strongly about the postdoctoral part.

MR. BRADY: Positively.

MR. ALT: Positively. Well, no, I feel great about graduate fellowships and training --

MR. BRADY: More positive.

MR. ALT: -- but I don't have anything special to say about them. Postdocs is a challenge to run right. The way I think it should be run is that NSF should essentially set up a market or a clearinghouse taking proposals both from the candidates and from the projects that would house them

and actually serving as a matching -- a dating service. Obviously, at least to get it off the ground, you'd have to have the power to do a little searching yourselves. That is to say if you had a really good candidate and you didn't have the right project, but you knew of a project that would be good, you should be able to try and make it happen.

But in the long run, my view would be that the best sort of postdoctoral operation is simply this kind of matching service, people with projects in the area covered. That is to say we're interested in the articulation and testing of formal models. Clearly we're going to try to foster research in that area, so the projects will be there that could house postdoctoral fellows. When they are there, there should be this kind of opportunity for a project to add a person for a year, not more than 1 year out from Ph.D., you know, with the kind of prestige added that powerful support from this kind of group and the NSF offers. And graduate students who could benefit from this should be encouraged to apply.

Anybody who was at CBRSS over the last 2 years and watched the transformation of Kevin Quinn -- I'm sorry to put his name in the record -- from a guy who really didn't know where he was going to the person I now regard as the top prospect on the market in, you know, sort of statistical methods now 3 years

out from Ph.D., would understand the power of an arrangement like this where you just have someone who's picked up a lot of tools and doesn't quite know what they're for. Just getting a direction by working on a focused research program under someone else's direction and sort of going, in the space of a year, from research assistant to, you know, own (phonetic) author, you know, research director is a wonderful thing to watch. They don't all work out that well, believe me.

But I would have thought NSF should have a target of something like I'll say five a year, five postdocs a year. The cost has got to be about 50K, so we're talking a quarter-million a year, and, again, running it 4 or 5 years. It makes the most sense as part of -- I'm not trying to make the program be one size fit all, but if you want to have a postdoctoral program with an emphasis on articulation and testing of formal models, then you have to be pushing the research somehow a little bit to make sure that the projects are there, too, to house these people. But I feel pretty confident that, you know, with some effort, in a year or two, you could be at the place where you could start up a program that would top out at about five a year. It might be only two or three in the first year, and run it for 5 years and you would have created, you know, two dozen superbly



tooled up young faculty.

MS. ZINNES: I think that's a really excellent idea. About a decade ago, maybe 2 decades ago, when there were several projects going across the country that were actually NSF-funded, although perhaps some of them were DARPA-funded. I mean, I remember when Rudy Rummell (phonetic), years and years ago, had an ongoing project. I guess his was an ARPA project, but anyway, he and I -- I had an NSF and we exchanged graduate students over -- you know, an advanced graduate student from my workshop would go to their workshop so that they would learn different ways of doing things. And I think that's -- you know, that was a small thing.

The only thing I would add to it is while I think NSF should be the clearinghouse, it would be nice if there were some, you know, input from people. For example, it might be that I have a student that is really doing some very interesting thing that are suggested -- that suggest a game theoretic approach that perhaps Chris is very much involved in or some time series approach. It would be nice if I could simply call Chris and say, hey, you know, this kid would really do very well working with you for a year, and then let's put in a joint sort of thing to -- what are you doing right now? Would this match up with what you're doing? And then sort of jointly submit

something. But I think it's an excellent idea, Jim.

MS. EAVEY: That's actually easier than having NSF provide a dating service, which I'm not sure we can provide. We could certainly entertain proposals where you get your student together with Chris' folks and institution and you submit a proposal for a postdoc. We could even potentially do something like a two-stage process where there is a competition for institutions to kind of serve as homes for postdocs. And then later have postdocs come in, you know, under separate proposals and be matched up with homes.

MR. MCKELVEY: Yeah. I think it makes more sense to have it be the institutions that make the proposals to NSF.

MS. EAVEY: I agree.

MR. MCKELVEY: I mean, I think that -- you know, that the graduate students are at a stage where they don't really know that much what they want to do. To expect them to be making these proposals doesn't make that much sense. But I think, you know, faculty members, you know, could either individually or together with other --

MR. ALT: Just a quick sentence. This is very -- this is all correct. And it occurs to me that if we get the summer program that we just discussed going, the information problem is going to be largely

solved there because that's going to be an interaction precisely of the most likely candidate graduate students and the sort of people doing research in the area.

MR. MCKELVEY: Yeah. Now, I mean, the other -- I'm a little concerned about Peyton's concern. Do you think that having this be an ongoing postdoc where you have to come back and, say, seek renewed funding or something of that sort, do you think that would help to alleviate this problem?

MR. BRADY: Well, I think the problem's greatest for graduate students because there's so much fungibility at that point. It's so hard to know what's going on inside. Once you've got a person who's finished a dissertation you have a much better sense of where that person is and you can judge whether they really need this kind of stuff.

MR. MCKELVEY: One thing I will --

MR. BRADY: I think there's less of a problem.

MR. YOUNG: Well, the problem can be solved with great attention paid to the process by which the awards are made. So you have to construct a review committee with exceeding care because otherwise, you're just going to get, you know, one for you and one for me. I mean, that's how it worked in this SSRC case.

MR. BRADY: But also that was not postdocs, was it?

MR. YOUNG: It was -- in this case, it was thesis sort of final year fellowship.

MR. BRADY: But I think the problem is it's just too easy to take somebody who, gee, they're already doing formal theory plus empirical work, I'm just going to say they're really doing this in a novel fashion, that they wouldn't have done it otherwise, and get the fellowship that way. When you've got somebody who just finished a dissertation you can sort of look and see, well, what's in that dissertation? What do they need? Would they really benefit from this?

MR. ALDRICH: I think you think of it in that case, also, as a -- I mean, here's a genuine postdoc, a person who's in transition having completed the project, the thesis project, looking for a way to either extend or being a second project and the second project could be, you know, here's my dissertation, look, there really isn't any data in here.

MR. BRADY: Right.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, exactly. Exactly.

MS. MORTON: Or there's no theory. Or there's no theory.

MR. BRADY: No theory, yeah, right.

MR. KEECH: I'd like to suggest an

additional focus of postdoctoral fellowships. These seem to be pre-tenure and we were discussing yesterday some of the disincentives and problems of combining what you want to have people do with the postdoc and what they're thinking about, namely getting a job and getting tenure. I would like to suggest that there be some fellowships for post-tenure people. They would be for people who had created some distinguished record in either theory or empirical work, and they would be designed to supplement that strength with some training in the other. And so you'd be taking people who had already demonstrated success by reaching tenure and demonstrated some distinction in one or the other of these fields, but if you want to combine them, this I think would be a good way of making a pretty small investment and supplementing the existing strength with the alternative. I think these might also be focused in a way that was designed to generate proposals that combine theory and empirical work in ways that we explicitly want to foster.

I have another suggestion --

MS. ZINNES: Bill, can I just ask you? Are you -- is this sort of like training in another discipline type of postdoctoral (inaudible)?

MR. KEECH: It could be, but I'm thinking of it within political science.

MS. ZINNES: Right. No, but I -- well,

okay. But I -- okay. It would be somebody who has modeling experience, but doesn't have much statistical background would sort of cross over.

MALE SPEAKER: Exactly.

MS. ZINNES: Okay.

MS. EAVEY: So it's a variation of the MMS midcareer, so we already have some experience with (inaudible).

MR. KEECH: My second proposal is for predoctoral, this is also in the educational area. I'd suggest -- now this may be risky, but I'd suggest that NSF have fellowships for predoctoral students. They would be awarded to individuals, but they would be useable, and here's the key feature, at programs that are known to have strengths in both kinds of training. Now this would provide two kinds of incentives. It would provide incentives for students to choose programs, but it would provide an incentive for universities to be sure that their programs met these kinds of standards.

Now I haven't thought much about how to implement that and I think there are obvious risks involved. But if we think we know what we want, if we think we know what we agree on, we ought to be able to write that down and say here is a model program or here is a set of examples or here are some things that ought to be included in a program that would train

people who were capable of combining theory with empirical work. And you would have programs seeking to translate themselves into approved programs and you would also have a place -- a set of places or you'd be confident in sending students to get the appropriate training for the kind of thing that we want.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah. The difficulty I see with that is -- and that's why I -- once again, we heard a proposal about this in which it was -- these were year-long courses. The problem is it's very hard to get a graduate student to move from one university to another.

MR. BRADY: Dina, let's say goodbye to Norman and say thank you to him for coming, okay?

MS. ZINNES: Thank you.

MR. BRADBURN: (inaudible) back in June.

MR. BRADY: Okay. Take care, Norman.

Thanks.

MR. BRADBURN: Well, thank you.

MR. BRADY: Bye-bye.

MS. ZINNES: The students can't really afford to take the time off. And so as a consequence, the summer program doesn't interrupt their progress through the dissertation and, I don't know, maybe that's something that one could work out, but it --

MR. KEECH: It wouldn't necessarily mean moving from programs. It would be open to students at

given programs.

MS. ZINNES: Oh, I see.

MR. KEECH: And the more universities who develop these approved programs, the more students would be eligible for fellowships that would reduce the cost of training graduate students at these universities. So it's an incentive for students to orient their training in the way that we're trying to point people. And it would be an honor to have this kind of NSF fellowship, but it also has some kind of leverage over the program because you would need to get approval by having a set of courses and an organized curriculum that was designed to give the kind of training that we think is involved in this.

MS. ZINNES: That sounds good, yeah.

MR. BRADY: But it seems to me the biggest problem is the overhead cost of NSF trying to certify many, many, many programs given what I think the scale would be of the number of fellowships involved. So maybe you need to think of another way to link the certification to the fellowships.

MS. EAVEY: Well, rather than have NSF certify or approve, if you want to go ahead and do this we could simply lay out the criteria that must be met for an award of this type to be made. That is the institution should have such and such, and such and such features in place.



MR. SIMON: Well, let me throw out again the possibility of looking at past successes, recent successes of theses that blend both areas as a criterion.

MS. MORTON: Well, and also, I think that it's one thing to have the courses on the books, but many political science programs are so unstructured that students can basically take whatever they want. So it is quite possible that you would fund some student to go to a program that has this whole thing there, and the student get there and they not take any of those courses.

MS. EAVEY: Would the reviewers know that?

MS. MORTON: There'd have to be some way of checking to say you have to take these, you know, advanced -- not just intro courses and methods and models, but the advanced courses.

MS. EAVEY: So a letter from a chair --

MS. MORTON: Certifying --

MS. EAVEY: -- (inaudible) that --

MS. MORTON: But the thing is, once you already gave the student money, trying to get that money back from the student if they don't -- I mean, that could be a problem. I mean, there are some problems. I mean, I'm all -- I think that's a great idea. I just think it --

MR. MCKELVEY: Let me -- well, what about

Carl's idea of looking at output of the program in terms of dissertation, a recent dissertation output? I mean, that sort of is a way of getting a handle on this, namely are the students really doing both theory and empirical work?

MR. SIMON: It has a way of rewarding departments who do exactly what we're trying to get them to do. It's a real carrot.

MR. BRADY: Carl, do you know of anybody who does that? Because I just worry about the overhead cost of who's going to read 200 dissertations, if that's what it amounts to. Not me.

MR. SIMON: Well, that's the definition of a panel, isn't it?

MR. BRADY: Maybe, but --

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah. The other -- Becky's problem, it may be that some portion of the fellowship comes in the important time of post-exam, pre-dissertation writing. And to get that money you have to demonstrate you actually took the right exams and so forth.

MS. MORTON: Yeah. Yeah. So that you could get this if -- and once you've taken the -- a set of courses and made such and such grades or pass the comprehensive exams in these fields, then you could get that. That would be -- and that would give the students the incentive to take the courses.

MS. EAVEY: Becky, I think the institution has the incentive. It's no different than a research submitting a proposal to NSF and saying he or she is going to do such and such. We give them the money, we don't do a lot of monitoring on the back end. We basically put our time on the front end, although that's changing in some areas, but still basically the front end. And the assumption is that they will, to the best of their ability, do such and such and if they don't do such and such, the odds of getting money again from NSF are basically zero. That's a pretty strong incentive to at least try to do what you say. And if a department comes in and says we will offer the following opportunities to the student and then doesn't follow through, it's not likely that they'd ever get any more money for this activity. Yes?

MR. KEECH: You might not have to have the institution certified permanently and they might make the case for any given year. I mean, we all know how difficult it is to staff courses, particularly these kinds of things and sometimes a year may go by. The application process might include a component from a student who is making the case for their career plans and it would also have a component from the university saying here's our record in the past, here's our plan for this specific year. And we plan to register this student in these courses and we guarantee that they

will be taught.

MR. YOUNG: Can -- oh, I'm sorry, I'm getting ahead of the -- we -- Henry, were you continuing with the consensus building or are we sort of on a more free-ranging --

MR. BRADY: Well, I think we've been talking about fellowships, both graduate and postdoc. Are we finished with that? Is there more to say?

MR. ALT: I'd like to read one sentence into the record just to make sure it got there because --

MR. BRADY: The distinguished gentleman from Harvard University.

MR. ALT: Yes. From a conversation -- a brief conversation I had while out of the room, by all means have the institutions -- going back to the postdocs, by all means have institutions do the applying. By even more all means, make sure that part of the application specifies an actual grant-supported current research project that would receive the postdoc. It doesn't have to be, I guess, an NSF project. You could put people on an NIH project with NSF funds and the money would be well spent. But that goes a long way to addressing Peyton's very real problem at that level because it prevents all kinds of skullduggery and it also gets away from what I dislike most about some of these postdoc programs, which is the place gets them and then, you know, you completely

lose the force of what you're doing with them.

So by all means, institutional proposals, but absolutely essential to have them linked to a currently active, grant-supported research project. And that means the institution has to reapply each year. You know, and that's just the cost of running the program, but it's worth it.

MS. MORTON: But not just any research project.

MR. ALT: No, no. It has to be an appropriate research project with current support. But I would say it does not have to be supported by the NSF itself.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, but given the amount of money that there is in the political science field for getting support for research, I'm not sure it has to be funded research. I mean, lots of people are doing very interesting research. They don't necessarily have a grant at that point.

MS. MORTON: Yeah.

MS. ZINNES: I mean --

MS. MORTON: There's unfunded research going on.

MS. ZINNES: There's a lot of unfunded research in this field. (Laughter)

MR. SIMON: Before we move on from this topic, let me just point out that it is very close to

the IGERT, you know, EITM IGERT, which would be -- you know, the IGERTs go to support for 5 years a program that meets certain interdisciplinary and sort of unique niche concentrations. And this is sort of close to it, and so, you know, I think on the list we should write the two next to each other since they have some of the same flavor. This has -- what we've been talking about has had a lot of stress on what the output is. The IGERT seems to me to have a lot more stress on sort of making sure the correct input is there.

MR. YOUNG: How is -- I'm unfamiliar with IGERT, how it really works. What's an example of how you monitor IGERT?

MS. EAVEY: We don't fund (inaudible).

MR. SCIOLI: How the foundation monitors --

MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

MR. SCIOLI: There are site visits. It's a -- as Carl said, it's a 5-year program. There's a site visit each year to see that a program is proceeding by speaking to the graduate students and --

MS. EAVEY: But it's a little different in the sense that IGERT is establishing a program that's relatively large-scale by NSF standards. What we're talking more about here is taking a student and putting them into a program.

MR. YOUNG: It's a low-budget IGERT.

(Laughter)

MR. BRADY: Well, I think that segues into the next sort of major class of kinds of things we might think about is so far, we've been talking a lot about training and teaching, but how about research? Is there something to be said for centers that would get money and resources that would be more research than anything else, but also might include some aspects of a teaching program. That might have to focus on a small number of universities and I always have mixed feelings about that for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is because of geographic distribution reasons. Wyoming always seems to get one. And -- I'm just kidding, Frank.

MR. SCIOLI: No, you -- please make sure you emphasize that we have an EPSCOR program, experimental program to stimulate cooperative research in certain designated states. And I don't think anyone in the room is from one of those states, but Wyoming is a state as is Nebraska, as is North Dakota, South Dakota.

MR. BRADY: Anyway. Well, I think there's great promise in Wyoming.

MR. SIMON: Sign me up.

MR. BRADY: I won't say anything about Montana because I'll get in trouble with --

MR. SIMON: Isn't the --

MR. BRADY: -- Chris down there. (Laughter)

MR. SIMON: The simplest idea in this vein -- Henry, it seems like the very simplest idea in this vein is something that was battered about at dinner last night, and that is just to have the poli. sci. division put aside a certain number of the usual NSF research support for EITM activities. It could -- hopefully, it would be some additional money so it wouldn't all be taking away from the current grant support, but that there would be a well-known special source, a special collection of, you know, research money for proposals that clearly demonstrate a strong integrated theory/empirical work. And that seems sort of the easiest of everything we've talked about.

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah. We could probably -- I mean, we can think about issuing an announcement as we did for the -- excuse me -- for the political science infrastructure competition and target it to, you know, a well-crafted letter that specified what we had in mind and announce a target in terms of how many resources are available and see what comes in. And if we -- you know, if we were lucky and you got 30 proposals, we'd have a, you know, a panel and we'd evaluate. We -- the program was quite successful with the infrastructure competition because our division director was interested in seeing how it played out and came to our aid with additional resources. Now



he's a lame doc and so I don't have to kiss up to him any more. (Laughter)

MR. BUTZ: Although I must say they tried very hard to get additional resources out of me for something just like that and I said, you know, you're just going to have to wait a year, I haven't even seen the panel yet -- I mean, this working group yet.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, you've seen us now.

MR. BUTZ: I have, but I don't --

MR. SCIOLI: Wait 2 more weeks. (Laughter)

MS. EAVEY: And no money.

MR. BUTZ: Yeah, and no money.

SPEAKER: Do we want to go one --

MR. BUTZ: Well, I can make recommendations for my successor.

MR. FREEMAN: Can we go one step further maybe? One of the most interesting ideas, I think it was Peyton's idea of the Hilbert problem analogy. This is supposedly a distinguished group --

FEMALE SPEAKER: What?

MR. FREEMAN: The Hilbert.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: We had a softball team in Minnesota actually named that in the math department. They weren't very good either. Anyway, I think that this group could conceivably identify -- and not binding foci, but nonetheless areas of focus that we

feel ought to have the most potential to -- or in which this approach would realize the greatest potential. Government dissolution and formation has been mentioned. Also I think legislative process, we can perhaps make it a little more specific than that. But I think it'd be unfortunate to just ask for a methodological innovation. I think we want to all avoid that and I would second Peyton's suggestion that we identify some problems in which we think this kind of progress could be made.

MR. GRANATO: I'd like to add something to that. We haven't talked about a comparative component. And one of the -- I just got back from Argentina and I spoke with the president their NSF and that's exactly what he said was kind of what Peyton says, focus on one problem that can unite Argentinean researchers with U.S. researchers. And one of the ideas he had was fiscal problems. I mean, they have a deadline of 2006 with their convertibility issue and some other things, and repaying back their debt. And the United States, for example, has the entitlement problem. We have similar systems in some respects and it'd be nice to have teams of researchers from institutes there and here working on some type of joint project that merges an EITM-type approach. So there probably will be in the Dear Colleague letter an avenue for international cooperation, as well. So I

want you to know that, too. I forgot to mention that yesterday.

MS. ZINNES: You might even send out a request for major areas of major problems that people think are really at the forefront of having breakthroughs. And those could be incorporated in things that we could think about as part of --

MR. FREEMAN: Don't we have some intuitions about that?

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, we do, but there may be some out there that we're not aware of.

MR. FREEMAN: Oh, for sure.

MR. YOUNG: Well, right. I'm just pursuing this point a little further. I mean, I think it's -- you're not proposing, or are you, that we just right now, sitting around the table, kind of concoct a list?

MR. FREEMAN: Well, I would be surprised if we couldn't identify five or six areas --

MR. YOUNG: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: -- where we think this -- no, I'm not saying it's binding. It's not binding. If someone comes up with something we haven't thought of, by all means we could support it. But on the other hand, we're together, we have some insights about where the progress is being made. Jim mentioned one yesterday.

MR. ALT: Well, I was going to say, I have

no stake in this, but I did actually list in the middle of page 3 of my memo places where I thought we needed work, which is, you know, I think a little closer to the Hilbert list. These are the -- you know, there has been a lot of work done on legislative process. There has been a lot of work done on coalition bargaining.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Where --

MR. ALT: It's the paragraph that starts with the words, "The third thing." I list failed democracy, democratic stability, regime transition, cycles of democracy and authoritarianism, politics in the absence of the rule of law, unstable property and political rights, economic development and growth, ethnic political strife, discontinuous political change like coups and revolutions. I mean, that's a, you know, a quick checklist.

MR. BRADY: That's an (inaudible) list.

MR. ALT: Yeah, that's the six from (inaudible) on the Hilbert list, you know. No, I mean, that's -- I'm saying, I don't think it's that hard to write down the topics. What's hard is to write down the models.

MR. FREEMAN: That's not Maslow's theorem. I mean, it's --

SPEAKER: Yeah, right. I mean, we're not going to know when these problems are solved.

MR. SIMON: Right. Unlike the Hilbert (inaudible) where you knew.

MR. ALT: But, you know -- so, I mean, I don't think it's -- seriously, I don't think it's that difficult to compile a list of problems. I don't think it would be that productive. I think -- I'm much -- but no, I was going to say, I like the idea of doing it, but I would -- I think it was Peyton's suggestion. If I just insulted someone, forgive me. I think it'd be much better to manage a competition, to let those proposals appear from the field rather than to try and write a list ourselves.

So to put another institutional forum for this, because we're all talking around the same idea, I was going to propose that we set up one or more research working group. So the research working group has an A list and a B list, an A list of maybe 15 scholars and a B list of 30 more. And the idea is that you facilitate them working together over an extended period, 3 years minimum, meeting twice a year. Say, the A list goes to every meeting with a third of the B list, you know, sort of each time so you have an inner core and an outer group. Everybody writes papers, everybody critiques somebody else's paper. You build up a community.

The core to the intellectual organization would be one theme of substance. So a competition for

these produces your Hilbert list, if you get, you know, 10 or 20 proposals. Those would be the 10 or 20 problems around which someone was willing to organize an ongoing team of researchers to work on this problem for an extended period of time.

SPEAKER: (inaudible)

MR. ALT: And the other -- sorry, this -- I'm about a half a sentence from the end. The other precondition is multiple approaches and methods. That is to say it should be a topic in which there are literatures from rational choice and nonrational choice, for which appropriate methodologies include statistics, dynamic modeling, and experiments. And that, you know, someone has to write a proposal to set up a research group like this and find 14 people willing to be part of it. They don't have to name the whole B list at the outset, but you would have to have a pretty clear A list to get the grant.

And then it seems to me we're not funding salaries here. We're really just funding ongoing meetings and promulgation of research and stuff like that. So one of these without overhead is maybe 150K or I don't know, I'm not really as good at costing these things out as I thought I was. But -- so 200K if you have to pay overhead on an activity like this. So you do it for 3 years, we're in the ballpark of a half-million-dollar award. So if you can get a

million, you know, over that period you do two of them. And you do it with a competition rather than having a committee draw up the lists.

And I think you get a structure that addresses the networking concerns that people have had, you get some of the center-like benefits that Henry was talking about. I mean, if this thing meets in one place it sort of becomes a thematic center. If it's kind of like the Frieden Eichengreen things that, you know, meets in two places or three places, I don't think it matters, you know, or at least I don't know ex ante whether one of those is better than another. But it seems to me this kind of organization, building a team of a dozen people, you know, who are really concerned with one problem of substance, who contain among the multiple approaches cuts, takes, you know, on that, and who surround themselves with twice as big a group of preferably mostly, you know, junior faculty, you know, scholars with an interest, and they all work together and you kind of generate these -- I think, you generate these enormous positive externalities then for the rest of the field having all these people.

MR. BRADY: I'm trying to think of what that might look like. In a -- just as an idea, right off the top of my head, is I'm (inaudible) the question of ethnic identity. And there's a bunch of people, Jim

Furon, David Leighton --

MR. ALT: Right.

MR. BRADY: -- have been thinking about this problem, and other people. And it's a case where George Echelov has now written a really neat paper, I think at least, on identify. And you can imagine pulling together a group like that.

MR. ALT: Well, you would put it together with Ian Johnstone and Yoe (phonetic) Herrera who just got a (inaudible) head initiative grant due to content analysis-based studies of identity, which is a sort of different (inaudible) --

MR. BRADY: But is that -- I mean, I'm just trying to get a sense, is this what you're thinking about, some group like that that might bring in younger scholars.

MR. FREEMAN: What happened to this focus on epistemology here? What happened to this marriage of formal theory and (inaudible)?

MR. BRADY: Well, but that would be the goal. In other words, I mean, the goal here is that there are formal models that are beginning to be developed about ethnic identity --

MR. ALT: Right. That's an Echelov model, I'm sure (inaudible). They call it (inaudible).

MR. BRADY: -- and identity more generally. And then there's a lot of empirical work and the two



need to meet. And so that --

MR. FREEMAN: It's got to be clear to people, we're not just talking about, you know, interesting work on ethnicity and identity.

MR. BRADY: No, no, no.

MR. FREEMAN: It's got to be people who have an epistemological (inaudible) kind of --

MR. ALT: No, no. That is -- I -- maybe I didn't say that part of it loud enough. Focused on a problem of substance and the two necessary conditions are multiple formal theoretical approaches and multiple methodological approaches.

MR. FREEMAN: With an aim to the marriage or --

MR. ALT: Okay.

MR. FREEMAN: -- complement (inaudible).

MR. ALT: Yes, and we prefer those to be integrated rather than fragmented. But the whole idea of having the group -- you know, the unspoken point -- actually no, I see why you ask that now. I could have made that clearer. The point of having the same core group meet again and again and again is that I believe in this evolutionary wave is actually the best way to get the integration and marriage of these disparate approaches. Otherwise, if you let them fund little satellite conferences, each one goes off and does their own thing and you don't actually get the

collaboration that produces integration.

MR. FREEMAN: But Jeff and Barry -- and I've been lucky enough to have been invited the last couple times and it's just sort of a celebration of all the different ways to study international finance. I mean, it's fascinating, it's -- I'm really glad I went. But it's sort of a smorgasbord of everything, you know. Anna Schwartz came last time, it was fascinating to hear her talk about when she was working with Milton Friedman in the 19 -- I mean, it was fascinating. I'm really glad I went. But I mean, how that connects with these guys from the IMF building, optimal control models of currency management, it just -- you know, it just didn't happen. It just didn't happen.

MR. ALT: Well, you raise --

MR. FREEMAN: So you've got to have somebody at the heart of this that understands what we're all about here today, and if you don't have someone at the heart of it (inaudible).

MR. BRADY: That's what I was trying to ask. I was trying to come up with an area where I think the area is right for, like, survey researchers who have done a lot of work trying to measure ethnic identity; I don't think very well, frankly. And then now there's formal modelers who are trying to think about this. I think if you brought them together something

good might happen.

MR. ALT: Well, but the --

MR. BRADY: Now I'm not trying to say that we judge the whole program on my example, but there is an example of something that might be done.

MR. ALT: Oh, no, I think it's an -- I think it's actually a prize example because it is precisely an area in the field that is currently extremely hot and one -- the reason I like it so well is that there isn't an area studies person in America who doesn't think it's an important question, much as they would hate the way you and I would approach the study of it.

MR. YOUNG: Part of the problem here gets solved by making it a competition, of course.

MR. ALT: That's why I led with that.

MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

MS. MORTON: It just seems too big to me, Jim, like, 15 A people and 30 B people. I mean, I don't know if you could find that many people on a specific problem who, you know, would be able -- who would really constrain it in the way you want it -- we would want it in terms of empirical and formal. I mean, I think it's a good idea, but I think a much smaller sort of thing is more likely not to end up being the kind of thing that John's describing. I think that's what scares me about what you're proposing is that it's just too big and then it

becomes this, well, everything's great and, you know, and we don't need any theory, you know.

MR. YOUNG: Can I -- this seems like a good moment for me, if you want, to comment on this MacArthur network since this is now getting very, very close to what MacArthur has done. Now -- would that be out of line?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Go ahead.

MR. YOUNG: First of all, I think the idea that Jim has proposed is terrific and it has an advantage that the MacArthur networks do not have. First, it's competitive. That is critical here. You force, by the competitive element, people to make that question, the substantive question, focused, answerable, at least in principle. And then the -- I would assume the proposal also involves a specification of exactly who at least will be in the A group and you read off of that. The panel then reviewing this would say, well, this looks like a group that really could work together, it really does involve people that are open-minded and have the appropriate skills; or no, this is kind of a smorgasbord group that is just going to talk about ethnicity from here till doomsday and never get anywhere. You know, that's the kind of thing a panel would have to decide.

The MacArthur groups, and this speaks to

Becky's point, are too big. Fifteen to -- they're too big. Fifteen to 20 people is just too big, in my opinion, and it's very expensive. You need to make this a kind of a lean, mean version of MacArthur, a little bit scaled down.

I actually have to tell you that I'm not in favor of the B list based on what I've seen. I think that it's great to have students, you know, participate in a kind of a, quote, B role, but to have members of the profession wheeling in and out in a B role creates all kinds of problems. In the first place, they know they're B. (Laughter) And you're just adding to the -- sort of the plethora of different points of view, and this is where the MacArthur things, in my view, sort of go off track. They just aren't focused enough. There's not enough drive toward a solution of a problem. It's sitting around talking year after year about a general problem area.

MR. FREEMAN: XXXital My Dinner With Andre,XXX that's exactly what it is.

MR. YOUNG: Yeah.

MR. FREEMAN: Just listen to people talking.

MR. YOUNG: And actually I think that even that, you know, flat as it is, has had a positive impact in economics. Actually it's okay. It's probably been worth the money, but I think it could

have been done more efficiently. And what is being proposed here would be a more efficient version.

MR. ALT: I completely accept all these. I mean, you know, it seems to me if we have agreed on the framework and the structure and now we're talking about whether it's an A group of 8 or an A group of 15 and whether you formalize the B list or whether, you know, you just bring people in in supporting roles without formalizing, it seems to me to be, you know, a wide measure of agreement rather than disagreement, so thanks.

MS. EAVEY: And if you're talking about a competitive process then --

MR. ALT: Oh, completely. I don't -- I can't emphasize enough how much I agree with Peyton's emphasis that that is absolutely the key to, you know, to me.

MR. BRADY: I must say the notion of trying to coordinate 15 people almost terrifies me. The notion of five or six or seven might be exciting enough, but not terrifying.

MR. GRANATO: Eleven is hard.

MALE SPEAKER: Herding cats. (Laughter)

MS. ZINNES: Herding cats?

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

MS. ZINNES: That's a good one.

MR. ALT: I suggest that the request for

proposals specify, you know, a non-negative integer not larger than 15. (Laughter)

MR. GRANATO: So cap it at 15. I mean, we want to give some -- there should be some specificity in the letter so that people don't get --

MR. ALDRICH: There is a successful one that goes around an ethnic conflict. That's Bates and Leighton and Furon and junior people that are A listed and it's about -- well, it's about 12 or 14 people. That means who actually shows up at any given one is, you know, 10 or so because there's always somebody who can't.

MR. ALT: Yeah. But the critical thing about the -- I mean, the other thing I -- that I haven't mentioned is they're -- I mean, clearly the proposal -- I know this doesn't meet the problem of how do you get them to do it when the time comes, but clearly the proposal, like every NSF proposal, has to include plans for disseminating, you know, results of the study. And one of the weaknesses of the Frieden Eichengreen group is that they've always had a kind of hang loose, you know, we'll produce an edited volume when the pile of papers is high enough approach to that side of it, and we have to try to do better.

MR. FREEMAN: To be fair to them, they don't the statistic logical agenda.

MR. ALT: No.

MR. FREEMAN: Just the opposite, they want -- Jim, they want to allow many --

MR. ALT: We want them to produce a volume that successfully integrates formal theory and, you know, empirical methods. And we will be as successful in getting them to produce results as the foundation traditionally has been in getting grantees to produce results, no more and no less. You know, I don't have any innovation to propose, you know, there. But I do think, you know, this is a good way to get at many of the -- you know, it's amazing to me how many of the things we've talked about, you know, get touched on by this kind of framework.

And remember, it doesn't have to be one. You know, ideally, you know, we have several -- in the steady state, we have several of these are going at the same time. It's not inconceivable that the same person, you know, would actually be on more than one, you know, in different roles. But I think it is important, whatever the size is, to get the A list listed and to make it clear that the understanding is that it's not like this informal group where some random intersection shows up, you know. What it is is a commitment to meet twice a year for 3 years on this project. And to get on the A list means you are going to show up six times.

MS. ZINNES: And produce something?



MR. ALT: Yes. Yeah, and to write -- you know, commitments to write --

MS. MORTON: Would there be --

MR. ALT: -- some part of whatever is being produced.

MS. ZINNES: Multiple different research papers?

MR. ALT: That's got to be in the proposal.

MS. MORTON: Would there be some money? Like I think in the MacArthur thing people get a little pot of money to do something with.

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MS. MORTON: So I mean, I think like \$5,000 or something.

MR. YOUNG: Well, unfortunately, sometimes more than that. (Laughter)

MR. SCIOLI: What's the size of those, Peyton? Do you know if --

MR. YOUNG: Fifteen thousand often.

MR. SCIOLI: I mean --

MR. YOUNG: Oh, the size of the whole thing?

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah, for a group.

MR. YOUNG: Well, these things are expensive. First of all, they meet at least three and sometimes four times a year. They involve -- the meetings usually involve about 20 people. Yeah. So you're talking about 500,000 a year or something like

that or 400,000.

MR. FREEMAN: I think ours was a million for 2 years that Minnesota alone received --

MR. YOUNG: Right.

MR. FREEMAN: -- including the graduate students.

MR. YOUNG: Those graduate -- sure, that does include graduate student funding and that has been important. I really -- it's -- for my -- I have always argued that these things are just too expensive for what they're producing. Now they are producing theses as well, however, so, you know, you have to subtract out that.

MR. SCIOLI: Who pays for the Bates meetings? Do you know, John?

MR. ALDRICH: Yeah, the individual universities.

MS. ZINNES: You mean it rotates around from one university?

MR. YOUNG: But the purpose of the MacArthur -- I mean, what's interesting is the contrast with a basic underlying philosophical purpose. In economics the whole idea was each one of these networks has got to have economists and X, and Y and Z, too; meaning psychologists and anthropologists and maybe even evolutionary biologists, and so forth and so on, so that you really -- it's truly interdisciplinary.

Here, I mean, in a way I think it's more likely to be successful because of, A, the competitive aspect; B, you sort of focus the thing much more sharply on certain kinds of questions within the field of political science that need to be solved and the economists aren't looking at it -- or MacArthur, I should say, isn't looking at it that way. They're trying to inject the whole field of economics with new ways of thinking from outside the field of economics.

MR. ACHEN: We've had quite a lot of fun this morning piling up interesting to spend money.

MS. ZINNES: Money, which we may not have.

MR. ACHEN: And if you add up all the things that we'd like to do and there's not a single one of them that's not worth doing, I think we're talking at least a couple million a year.

MS. ZINNES: Oh, more than that.

MR. ACHEN: Well, that's the bottom, yeah. I'll be surprised if I get an E-mail a year from now saying we've got 3 million a year for this one particular thing and we're going to do everything we suggested. So I wonder whether we shouldn't -- I don't have the schedule right in front of me, I don't know when the coffee break is, but I wonder whether we shouldn't, after the coffee break, spend a little time giving the foundation officers some advice about our judgment on priorities among these various things.

There's also a political process that'll go on here where you will have to convince the people above you who actually have the money what's worth doing here and what's not. So I think we understand that what we might put first might not be what comes out in the end, but it might be useful to you to have in hand some consensus judgment from us about what we thought was the most crucial thing to be done and so forth down the line. So that would be my suggestion for somebody to take up after a coffee break.

MR. ALT: Yeah, maybe -- I think that's a good idea and I'm actually feeling brain cramp right now. But maybe what we ought to do is just see if there are any other, you know, people's lists of three, see if there are other structures to add to the list and then take the break. And if there isn't anything to add, let's take the break now and then come back and do some prioritizing. So it's really open. I have nothing to add to this.

MR. GRANATO: Let's take 15 minutes then.

(Recess)

MR. SCIOLI: Let's get to work, gentle people. And we have a surprise announcement. Without any strings attached, the economics program -- oh --

MR. BRADY: Is donating all their money to political science. Thanks, Dan.

MR. SCIOLI: Without understanding what

we're doing here or why we're doing it, it's just as a pledge of faith, Dan has come forward with --

MR. BRADY: Hey, look, we'll just take half.

MS. EAVEY: Does MMS get the other half?

MR. BRADY: Sure.

MS. EAVEY: Thank you.

MR. BRADY: Okay. Okay, so during the break, Dina, ever the skeptic and pessimist --  
(Laughter)

MS. ZINNES: I've just been there too many times.

MR. SCIOLI: -- looked over to Bill and said, you know, this is all nice, but what about -- how realistic is this? Would you mind articulating --

MS. ZINNES: I said, have you got 10 million?

MR. SCIOLI: -- articulating (inaudible). Bill didn't comment on the 10 million figure, but --

MS. ZINNES: (inaudible) use it.

MR. SCIOLI: -- but what -- do you mind saying what you did say because it was --

MR. BUTZ: To whom? To Dina?

MR. SCIOLI: Yes.

MR. BUTZ: Well, the first thing I said to her was I thought her -- what she's doing with the students in terms of identifying puzzles and using propositional calculus was really exciting. But

anyway, that's not what Frank wanted me to say.

Norman is very serious about what he said concerning a desire to find ways to transfer let's say best practices, methodologically or in the intersection between theory and empirical work from one science or one subsience to another. That's something he came in here wanting to do, not just across the social sciences, but also across the social and the cognitive and behavioral sciences, but more broadly than that into computer science and math and computational methods, for example. And so I think it's -- having talked to him a good deal on this subject, I think it's quite possible, and he implied as much yesterday, that he would see this as a leading edge way to do that.

And so I would guess that what you're going to come up with here will be taken quite seriously at a level higher than the political science program. So I -- that's really all that I had to say, which isn't saying anything more than what Bradburn said yesterday, just to say that I assure you that he's serious about that.

MR. SCIOLI: And I think that you can be assured that although the resources in the political science program don't allow the kind of a commitment of the variety that Dina mentioned, we do plan, certainly with the concurrence of our advisory panel

and the concurrence of management, to put a substantial portion of our resources aside for this activity because I think the time is right. I think the commitment to advancing the science part of political science is right.

And I mean, I personally would get a great kick out of doing it because of the excitement that you all have expressed, and I don't think Jim's going to give up. He's just getting warmed up and talk about raging bull. (Laughter) You know, and Cheryl's presence doesn't mean that we're excluding sociology or economics or any of Phil Rubin's activities as well. I mean, Norman -- if political science were the only group to come forward with something like this, I'm sure Norman would say, well, what if -- you know, aren't you going to involve economists, aren't you going to involve other disciplines? But even if that doesn't work out, the political science program is going to devote a substantial portion of its meager resources to getting this off the ground. So the question is what priorities -- and, you know, if we're putting up, hypothetically, a million bucks --

MS. EAVEY: That's all?

MR. SCIOLI: And every dollar of that means that three calls from people who say why the heck are you letting those methodologists and formal theorists rule the discipline?

MS. EAVEY: That's a huge commitment from a standing program.

MS. MORTON: I think the summer thing is the most exciting to me.

MS. EAVEY: I think so, too. I think it's the most critical.

MS. MORTON: And I would think -- put that as my first priority.

MS. EAVEY: Yep.

MALE SPEAKER: And universities (inaudible) might be able to pay for it.

MR. ALT: I said to Chris a minute ago, I think the proposals came out in the right order.

MS. MORTON: Yeah, I do, too.

MR. ALT: Because the third one you can't do without some guarantees of money. The third one is beyond the million that you're putting up. So, you know, we can all say it's extremely important, but you can't do it without getting other support whereas --

MR. SCIOLI: What was the third -- I'm sorry.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, we might (inaudible).

MR. ALT: (inaudible) support group, the competition for research support groups.

MR. YOUNG: Well, no, hang on here. I mean, I would -- I'm -- I sort of agree that the number one is first priority. But first of all, if you only



awarded -- in the number three category, if you only awarded one group instead of several, I mean, you can run a group like this very effectively on the scale that we are discussing for 250,000 a year. It's -- so, you know, a quarter -- that's one quarter of the million-dollar budget. That's not ridiculous.

MR. ALDRICH: Actually I bet that one you could also get matched from the contributing -- I mean, especially the A list people.

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah. For those of you that have been involved with political methodology know that that small amount that the programs, MMS and political science, give have gone -- I mean, sometimes we keep on getting notices we haven't spent all the money. Can we have a few more years to spend the money?

MR. YOUNG: I -- let me just, if I can, just say one other thing. I actually put number two as my last -- my lowest priority. I think that the postdoc thing is nice. I indicated that I think the selection process is -- has to be done with great care, but the other thing is it's expensive. If you're going to pay these people what they would get as a salary, it doesn't take many of them --

MR. ALT: You don't pay anything like that much for postdocs unless you just like burning up money. We pay assistant professors about, whatever,

58 to 60 a year, and we pay postdocs 32 plus benefits.

MR. SIMON: And that's universal in  
(inaudible).

MR. ALT: But that's -- no one has ever  
turned us down.

MR. YOUNG: Right, but 32 plus benefits  
means 40, and 40 times 5 -- so in other words --  
here's the way I would look at it: Would you rather  
be funding five postdocs a year or one of these number  
three items, research groups?

MR. ALT: Well, I mean, I guess, you know,  
when -- I didn't realize that you were ponying up a  
million a year.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, I mean, that's off the  
record. (Laughter)

MR. ALT: Well, then my answer's off the  
wall. (Laughter) I guess then my response to Peyton  
would be we don't have to choose because we can do it  
all, right. Why not do both? It's the Miller Lite of  
political science. But I think my answer would be  
that for sure I would rather do the postdocs than the  
second research workshop or the third or something  
like that. And since we don't have to choose about  
doing the first one and the postdocs and the summer  
program, why not just take that as a three-pronged  
initiative?

And I -- you know, I mean, if there isn't a

budgetary constraint, which was actually Chris' presupposition for bringing up the idea of prioritizing them, then I think of them as three equally valuable enterprises. And since you don't have to choose, why sit around arguing about what you care about most?

MR. MCKELVEY: I'd like to say something about the summer program. I guess, you know, we sort of lumped together the summer program and sort of these conferences that is focused on particular problems having to do with the intersection of theory and empirical work. But, you know, the problem there is if it's decided that the summer conference is too expensive and both of these go down together, I think that the -- you know, the conferences are really a -- something that you would -- well, first of all, they'd be cheaper than the summer program, I would think.

The -- they're easier to schedule. You know, the problem with the summer program is there are already several summer programs going. Getting people to commit for the amount of time that is required for a program like this is going to be -- you know, it's going to be hard to get it off the ground. It needs a lot of organizational work behind it.

And I think it'll be expensive to do it right, whereas the conferences I think would be a lot cheaper and have -- they would have a lot of the same

effect of getting students at the beginning stages of their career, especially if you got young graduate students and brought them back year after year. And it also has the benefit of transferring some of the educational costs of the enterprise back to the universities where these people come from. If the students come, say, several years in a row, they come, they get excited about a particular problem. They'll go back to their home university and they'll realize, oh, I have to learn some more statistics, I have to learn -- you know, and instead of having a short course that's -- you know, funded by NSF, they can do and spend some time to do this. So I think that the maybe we should break out the conferences from the summer program, make them a separate item.

MR. BRADY: You might also want to fund more than one conference per year because it might be there'd be two separate takes, both of which look really interesting. It might be substantively different; it might be, in terms of micro and macro, focused different. Who knows? But --

MR. MCKELVEY: Right.

MR. ACHEN: Just so they're not -- one isn't called empirical and the other one's called theory.  
(Laughter)

MR. SCIOLI: What is the health of the graduate programs in 2002 vis-a-vis suppose NSF were

to issue some kind of an announcement that said, you know, we pay for half of the students' attendance? Could universities pick up the other half?

MS. ZINNES: Yes.

MR. SCIOLI: Are they in the -- are universities in the position where --

MS. ZINNES: You're talking about going to one of these conferences?

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah.

MS. ZINNES: We -- when we run the junior master class, which these students coming from all over the country, we ask if they will match -- if they will try to get their university to match the funding for the purposes of the travel and then we pay for the on-site expenses. We run -- now we do it for about 2-1/2 days. And we bring in somewhere around six people, plus two senior masters, two people who are, you know, modelers and statisticians in the field from other universities. It costs us, with a minimal honorarium to the senior people, about 6 or 7K.

MR. SCIOLI: I mean, is that typical? Let's the C institutions, could they send a student under this same approach?

MS. ZINNES: We've had very good luck across institutions, and we've had people from --

MR. SCIOLI: Okay, so that's typical. That would answer the concern that if we were -- I mean, I

think if it's the number one priority and it's the one that we discuss the most, and seeing the way the summer methodology has kind of taken off, that's the one that I'd like to see us get started with anyway in terms of seeing --

MS. ZINNES: The conferences.

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah, and I would pick 5 years.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, I would like to argue more for the summer program.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, pardon me, I meant summer program.

MS. ZINNES: Oh, I thought we talking one versus the other.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, I'd like to see us do both.

MS. ZINNES: Okay. And I will also say that the workshops we've run with the money that Cheryl's given us we can do those minimally at around 7 or 8K. Now we're talking, what, about 10 people coming in. We have several people on staff. We bring in one or two other people to help with some of that, but that's now 1 week. So even if you have to cut it down to 1 week, it's better than nothing.

I think -- I appreciate the fact that you're, you know, getting these things organized and having them, like a summer program at Michigan for 2 months. You're not going to do that right away for

sure. But why not start with the smaller thing, maybe a week, maybe 2 weeks? Set it up and sort of go from there. But you don't -- it doesn't have to be that expensive, it really doesn't. The universities will help to chip in the travel component to getting their students there if it's a prestigious sort of thing that they feel is worthwhile.

MS. MORTON: Plus for the teaching, I mean, the graduate students can stay in dorms or -- cheaply. I mean, they don't -- it's not like you're putting up people for a week that are being -- staying in hotels and eating big meals, you know.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah.

MS. MORTON: They're -- you give them a ticket to eat lunch at the cafeteria. And summers are typically relatively inexpensive at universities.

MR. BRADY: You know, this isn't the place probably to get into details about what the subject matter would be, but I really hope that people think about stuff where I would hate to see a situation where people come and if they're formal modelers, they talk about their formal modeling and if they're -- do empirical work, they talk about their empirical work. I would much rather hear people talk about how they've tried to really bridge that gap. And that's not stuff necessarily that amounts to a research paper that's going to end up in the APSR or something like that.

Maybe they might end up in political analysis if Neil Beck decided to do a special issue, so maybe that's an outlet for it.

But even if it didn't, I would hope people would be willing to write on those things because, at least as I reflect on it, I think I could write a paper that might be vaguely interesting about how I think about those things. And I'd love to hear people around this table write such a paper, which they might not otherwise do and I think it could be very, very useful. Does that seem reasonable to people that that's something they think they can do?

MS. ZINNES: Absolutely.

MS. MORTON: One way to do that is to have papers that are -- or even the classes be a substantive area of specific -- like, say, okay, we're going to look at this area in international relations. What is the -- how many formal models have been empirically tested? What are the strategies people have used in this area? And that way there's a -- because I also think it's really important that students get this -- that they see how this stuff relates to their substantive, that these things aren't -- it's not just math, it's models, but there is, like, we're really asking real questions with this stuff.

MS. ZINNES: Yeah, and I -- but I think the



issue how many of these have been empirically tested. You have to look very carefully what that means.

MS. MORTON: Right.

MS. ZINNES: Because people will tell you all over the place that the Richardson Arms Race model has been empirically tested. Yeah, regression equations, lots and lots and lots of them, measured all sorts of ways.

MR. SIMON: But we've talked about the need to upgrade and encourage the theory component. And it seems, Henry, that not every course of seminar can be on the integrative part unless the other two parts are strong enough. So you really may need to start with --

MS. ZINNES: Both, yeah.

MR. SIMON: -- both separately with an eye on pulling them together.

MR. YOUNG: I -- I'm a little -- may I express some skepticism about that? It does seem to me that we did start here with the problem that there's a gap. And I think it would be unfortunate to set a precedent where in the top priority item and in the lead-off things we say, well, okay, we're not quite ready to bridge the gap. So we're going to tolerate some formal papers and then some separate empirical papers because we've got to beef each of those up first and then later, we're going to try to

integrate them. I'm just -- I'm worried that that's --

MR. SIMON: Well, I guess for the conference I see your point. But I -- maybe I was focusing on the workshop program, the more tutorial part.

MR. YOUNG: Well, what I had in mind was --

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MR. YOUNG: -- (inaudible) -- with all due respect to Dick, I had it in mind Dick doing a talk on quantum response equilibrium (phonetic) and then Curt Signoreno (phonetic) doing the strategic probit (phonetic) model with the software, and then actually having them do exercises. Then you have Keith Pool come in and talk about nominate and legislative processes; and you have John Londregan present his model of proposal setting that solves the identification problem with John's software; and computational methods maybe with Carl, talking about complex systems; and Scott Page coming in and presenting some software on computational methods and some application. I mean, something that focused, I think you should -- and yeah, I apologize if I'm putting you in a corner, but you and Curt together with some actual exercises with strat would seem to me to be exactly what we want them to do. So they leave with an understanding of the game theoretic underpinnings, the statistical issues with Curt, and

then a knowledge of how to implement the software.  
Isn't that what we're after?

MR. MCKELVEY: Yeah. I mean, I have no problem with, you know, how you're envisioning the summer program. My only concern was putting the two together and then, consequently, you know, if we -- if you end up having to throw out one of these, you throw out the conferences, also, which I think are one of the quickest ways to getting to where you want to go. I mean, because, you know -- I mean, I think they're even quicker than the summer program.

MR. BRADY: I just want to be exactly clear on what the conferences will be because I think it's real important that we have a vision that we've presented to the NSF folks so that they know what we are thinking about in detail. And the more people I think can flesh that out the way John just did, because I find that very amenable to what I'm thinking about, the better. So if other people have other examples, maybe -- I don't know, Frank, would this be useful to hear this kind of stuff so that you know exactly what we've got in mind?

MS. MORTON: One thing about the conference, I think that it should not be so big that there are multiple panels at the same time. There should be usually one panel at a time because that way you get more a group communication, you know, where people are

going and hearing the same sets of papers and, you know, it's just -- when there are two panels running at the same time they just -- people end up leaking (phonetic).

MR. ACHEN: I think if we require that people be a certain ways along on the -- graduate students now I'm talking about, certain way along on the econometrics and have a full year of game theory, the size of the conference will be under control.  
(Laughter)

MR. BRADY: Let me put in my plug, too. When you say a full year of game theory, I'm quite willing to have formal modeling be the phrase, not game theory.

MR. ACHEN: Absolutely.

MR. BRADY: I agree that game theory is incredibly important and very central, but there are other forms of modeling and I really think we have to recognize that.

MR. ACHEN: Yeah, I agree strongly with that, I misspoke.

MR. ALDRICH: I was just going to say that the conference itself -- unlike the summer program which may -- the instructional part, which may be very focused on one topic and working it through theory, empirical, where things fall short now, how might be solve it? The conference we'd probably want to have

a little bit -- you want to -- probably want to be sure to bring in different people with different substantive interests. And so it'd be more conference-like in the sense that, you know, today may be focused on voting, the next time on coalition formation, the next time on, you know, economic sanctions and their success or something like that.

MR. ACHEN: And I think we can appeal to the history of the methods, meetings, as a kind of a model for this. Whether that turns out to be the real model is a different question, but there's a real case -- there's a real history out there where something like this that had NSF support within a couple of years after it got started has made a huge difference.

MR. BRADY: I also like Dick's discussion of these old, what was it, mathematical social sciences (inaudible). Is that what the papers on nonmarket decision-making came out in, those meetings? There were some books and -- no, actually there was --

MR. MCKELVEY: There were some volumes that (inaudible) specifically --

MR. ALT: Mathematical applications.

MR. BRADY: Right.

MR. MCKELVEY: -- in the social sciences.

MR. BRADY: Right. See, that's what came (inaudible).

MS. ZINNES: Well, I'm not clear whether

we're talking -- okay, apparently we are talking about sort of advanced graduate students, maybe junior faculty members. Is that -- okay, I still would like to -- maybe this is implicit. I'd still like to see these focused on sort of works in progress as opposed to a finished paper simply because I think if you want -- this is where the pedagogy can come in in terms of helping people see links; helping people develop ideas as opposed to, you know, here's a finished piece of work and I'm already committed to it and I may not want to listen to you too hard about how I could change this or test this or whatever, whereas somebody, particularly a junior person, would be very open to those things. So I would like to put in a plug for that.

MR. ALDRICH: You know, Mike Munger runs a 2-week summer conference. Liberty Fund-sponsored so it's -- doesn't stay in college dorms, very plush. But -- so go for the budget, but you -- we might want to get his -- you know, how he runs -- sets things up because he brings in two or three faculty members -- faculty over the course of time. So at each segment, he's there for the whole time.

MR. BRADY: What's your -- what are his topics, John?

MR. ALDRICH: It's formal modeling.

MR. BRADY: Formal modeling.

MS. ZINNES: And game theory.

MR. ALDRICH: Or, to be more specific, game theory, yeah.

MR. BRADY: Okay, game theory.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, let me repeat what I said yesterday and implicit in all of this. You can rest assured that neither Jim nor Cheryl nor I are going to organize or lay out an agenda. We're going to have to receive a proposal.

MS. EAVEY: Or proposals.

MR. SCIOLI: Or proposals. And so we're going to issue a letter calling -- announcing and we'll see what happens. I mean, hopefully, your point is an excellent one about someone who thought about organizing this activity would want to speak to Mike.

MR. ALT: What you reminded me of yesterday, the economic theory workshop is in Cambridge (inaudible).

MS. MORTON: Oh, the experimental -- the Economic Science Association meeting (inaudible) in Cambridge next summer. Yeah, so --

MR. ALT: Which Cambridge?

MS. MORTON: I mean, that's just experimentalist.

MR. ALT: I mean, I'm here to propose a summer program that I was going to run. I haven't heard a lot of people around the table actually say

they want to do it.

MS. ZINNES: I do.

MR. ALT: If somebody does, I (inaudible).

MR. SCIOLI: We've got a lot of (inaudible) people here, Jim. They're going to --

MR. BRADY: Yeah, I would hope that we get people who maybe built some coalitions and sort of --

MS. ZINNES: Yeah.

MR. BRADY: -- maybe more than one person doing (inaudible).

MS. ZINNES: I think that's --

MALE SPEAKER: That's (inaudible) teams.

MS. MORTON: I would hope there will be, like, some experiment component to this, but --

MR. BRADY: The whole thing's an experiment.

MALE SPEAKER: That's what I was just --

(Laughter)

MS. MORTON: Not a huge one.

MR. BRADY: Oh, I see what you meant.

MS. ZINNES: You, too, can write a proposal.

MR. BRADY: (inaudible) assign people.

MR. ALDRICH: Let's back up. I'm getting -- I'm sort of with Dick. There's still two separate things here. I mean, it's an -- if I were to put a proposal in, I wouldn't want to have to devise them for a conference, also devise them for a summer program, and get a big stapler (phonetic).



MR. SCIOLI: I don't think we have that in mind. I mean, I think those are the kinds of details that staff will at least appreciate your comment.

MR. SIMON: The Dear Colleague letter could include both, but the NSF would then choose among the responses.

MR. SCIOLI: And someone could propose to do both.

MALE SPEAKER: Right.

MR. SCIOLI: Yeah, we --

MR. ACHEN: They really are separate things.

MALE SPEAKER: Right.

MR. ALT: Yes.

MR. ACHEN: Completely so.

MR. ALT: Yes, they were listed as options.

MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. I mean, it -- yeah, it seems to me we have a sort of list of five things that (inaudible).

MR. ALT: Yeah, that's --

MALE SPEAKER: There's research work groups, there's a postdoc program, there's an EITM IGERT or similar sort of graduate program, there's a summer camp, I mean, which is teaching and research, and then there are summer conferences.

MALE SPEAKER: Right.

MS. EAVEY: You guys have done your work.

MR. ALT: I'm sorry?

MS. EAVEY: You guys have done your work.

MR. ALT: And, I mean, they budget out pretty well to the kind of funds -- you know, fully funded, fully running, they're both what you're staking us so you'd have to get money somewhere. And as startups they're within the parameters you've outlined, so you don't have -- you can start them up. And I don't think we can do much more for you.

MR. SIMON: And over and above all this are the dedicated research grants to EITM activities.

MR. SCIOLI: Absolutely. I would not want to admit the notion that if it's a lot of work and Carl did work on an IGERT and was not successful, but is not going to abandon it, in my view, if any of you have any interest in that kind of an activity, it's a lot of work, it's coordinating a training program, it's coordinating a research activity, but the potential payoff is quite large. And again, if we are alerted to the fact that you're thinking about something like that, we can give you all the advice that we have at our disposal and we could see that it gets a fair hearing. I mean, beyond that, we can't write you a check, but we can certainly see that it gets a fair hearing.

MS. ZINNES: Now what's the difference between the IGERT and what we're talking about here?

MR. SCIOLI: Well, the IGERT would be at a

single site, you know, and would be a university developing a program, say, where you involve political science and economics and mathematics and statistical -- statistics faculty around a topic. You know, maybe the ethnic identity project would be an IGERT activity.

MR. SIMON: It's basically building a Ph.D. program in a nontraditional area that combines many disciplines and doing it in sort of a carefully thought out way, I think.

MS. EAVEY: (inaudible) are coming from someplace else in the foundation.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yeah, right.

MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible) complete their degree?

MS. MORTON: And why is it that you think -- why is it -- do you have any idea why you failed, Carl?

MR. SIMON: I think -- well, from what I heard today, the social sciences were not -- were a little bit out of the main focus of IGERT funding. We may have -- our -- we put it together with the Santa Fe Institute and some of the negatives of that relationship seemed to float up. People for -- well, one of the things we suggested were that students would have the option of spending a term at Santa Fe working with some of the people there, and some people

argued that, well, that's needlessly prolonging their thesis writing. It came close I think; we're trying again.

MR. YOUNG: How big is -- how much money, I mean, would be put into an IGERT, a successful IGERT --

MR. SIMON: Half a million a year for 5 years.

MR. BRADY: Yeah, it's big money.

MALE SPEAKER: We applied at Berkeley about 2 years ago, through sociology and political science, and didn't get one. Maybe it was 3 years ago, I don't remember.

MALE SPEAKER: (inaudible) applied for one on methodology a couple years ago, didn't get.

MS. EAVEY: At first you don't succeed?

MR. SCIOLI: Well, you know, as I was saying to Carl during the break, you have to make a clear case that this is different than something that already exists. And unfortunately, sometimes people see Michigan proposing a methodology activity and, you know, they start saying, geez, doesn't Michigan do this already? I mean, you know, and so you have to make it a distinct kind of an activity. And it's a Ph.D. program, so the notion of imposing on students the Santa Fe component may not be -- and your colleagues who evaluate these things, a realistic kind

of activity given the gains to be met. XXXHUH?XXX

MR. SIMON: In the rewrite we made that a lot more -- more of an option than a component and, you know, tried to emphasize flexibility and --

MR. SCIOLI: Dan, you've had a lot of IGERT experience over the years.

MR. NEWLIN: No, I was going to second Cheryl's point. The problem in the social sciences, if people are declined once they assume that the door is shut and they don't try again. What they don't realize is this is -- \$2-1/2 million is a lot of money cutting across all fields of science. This is a highly competitive activity and if you, as Michigan did, get beyond the preproposal phase and are invited to submit a full proposal, then that's a good sign. That's already -- a substantial number of proposals, most proposals are declined at the preliminary preproposal stage. So it's important to look at both the positives and the negatives and not poo-poo them because of a decline decision that the door is closed.

Also, I'd like to second what Frank said. I was liaison with IGERT, Frank is current -- you're the current liaison with -- no, you aren't?

MR. SCIOLI: No.

MR. NEWLIN: Who's the current?

MALE SPEAKER: I thought you were for a couple years.

MR. SCIOLI: I was, yeah.

MR. NEWLIN: Yeah. Who is --

MR. SCIOLI: Bonny and Kathy Ball.

MR. NEWLIN: And Kathy Ball. So we -- you can call us if you are looking for advice or feedback or help. And we can't, as Frank said, write out a check, but we certainly can make inquiries and get information and provide you any help or assistance (inaudible).

MR. ALT: Yeah. I just want to, you know, again, underline that. When we got the RTG 10 years ago, which was the precursor to an IGERT, it took two site visits, two applications. It was hard work getting it, but it was worth it.

The other thing that I want to say is you can do very effective IGERT-like activities for a lot less than half a million a year. I mean, just having -- you know, thinking about it -- instead of thinking about it as how do we put together an IGERT, how does the program cost effectively kind of deploy its money towards graduate training? Anybody, again, right off the top of my head, who puts together a proposal that would involve mathematicians, you know, teaching, you know, the maths of dynamic of modeling, statisticians, psychologists teaching experimentation, political scientists and economists teaching formal modeling has got enough interdisciplinary to be an IGERT program.

And just getting an injection of half a dozen graduate fellowships a year into that, you know, is a significant way to kick start that kind of activity. It gives people who want to do that an interesting choice because by taking that kind of assistance, you take yourself out of the running for an IGERT because, by definition, you will have created a program so it will exist.

But if you actually think you can't do -- you know, seriously, it's a much easier scale to think on. It is hard to get these IGERTs because the model is a bunch of big science departments just putting themselves together. It is easier for them to write that kind of proposal and make it effective and expensive. It's hard in a way to scale up to that level of activity for most of the things we're interested in, but many of us might like to design a Ph.D. program that had that kind of interdisciplinary element and with, you know, the knowledge that you could support, you know, three to five people a year. That would be enough of a guarantee to make it worth doing the dog work to, you know, write the program and get people to commit the teaching effort, and that does not have to cost a half a million a year.

So I would keep the heading of EITM-IGERT alive. I mean, you know, if we can write a satisfactory IGERT proposal, it's not going to cost

you anything, you know. But that, I think, may be difficult given the competitiveness of that program, and we can do a lot of good like that without winning the lottery.

MR. SCIOLI: Well, while it would not cost our programs directly, it is a tax on all of us for the foundation-wide activities. I mean, that's why we --

MR. ALT: It would be nice to get our share.

MR. SCIOLI: Yes, exactly. We remain very interested in seeing that social behavioral scientists apply and we chart the course of the proposals through the --

MR. ALT: Yeah. Could I -- this is a proposal for NSF institutional reform. (Laughter) I think it's still an IGERT bylaw that each institution can only submit one proposal. And the reason that you don't get resubmits -- two? Fine. In the past, the reason you often didn't get resubmits was that the institution turned its back on you. They said you had your chance; now this year, we're going to let the biologists have a crack at it. And, you know, by the time the clock came around to the social scientists again, you know, the group had left.

MR. SCIOLI: And one of Carl's colleagues did get one this year. And I don't administer the foundation-wide program, but there is the notion that



if we're only giving 15 of these we shouldn't -- you know, we should spread them out.

MR. ALDRICH: Can I change the subject?

Back to the workshops, when the (inaudible) conversation ended with, well, you know, perhaps one of those, I would feel real uncomfortable with NSF sponsoring a program that a priori anticipates funding exactly one group for, you know, whatever it is, 12 people for 5 years or something.

MR. SCIOLI: Oh, the working group?

MR. ALDRICH: Right. It may turn out that you would only get one fundable proposal, but I would -- you know, if it's that small, I maybe rather not do any or at least have the potential for two, if not more.

MR. ALT: No, no. My belief about that program is your goal should be to be funding sort of two of those a year or something like that, and each one is a 3-year commitment. I just think, again, you know, you should -- if you get one fundable in the first round you should do it and, you know, from a lot of years here trying to start things (inaudible) the expected value of the first round.

MR. SCIOLI: How do we overcome the kind of question that I asked you, John, where somebody would say, oh, Bates funded this on his own. Why should NSF give him money? I mean, you've been on the panel and

you've heard that thing. This is something that would go on without NSF support. So how can a faculty member argue that the resources here at my institution wouldn't allow it unless there's a matching component.

MR. ALDRICH: Right.

MR. SCIOLI: You understand what I'm saying?

MR. ALDRICH: You don't have \$26 billion endowment?

MR. ALT: I think the effective answer to that is we are precisely trying to design a work group that has not appeared through the ordinary workings of the market precisely because of the multiplicity element. We are not going to fund one that doesn't feature multiple approaches and multiple methods. The typical evolution of these groups is single favorite approach, single favorite method, if any. You know, often these groups just exist to talk about the models or talk about the data, but not both. And it is precisely the inability of the market to, you know, to throw up those multiple-approach, multiple-method groups that makes this appropriate.

MALE SPEAKER: I mentioned --

MR. GRANATO: (inaudible) language.

MR. ALT: Let the record show.

MR. GRANATO: That language will be in the Dear Colleague letter. It'll be very explicit that all proposals must include elements of both. So

there'll be no mistaking that.

MR. ALT: And I think, also -- and many within each. That is to say --

MR. GRANATO: Sure. Oh, it's a big --

MR. ALT: -- (inaudible) not just game theory and some data, you know. It's multiple approaches and multiple methods for --

MS. MORTON: But not, you know, just multiple approaches to modeling and not just multiple methods, but focus on modeling and -- so you could be just a game theorist who does, you know, a particular type of data. You don't have to be a game theorist that also does computational modeling, too, you know.

MR. SIMON: I mentioned yesterday in my --

MS. MORTON: That's a whole lot.

MR. SIMON: -- quick autobiography about how NSF turned my math chair around. Just because they began supporting applied math, suddenly it became a topic that he wanted to support. And I, you know -- I think if other groups are doing this sort of thing that we're talking about, well, the fact that NSF does it, sends an important message about what NSF views as important. And I mean, I think that's the key part that the message come out that NSF values putting together formal and empirical work. And therefore, if it meant doing something other people are also partly doing, it might be worth it.

MR. ACHEN: Yeah, I think it'll have a pretty large demonstration effect. It's been a long time that people have been talking about doing this, but when you get down to brass tacks, there's been a lot of disagreement about what exactly ought to be done. And we all have encountered students who say, well, I've got a model, here's my regression equation, you know. And so the content of this letter and the specifics that it spells out I think will, first of all, fill up this gap that this 10-year market failure has opened up; and secondly, will send a strong signal about what can be built and what ought to be built, including what will be inevitably built by other people and other groups with other money that we're not even thinking about yet. So this is a kind of classical role for NSF.

MR. GRANATO: One thing that struck me in Carl's commentary that -- about -- that these wars are going on other disciplines is that my sense of social science, in my encounters with other program directors here, that social science is considered not, quote, unquote, as scientific. And what this kind of thing is doing is it gets in the report, the (inaudible) report, what we're trying to do, it already mentions -- that's the wrong word again. What's the word I'm supposed to use?

MALE SPEAKER: Priorities.

MR. GRANATO: Priorities. Next week, it'll be something else. But the point is, once that gets exposed and it's out there, it could raise the visibility of social science and maybe direct more firms to us, and also help with these cross-directorate competitions.

MR. ACHEN: And with convincing some college freshman that this is real science.

MR. GRANATO: Do you have someone in mind?

MR. SCIOLI: Benediction?

MR. GRANATO: Do we have one more thing? Priorities. Summer program/conferences, we'll have as separately. Research work teams, postdoc/fellowships. Is that the order people agree on here? It's not necessarily the case that we're going to exclude something, but if we were forced to, if we were to cost these things out, is this the order people would accept?

MR. SIMON: Well, let me just raise one small disagreement with Jim Alt about the use of the word "postdoc." Would you rather narrowly define in the Harvard fashion saying it has to be -- these are people who work on someone else's project? Maybe a better word is "fellows." I'm not sure I think that's the right idea. I would like to see work on their project, but learn from the masters on how to integrate. And postdocs to you mean definitely work

on someone -- on some advisor's project, then I think we should talk about that.

MR. ALT: Oh, I certainly agree it's there to talk about. The only piece of wisdom, and put that word in quotes, that I have gotten out of now 10 years between the RTG and CBRSS of running these programs is that there is much more of a difference between those two things than you think at first sight. The visiting scholar who pursues her own research project gets the occasional advice of people around. You must be in an environment where there is an active, ongoing research workshop in which papers can be presented because you do not get the total attention of the senior scholars that you want in the order of things. If you are a postdoc working on their agenda, you are never short of supervision and opportunities to do stuff. It is a totally different experience. I am gloriously in favor of both of them, but I do just insist they're different.

And I would like to see us -- that's me, it does not have to be you, I would like to see us start with the postdocs, the people not more than a year out, who will learn by doing. You know, the ones who did a lot of formal modeling and now are going to go work with someone who's good with data to see -- they'll bring their formal modeling expertise and they'll learn from someone by carrying out assignments

to analyze stuff, how to do that and make those connections. It's very different.

First off, you never -- with a fellows program or a visiting scholars program, you never, never, never want to run it for people immediately out of Ph.D. because they come and they say my plans for the year are to revise my dissertation for publication and to get a job. So right there, you forget it. If you run a visiting scholars program that's minimum 3 years out, because by then they've revised the dissertation and they've embarked on a second project, it's also not part of the experience to give them the second project. That is to say they should have the idea, you know, when they apply and then they come and use the resources of the place they go to, to the benefit of the project.

So I have gradually evolved by doing. You know, the really firm conviction, as I say, only that these are not the same thing and you have to make up your mind whether you're doing one or both and just think of them as separate entities, and -- enough said.

MR. SIMON: I guess, you know, one solution is as we're doing with step one, programs/conferences, that in step three both are clear options in the Dear Colleague letter and see what comes out through the competition.

MR. ALT: Sure. Oh, I would encourage you, if you do want to go the visiting scholars route, for sure, you know, to make it clear that that's a separate option and a different program from the Post Office.

MS. MORTON: Plus a visiting scholar would be also somebody who might already have tenure, but still be pretty, you know, low-level associate and to capture it, like Bill Keech had suggested.

MR. ALT: Sure. Sure. No, the big difference with the visiting scholar is -- I mean, I raise this because I want to hear what Frank says, is that it would actually put NSF in the business of funding research (inaudible), which is going to, I believe, then generate a lot of demands for why do I have to be young and go somewhere else in order to get research money when I could do more for the benefit of the profession by staying right here and being relieved from teaching. So my belief is you want to tread carefully into the visiting scholar business, but, let the record show, were you to take that step I think it would be a great one for the profession. But you should see where it leads when you take it.

MS. EAVEY: MMS does this with the new careers and in -- we don't get a lot of demand. In fact, we'd actually like more demand.

MR. ALT: It's (inaudible).



MS. EAVEY: (inaudible) so --

MR. ALT: (inaudible)

MS. EAVEY: Except that it's -- you're asking them to do a lot, right? You're asking --

MR. ALT: How about end career retraining?

(Laughter)

MS. EAVEY: Well, I have had some people ask (inaudible) this career end? (inaudible) a long time.

MALE SPEAKER: Their retirement planning, yeah.

MS. EAVEY: In some sense, it may depend upon the parameters that they set.

MS. MORTON: Well, if we're going to do it, but I just want to say thank you to Frank and -- for all the support you've given to formal theory through the years because --

MR. SCIOLI: And we've paid for it.

(Laughter) In more ways than one.

MS. MORTON: And I just want to say, also, you know, it's great having Cheryl and Dan and Jim now pushing this issue, I mean, Jim especially. This is real exciting for me. So I really do think that -- I think that formal theory -- we wouldn't be at this stage if it wasn't for the funding that NSF has given formal theory through the years.

MR. SCIOLI: Thank you.

MR. BRADY: Well, since we're saying thank

you, that's true for the methodology group, too, by the way. The conference has obviously been important.

MR. SCIOLI: The good that men do off -- well, you know that. We want to thank you very much for coming on a July 9th to NSF. You know, it's a hot, summer kind of an activity. You are our A list, to use that term. We never get any argument when we push for the A list, but we're always asked to demonstrate that it is an A list. We -- Jim and I have been very excited, he a little bit frenetic, but I 100 percent convinced that this is an activity that must go forward. And so we're -- you know, I mentioned the figure that our paltry political science program is willing to put forward, but we'll try to get other sources and Cheryl's --

MS. EAVEY: Even Paul Trear (phonetic).

MR. SCIOLI: Even -- we may go after the big gorillas. (Laughter) But someone else had something to say.

MR. PRICE: Yeah, I just want to say this is a pretty distinguished group and I enjoyed my sitting in on this hearing. One of (inaudible) I'd like to address the issue of diversity and not for its own sake, but for the (inaudible) democracy. Jim and I talk about this often, but I'm a graduate of a black college, North Carolina (inaudible) and I get the sense that what goes on there at the graduate level is

just kind of retrograde. I think -- I would urge you to at least consider, in your activities, to consider some of the historical black (inaudible) programs in political science at Clark, Atlanta, and Howard.

Now I know when you look at the (inaudible) ratings there they're pretty low rated, but I think they're low rated for a reason. They're cut off from the discourse, the (inaudible) ideas that fuel progress here. So if you want to -- I think it'd be helpful for a democracy to try to pull in these here groups that can sort of increase the stake that we all have in the ongoing discourse of ideas.

So take a look at those programs, maybe we can include that to sort of beef up their programs and help us diversify our -- the ranks of social scientists. Because in economics, I mean, (inaudible) surprising 1.2 percent of all tenured faculty are black Americans, that's one estimate. That's not a good thing because (inaudible) implications of our capabilities and I don't think it's healthy for a democracy. So I would urge you to at least consider that, those programs in your activities here, your programs and conferences to include some students (inaudible) and some faculty so they can transform their programs as well, too, and participate in these ongoing great conversations (inaudible). Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Greg.

MR. GRANATO: Frank, I'd like to -- I want to give you a little background before saying thank you. When we started this I sent out messages to all of you and the only person that -- I mean, I went down the lists of people and the only persons that couldn't come -- everybody said yes except one and she was out of the country. So there was no -- in terms of trying to find an advisory panel where people say no and you have to keep going down the list, everybody said yes.

And I can also tell you that this idea has been germinating for quite a while. There -- numerous people have talked to be over the years about their frustration with the journals, with their departments, and that this is one vehicle to change that kind of thing. And I just want to thank you all for coming. This -- you know, you took a day and a half out of your very busy schedules. You weren't going to be getting a ton of money for doing this. And I'm hopeful that something's going to happen. It won't be because we haven't tried, I can tell you that. This is what we have to do. I don't think there's a compromise on this type of thing. So thank you very much.

And for some of you I've known for a long time, thanks again. For some of you I met for the very first time, it's been a pleasure.

MR. BUTZ: And now we'll see whether this is

pushing on a string or whether the community is really ready for it. When I put more money into the political science program this spring for the infrastructure project, it was because the proposals were in hand and I could see them and I could read them, and I could see that it worked and that the community responded, and so your job isn't over. Your job is not only to write proposals, but also to get the word out.

And when this Dear Colleague letter goes out, to be sure that the jokes that have gone around the table, most recently Chris' (Laughter) about how we -- well, we don't have to worry about, you know, this group or that group being too big or having too many proposals, now we need to be sure that those are just jokes and that, in fact, we've got a real problem here because we've got so many good proposals that we're embarrassed. That's the good problem that we want to have. So your continuing job is to help us do that by getting the word out in the community.

MR. ALT: Well, I'm personally delighted to have lived long enough to get to the day (Laughter) at NSF where we as a group have convinced Bill Butz that we have something good to offer. (Laughter)

MR. SCIOLI: Oh.

GROUP: Oh.

MR. ALT: And I can only say how sorry I am

now that we've convinced him to hear that he's leaving.

MR. BUTZ: It did take a while, I'll admit it.

MR. ALT: Thank him for his support, wish him well, and, you know, thank Frank and Jim.

(Applause) Great meeting.

MR. SCIOLI: A word that most transfixed Bill Butz in recent 6 months is the word "transforming." He would come into panels and he'd say is this a good activity or is this a transforming activity? So keep that word in mind.

MR. GRANATO: Over the next (inaudible).

MR. BUTZ: The next person will probably want stability.

FEMALE SPEAKER: So what will we give everybody?

MR. GRANATO: One thing, we'll do a report in the next 3 to 4 weeks. That'll be put on the Web sites, you all have access to that. And then we'll be working on the Dear Colleague letter and we'll be using what's been said today to inform the report. Your commentaries will be attached in appendices and, hopefully, it'll something that's well received.

\* \* \* \* \*