

November 1982 Council

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

- - -

COUNCIL MEETING

- - -

(Transcribed from a tape provided by agency.)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

P R O C E E D I N G S

Willie : The first order of business is the minutes of the previous meeting, the 65th meeting, a copy of which has been provided to all members of the Council.

I have one correction to note in those minutes, for those who marked it. On page 14, the second paragraph, unfortunately, the word "not" was left out. The one word I'd rather not leave out.

It should read: Mr. Nussener (phonetic) said he thought -- Mr. Nussener said he thought it preferable for a Council member not to be involved in the recommendation process.

Are there any other comments or corrections?

(No response.)

We need a motion to ratify the minutes.

: So moved.

: Second.

: All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

: All opposed.

(No response.) : I'm not going to take

Bennett : I'm not going to take 15 minutes on these introductory remarks, just a couple of minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

Bennett Following the Council's party last night -- I should say the Council's lunch at 5 o'clock, given the source of our funding for our lunch last night at 5 -- I went to another do. And there again I ran in to what seems to be a common thing in Washington. I was introduced to someone by someone who knew vaguely what I did, as the Director of the American Federation for the Arts. This happens all the time. And he said did I get it right. And I said, yeah, close enough.

(Laughter.)

I was tired. It was a long day. But, again, it reminds me that there is so much misunderstanding about what we do, it's very important for us members of the Council to have a clear sense of what it is we do and should be doing.

As a result, a consequence of that, I think it important for Council members, and now new Council members have been on long enough, to lend a special hand in taking a look at our various programs, the way we do our work, and I welcome that. ~~Part of the advise of the Council~~ which the Chairman ought to be able to depend on, is advise about how we do our business. So I invite all Council members to take the scrutiny of our program that some of you have been taking lately.

I sat in on one committee meeting yesterday,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 which I was asked whether my questions about the work of
2 the division were questions I was also raising or other
3 Council members were raising about the work of other di-
4 visions. Believe me, in the words of Moby Dick, the uni-
5 versal thump is being passed around. Everybody is getting
6 a look, as everyone should get a look. I think that's
7 our responsibility as members of the National Council.

8 We inherit structures, there are reasons for
9 those structures, there are reasons for those programs,
10 there is also reason to look, from time to time, at our
11 programs and procedures, even if it turns out that we do
12 not change a particular here or there.

13 That's really all I wanted to say. Again, an
14 invitation, and I state it now rather than, if you will,
15 two weeks before the budget meeting, which is what, next
16 June or July, so that Council members can be thinking not
17 just about the work of their own committees, but about the
18 work of the agency as a whole. I invite you to do that.

19 Again, I thank you, and recognize that the work
20 you have to do for each of these meetings is onerous, but,
21 perhaps, you can take time between meetings to give thought
22 to larger questions. I welcome your advise at all times.

23 That's really all I had to say.

24 Are there any comments, questions?

25 *Thompson*
Mr. Nussener. (phonetic).

1 MR. NUSSENER (phonetic): Thank you. Is this
2 an appropriate time to ask some general questions about
3 the changes in various divisions, or make comments on
4 such changes?

5 *Bennett* : Sure.

6 MR. NUSSENER (phonetic): Okay. I was -- I did
7 want to make two remarks. One was to express my admira-
8 tion for the way in which the budget statement revealed
9 the reform or important changes in the Education Division.
10 It's easy now to understand what the division is doing.
11 Its language tells us something. And the criterion for
12 a successful application, as distinct from an unsuccessful
13 one, is readily to be formed.

14 By that same standard, however, I'd like to ex-
15 press by disappointment in the general programs program
16 as expressed through its budget that we read in prepara-
17 tion for today's meeting.

18 I don't feel that much has happened under the
19 present Administration. I don't think that we've getting
20 a better explanation for the division than we have had
21 in the past. I'm not sure how a person on that committee,
22 or, all the more so, a staff person, would know by the
23 stated criteria good from bad.

24 And I'm troubled by the contrast between the
25 effect of intellect in the Education Division and the

1 absence of those same effects in the general program.
2 It's not enough, for example, to say we do what no one
3 else in the Endowment does. I've complained about that
4 at numerous preceding meetings, and I -- and there it is.
5 I thought that the explanation, again, for the TV program
6 was perfunctory. It shouldn't be perfunctory. It's an
7 important part of our work. I think everyone on the Coun-
8 cil and on the staff favors these things. And, yet, we're
9 not getting the kind of thoughtful rationale in that bud-
10 get, therefore, from that division that we have gotten --
11 I use education as an example, you could use State pro-
12 grams as an example. If I weren't so modest, I would men-
13 tion even research.

14 And I think that that's now the one weak link
15 in the chain of strong intellect that the Endowment is
16 trying to forge.

17 : Thank you.

18 *Bennett* I want to keep discussion, if there is discus-
19 sion of this, only till 20 after, the time allotted for
20 my remarks.

21 Harriet or Steve would you like to say something?

22 : Mr. Chairman, I would like
23 to speak.

24 : Mr. Stein, yeah.

25 MR. STEIN: I take Jack's remarks very seriously.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 I take them both as a fellow member of this Council and as
2 a man -- listening to a man of superior intellect. And
3 he's had opportunities in scholarship that I have not had.

4 *Stein* But, for me, I find myself in exactly the right
5 place. I'm on that general committee. And I don't --
6 I'm concerned with some of the vagueness of purpose, of
7 stated purpose, but I'm not afraid of it. There are some
8 areas of human endeavor where you can't be as concise and
9 specific, sometimes, as you can be in old disciplines that
10 have developed a rationale and a routine.

11 I share some dissatisfaction with the product
12 of our deliberations in that sphere. To me, as a non-
13 academician, that program, the one especially in media,
14 presents a kind of utopian opportunity for a fellow who's
15 concerned with getting the humanities moved, somewhat, at
16 least, out of confinement to academia and in to public
17 presence. And I don't find that happening to a signifi-
18 cant degree even now.

19 This morning, in a conversation, I cited the
20 excellence of a -- I'm not going to discuss it, but there's
21 one on a notable literary figure in England, Virginia
22 Wolff. And I will be sure to watch that, if we approve
23 it and it goes through. But I have to ask myself will the
24 other members of the union to which I belong make an ef-
25 fort to see a thing like that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 I had hoped that somewhere along the line here,
2 the Medea program -- the media program.--

3 (Laughter.)

4 : Well, that's one change.

5 : I'm sorry.

6 (Laughter.)

7 : -- would become the means,
8 the conveyor for making accessible, for the people with
9 whom I spent the better part of my life, of that knowl-
10 edge, of those beauties, of the whole wonder of the hu-
11 manities, which has not been in their lives at all.

12 And I would hope to see before I depart this
13 Council some effort to discover a way of using this over-
14 whelming media to bring to the mass of our citizens the
15 content and everything else that goes with it of the basic
16 works and challenges of the humanities.

17 Why can't I tell my fellow union members, tune
18 in next week and see a program about Erasmus speaking with
19 my colleague member there yesterday? We're going to do
20 the symposium. It will be the greatest love story on tele-
21 vision this week.

22 And I would like to see -- I don't know exactly
23 how to do it. But how do we move this program not off
24 of the track that it's on, but give it a second track on
25 which to move?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 : If I could just say a word.
2 Let's try to keep it, the area of general reflections here,
3 and avoid discussion --

4 MS. ZIMMERMAN : Mr. Chairman.
5 : Could I just say one thing
6 Ms. Zimmerman?

7 Your departure point, Mr. Nussener, was the sub-
8 mission to OMB. And I would just want to insert that there
9 is a question of timing here. Yesterday, there was some
10 discussion, the Division of General Programs meeting, about
11 the programs and policies of the division. I think there
12 are intentions to look at things. And we have new leader-
13 ship in the division, and leadership is recent. The OMB
14 submissions was -- had to be made, prepared pretty early
15 on.

16 That's not to blunt your point. That is, again,
17 the need here, as throughout the Endowment, for a good,
18 thorough look at things.

19 Yes, Ms. Zimmerman. Excuse me.

20 MS. ZIMMERMAN: The Chairman submitted to us a
21 memorandum that was to me and to Steve that formed the
22 basis of some brief discussion we had yesterday about the
23 mission of the program, if you want to call it mission.

24 I would like to quote from one -- from the Chair-
25 man's memorandum, because I think his language should

1 provide a very interesting basis for discussion between
2 you and me. Towards this end, the Division may work either
3 to deepen and expand a public understanding of the disci-
4 plines of the humanities, or introduce the public to major
5 works in the humanities, thus inviting them to continued
6 investigation without sacrifice of intellectual rigor or
7 depth.

8 And I -- we decided, we thought that that was
9 an extremely well balanced sentence. And it expressed
10 our feelings about the program. And we were prepared to
11 continue -- I think I died.

12 (Laughter.)

13 We think that we are perfectly content to stand
14 on that, at the moment. Of course, we would always wel-
15 come any assistance you care to give us Professor Nussen-
16 er (phonetic), in straightening ourselves out, as you have
17 straightened out so many problems in this country.

18 MS. NUSSENER (phonetic): Okay, okay, okay. Let's
19 get back to (Laughter.)

20 : Let's get back to the spir-
21 it of the symposium.

22 (Laughter.)

23 Jack.

24 : May I?

25 : Sure.

1 : I think the general state-
2 ment that the Chairman is fine. But it's how to cross
3 the bridge between that general statement and the specific
4 programs of the Division that I think has to be explored.
5 To name two programs that I have never admired, youth
6 grants and youth, the other one --

7 (Laughter.)

8 : I think that these have
9 to be rethought. I think program development is the title
10 of something which says nothing that I can think of. And,
11 as I said at the beginning, if you contrast this with the
12 language and the clarity of purpose brought into being
13 by education, to name one, I think the contrast is not
14 to the favor of general programs.

15 So it's really just an observation that some
16 time in the next year I hope that we can witness a good
17 deal of reflection and improvement in how these things
18 are thought through and related to the whole purpose the
19 Division is supposed to serve.

20 Permit one footnote. I agree with everything
21 you say, Leon, on the importance of the TV. But --

22 (Laughter.)

23 : Okay.

24 : No but?

25 : Steve did you want to say

1 a word?

2 : Could I have a personal
3 privilege, Mr. Chairman?

4 : Sure.

5 : Do we have a humanist tech-
6 nician in the room who can do something about the micro-
7 phone. It seems to be giving more trouble than usual.

8 : We're checking on it, right
9 now.

10 : Steve.

11 : I just wanted to assure
12 Jack that the rethinking that he is requesting is, in fact,
13 going on. And we will not be waiting a whole year to get
14 back to you. We'll get back to you in three months, at
15 the next Council meeting, with the results. So we are
16 very much concerned about the very questions you've asked
17 about.

18 : Thank you.

19 Yes.

20 : Mr. Chairman, I just wanted
21 to reassure Leon that at a recent labor union meeting in
22 Southern Indiana I was confronted by a number of women in
23 the stone cutter's union, that's the union that brings
24 most of the limestone to Washington, D.C., to adorn it's
25 great buildings, and they said they were so pleased with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 our American short story program that they were viewing
2 in that area.

3 : Right.

4 : Thank you.

5 Introduction of new staff, Mr. Marshall.

6 MR. MARSHALL: There are times when this short
7 moment, at the beginning of each meeting, seems metaphor-
8 ical for the human condition. We have good news and bad
9 news, always, with the introduction. There's always good
10 news to introduce new staff. I have, at this time, as
11 sometimes, to announce a few departures as well.

12 I won't do a reading of the material, it's the
13 one-page biographical sketches that are in your brown
14 folder. But I would like to ask to stand three people who
15 have joined the staff. Mark Kingston. Mark is working
16 with the Chairman, and I think that we'll have a chance
17 to work closely with him in the coming months because he
18 has been given responsibility for the Jefferson Lecture,
19 so that as we work on that process, Mark will be working
20 with the committee looking at the lecture.

21 Carolyn Reed (phonetic) Wallace has just joined
22 the staff. I saw Carolyn this morning. Carolyn is here.
23 She has helped the Endowment in numerous ways over a very
24 distinguished academic administrative career, and now has
25 helped us even further by joining the staff in the Division

1 of General Programs.

2 Doris Williams. There you are

3 : Is she here?

4 MR. MARSHALL: There you are. Thank you, Doris
5 has just joined the staff in ADP which continues to provide
6 services for us which make it possible to be more effi-
7 cient all the time.

8 I have one promotion to mention, that I think
9 will delight everyone who has worked with this. Jeff
10 Field has now been named the Assistant Director of the
11 Research Division for Research Resources. Jeff.

12 (Applause.)

13 : At a --

14 : Remember Jeff's lesson in
15 history at the last meeting about America being settled
16 from east to west. I --

17 (Laughter.)

18 : I probably shouldn't have
19 brought that up again.

20 (Laughter.)

21 : It had nothing to do with
22 your promotion.

23 (Laughter.)

24 : Just a nice bit of history.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. MARSHALL : And the part that gives
2 us a little balance, we have two departures to describe
3 to you today. One, Maura (phonetic) Mayer (phonetic).
4 Maura (phonetic) would you stand for a second? Maura (pho-
5 netic), I think many of you know, has been with the Endow-
6 ment for a number of years working in the media program
7 She is leaving to become the Executive Assistant to the
8 Director of Educational Activities at the Corporation for
9 Public Broadcasting. In particular, Maura (phonetic) will
10 be working with the Annenburg (phonetic) Fund, which I
11 think many of you know is a gift from Walter Annenburg
12 (phonetic) to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to
13 make possible educational programming in the public net-
14 work.

15 We have known a little bit about Maura's (pho-
16 netic) leaving, in the Endowment, for a week or so. But
17 this next one will come, I think, as something of a sur-
18 prise to a number of people. And the surprise is due not
19 to the Endowment's decision in timing, but to the -- the
20 new place to which the individual is going. And I'm an-
21 nouncing this morning to many of you for the first time
22 that Sherrill (phonetic) McClintock (phonetic) is leaving
23 the Endowment. Sherill (phonetic) is now the Assistant
24 Director in General for Museums. Sherill (phonetic) would
25 you stand? Sherill (phonetic) is leaving to become Assis-

1 tant Director for Programs at the Philadelphia Museum of
2 Art. And --

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. MARSHALL: The Museum was not able to make
5 all the pieces fall in place itself until just last night.
6 And so we couldn't make the announcement until this morn-
7 ing.

8 So, for both of them, our very best wishes, and
9 welcome to the people joining us, and to the people tak-
10 ing new responsibilities in the Endowment.

11 : Thank you, Jeff. Mixed --
12 a mixed report, as you said. Would you carry on with con-
13 tracts, emergency grants?

14 MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

15 In the -- in tab A of the agenda book, this time,
16 is a new entry, which you will see now each quarter. The
17 enabling legislation for the Endowment permits us to con-
18 duct our business through a variety of mechanisms, includ-
19 ing, and I'm quoting now, grants, contracts, loans, and
20 other forms of assistance.

21 Now, we've made contracts to support program re-
22 lated activities since at least 1970, always at a relative-
23 ly small dollar volume, but they represent a reasonable
24 and significant aspect of our work. They are, primarily,
25 a means for us to undertake some initiatives of our own,

1 such as, dissemination workshops, or conferences on topics
2 of special importance, and so on. But we have been, as
3 I think you've seen in the past two Council meetings, re-
4 viewing our procedures internally. A group of people have
5 been working to look at the way in which we conduct our
6 internal -- our business. And we've concluded that it
7 would be appropriate to find a means to more routinely
8 inform the Council about these contracts, and, thus, the
9 appearance of the tab in the book.

10 Program staff can describe any of these in a
11 little bit more detail for you, if you like. But my bas-
12 ic point is simply that such a tab will now appear rou-
13 tinely, and we'd like you to be aware of it, and to ask
14 us any questions, if you have them, about the entries in
15 that section.

16 Mr. Messener. (phonetic).

17 : Yes. Oh.

18 : I just wanted to ask a ques-
19 tion. My very quick tabulation of this is that in this
20 quarter is about a million, one.

21 : Yes.

22 : Is that typical?

23 : No. I think that in our
24 examination of the past three or four years the total each
25 year has been between a million and two.

1 : For the whole year?
2 : Yes.
3 : And, well, I think it's fair
4 -- the -- the amount for the total year, for 1982, is
5 typical of what it's been in previous years. It happens,
6 as with all Government agencies, that many contracts are
7 entered in to at the end of the year, I think, as every-
8 one knew, as a function of the programming requests, we
9 were in a position to make certain commitments at the end
10 of the last fiscal year.

11 But this is not a pattern which departs from pre-
12 vious Endowment practice.

13 : Is this a pattern that you
14 foresee, or this is an unusual --

15 : No, I think that -- first,
16 there's never symmetry across the year. But the amount
17 that we have spent in contracts for the past three or four
18 years has been very close from year to year. The fourth
19 quarter situation is simply it's that's at the time. For
20 example, in this case, a number of the contracts have to
21 do with activities in education. It was only until July
22 Council, you recall, that we had the guidelines. And so
23 many of these are promulgations of that, and so on.

24 We have, if anything, I think, -- if there's a
25 pattern, the pattern is to decrease the number of contracts

1 being made, not to increase them in any way.

2 : I just --

3 : We have been slowly shrink-
4 ing the amount. This is -- it's anomolous in the sense
5 only one quarter ever looks quite like this, but it's
6 within, as Wendell said, our general practice for several
7 years.

8 : Okay. But were it not to
9 -- were it not be otherwise, it would seem to me, given
10 this magnitude, that we might want to consider something
11 more formal or at least --

12 : Sure. It seems that some
13 of this items, at least by title, which is all we have,
14 might have come through various Division's in the normal
15 way. I notice people organizing conferences for a quarter
16 of a million dollars, where we could have offered them
17 30,000 for their three conferences. And it would be in-
18 teresting to understand -- maybe this is not the time --
19 the rationale by which two programs will be set apart so
20 that we one goes through normal competition in to a Di-
21 vision and another has what would seem to me to be a com-
22 pletely different fate, and would appear also rather gen-
23 erous budgets, without Council scrutiny.

24 So I would hope, as Jeff just said, that this
25 policy of limiting contracts would be joined by a policy

1 of saying we wanted to enter competition, unless there's
2 a very pressing argument not to do so, in which case it
3 could be an emergency grant, or in which there's a spe-
4 cific administrative need, which would pull it out of the
5 competition of the Divisions entirely. Those seem to me
6 to be two useful criteria.

7 : So -- so, I think, do we.

8 : Yeah.

9 : Those are exactly the cri-
10 teria that we ought to use. That I think that, just in
11 general, without -- we can speak to any specific, but,
12 in general, something which looks familiar under this ru-
13 bric is there under this rubric because we have solicited
14 it rather than the other way around, that is, it's some-
15 thing that we wish to --

16 : What's your rationale for
17 the contracts over all?

18 : Well, first of all, some
19 of these contracts actually went through OPPA, --

20 : Yes.

21 : -- the normal competition
22 process, and we saw them, and they are just let as con-
23 tracts rather than given as grants for technical reason.

24 : Mr. Chairman.

25 : Yes.

1 : In reading this, I find
2 different kinds of contracts.

3 : Right.

4 : And I don't know if they
5 all come out of the same pot, and, if they do, why they do,
6 and, if they don't, I'd like to be able to know which goes
7 where, as Jack says. For example, on the page that begins
8 with 21022, but down a little bit, there are three con-
9 tracts, and each one is a different kind, at least the
10 way I read it.

11 The one to develop and install a multi-media
12 presentation facility is the kind of thing like ordering
13 printing, and what kind of competition is that --

14 : I'm sorry, Jack. There are
15 --

16 : Just if I could -- excuse
17 me.

18 : Yeah, I'm sorry.

19 : Just if I could correct
20 that. This has a couple of contracts in it which shouldn't
21 be. We printed all the contracts in order to get that
22 them. That's an administrative contract and not the kind
23 I'm describing. That -- you're exactly right -- the kind
24 of thing that is -- that's a contract with administrative
25 funds, and it's purchased in the same way that we would

1 other kinds of supplies. We -- by doing this the first
2 time, we've got some things in it that --

3 : Does the money come from a
4 differnt --

5 : Yes.

6 : -- account?

7 : For that item it does.

8 : Where does the other money
9 come from?

10 : They're program budgets from
11 the Divisions' program budget.

12 : What's the basic rationale
13 for contracts as against competitive award. I understand
14 with OPPA, because we live with OPPA.

15 : I think that you've des-
16 cribed them. There are two fundamental reasons for doing
17 it. The one is that we have a purpose of our -- of ours
18 to carry out, and this is a way to conduct the business,
19 which is why the authority was given to both Endowments in
20 the first place to enable them to initiate activities which
21 otherwise would be difficult if not impossible through the
22 contract process -- through the grant process.

23 And the other is to -- that the -- the work it-
24 self, somehow or another, doesn't lend itself to the regu-
25 lar review process.

1 Now I think it's mostly that first category that
2 we do things.

3 : So you would say that this
4 is to allow the Endowment to be an active agent rather than
5 simply waiting for what other people suggest to us?

6 : Yes, yes. And I think that
7 we -- we -- again, our whole intention here is to decrease
8 the number of times we do that. And almost always there's
9 a special reason for us to pursue that.

10 : And may I ask a question
11 on one, on the modern language?

12 : Yes.

13 : MLA didn't come to you and
14 ask you for instruction on the computer-aided instruction
15 in the humanities, but you are suggesting that they ought
16 to know about that?

17 : Well, it's a combination
18 of those things. Rich, would you like to speak to that?

19 : Yes. This contract with
20 the Modern Language Association to organize and host a con-
21 ference on computer-aided instruction in the humanities
22 was initiated by us on the staff. We found, in the past
23 years or so, a growing number of applications that pro-
24 posed uses of computers in instruction. And, frankly,
25 we've been at a loss to know how to deal with such appli-

1 cations because it's a relatively new area. We felt a
2 growing need to have clarification of what our own pol-
3 icies ought to be and our own procedures in dealing with
4 what is apparently an important emerging branch in under-
5 graduate instruction.

6 We cast around to see who had expertise in this
7 field, and came to the conclusion that Hans (phonetic)
8 Rudimen (phonetic) at the Modern Language Association was
9 the person, generally acknowledged expert in the field,
10 knowledgeable about persons and institutions that have
11 done work in the field, and also with a proven track rec-
12 ord for organizing conferences and other activities, spon-
13 sored both by the Endowment and others.

14 On the basis of that, then, we worked very close-
15 ly with Mr. Rudimen (phonetic) to design the details that
16 went in to this contract. The result will serve the Di-
17 vision's ends. We will get from it guidelines, policy
18 recommendations, a list of individuals and institutions
19 which will provide the staff with a map, as it were, of
20 what this field looks like and how we ought to proceed as
21 we make grants in response to this growing number of ap-
22 plications of this type.

23 : Thank you.

24 : Yes.

25 : I wasn't clear on one --

1 I've not been clear on one point. Those contracts which
2 are purely administrative housekeeping, obviously don't
3 have to go through Division or committee. A number of
4 them, though, clearly would originate with a Division.
5 Would each such contract be discussed with the appropriate
6 committee?

7 So No, I don't think so. At
8 least it hasn't been our practice in the past. What has
9 been pointed out, and (inaudible) pointed out is that it's
10 been uneven, and that's what I meant about consistent re-
11 porting too, when I was alluding to it, because there have
12 been some which went through the review process, as ap-
13 plications were made, as contracts for reasons of admin-
14 istrative convenience to us, and there are others that
15 we have initiated and that often take place out of sequence
16 with Council and so on. So the answer to your question is
17 no, not routinely.

18 : But I think it would be a
19 good idea to do that Division by Division, excluding those
20 things that emerge from the Chairman's office, that is,
21 following up on Lou Hector's (phonetic) question. I think

22 --

23 : Unless they are of an emergency
24 emergency character.

25 : Then they come in under

1 emergency grant.

2 Louise. : Right.

3 Mr. Burns. : At the very least, it seems

4 MR. BURNS: These contracts that come under ed-
5 ucational programs were, in fact, discussed yesterday, if-
6 and some -- at our committee meeting, and discussed vigor-
7 ously. Louise raised the question as to the actual sum
8 of money that was coming out of our own budget, exceeded
9 \$700,000, I think, on this one occasion, and she very
10 properly raised -- in my opinion, raised the question as
11 to whether a sum of that sort, involving programs of this
12 sort, ought not then to be discussed routinely.

13 contract is as big as \$220,000, : Yeah. to me if it is not

14 MR. BURNS: And I think there was a kind of an
15 agreement that that would happen. so that at least we being

16 subject to problems of appearance as well as reality, Again,
17 as Wendell pointed out, the amount of contract money we're
18 talking about this year is not unusual compared to past
19 years. What we are doing, and this is the first step, could
20 and excuse some of the glitches in the process, but we
21 are now routinely reporting to the Council all the con-
22 tracts, which, I think, is a good idea. And discussion
23 should take place as appropriate, and, as occurred yester-
24 day, this is entirely appropriate. are followed in each case

25 when we So we do intend to make this a manner of routine

1 reporting to you.

2 Louise.

3 : At the very least, it seems
4 there might be some policy discussion in anticipation of
5 some of those awards. And, for example, it was very dif-
6 ficult for us to tell in what order of priority these
7 awards were given, assuming -- and us knowing that there
8 are lots of needs, lots of kinds of information that we
9 need, as, for example, computer as opposed to some other
10 techno -- media, for example, would be another need. How
11 is the decision made for one or the other? And establish-
12 ing the specific needs, emergency need, and when a con-
13 tract is as big as \$220,000, it seems to me if it is not
14 an absolute, extreme, immediate emergency that one method
15 of doing that would be by an RFP so that at least we being
16 subject to problems of appearance as well as reality, we
17 need to be very careful.

18 : There are -- sorry. I think
19 the points taken, and we understand what that is. I would
20 say, though, that -- so no one misunderstands, there are
21 very rigorous rules about the Federal contract, about the
22 way in which they can be let, circumstances under which
23 they can be let, and the justification for them, and so
24 on. And all of those procedures are followed in each case
25 when we let a contract. So, it's a procedure which we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 don't use very often, despite this one quarter's response.
2 But I think I understand the point perfectly well, and I
3 think we all do.

4 : Fair enough.

5 Can we move on to emergency grants, which is re-
6 lated?

7 : The Chairman asked the staff
8 to work with him and consider a way to cope with a problem
9 which he mentioned to the Council yesterday. And the re-
10 sult is the new definition of emergency grants, which is
11 in tab B of the Council book.

12 : (Inaudible)

13 : Yeah. The fundamental issue
14 that is of distressing consequence from time to time is
15 the assumption because the term Chairman's grant has been
16 used that the Chairman has a discretionary fund. The Chair-
17 man does not have a discretionary fund. And there have
18 been too many instances of individuals and organizations
19 approaching the Chairman directly and seeking money which
20 they feel, somehow or another, he can return to the office
21 and write a check for and so on.

22 The authority for Chairman's grants, therefore,
23 we want to define more sharply. And the results are in
24 the book in tab B.

25 Emergency grants will be publicized, as the

1 wording is there in the tab, the second page of that en-
2 try, in our brochures, as they are reprinted, so that the
3 public is aware of this category and how it's to be used.

4 We expect that the bulk of the work that we do
5 in this category will come in under this auspices, that
6 of the emergency grant.

7 We are also provided by the authority with the
8 ability to make some awards directly to carryout initia-
9 tives that we want. An example of that is that every
10 State program in the United States began with a Chairman's
11 grant in order to give the people enough logistical sup-
12 port to begin a program in each State committee. And we
13 recently made such an award to start a program in the Vir-
14 gin Islands.

15 : May I ask a question?

16 : Yes.

17 : The definition of small
18 grants, second page, what does small mean?

19 : The authority provided by
20 the Endowment is not to exceed \$30,000. We avoid the
21 figure in the page you are looking at, so as to avoid an
22 endless number of applications for \$29,999.95. In other
23 words, we feel that if publicity says small grant --

24 : I understand.

25 : Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 : Sir.

2 : What is the meaning of em-

3 ergency?

4 : Well, I think --

5 : Is that -- is there liter-

6 ature on emergency. I raise this --

7 : Yeah.

8 : -- because in my particular

9 State there's been a law suit against the Governor for mis-

10 using the so-called emergency appropriations --

11 : Yeah.

12 : -- that he has because they

13 weren't really emergencies.

14 : It's a good point. But I

15 think that what we have done is try to make the burden of

16 definition fall on the applicant rather than on ourselves.

17 In other words, the applicants got to explain to us why

18 this can't be done in the regular process.

19 We've had an extraordinary number of things that

20 I -- emergency may not be the exact word, and we did strug-

21 gle some with trying to find what it is -- but occasional

22 international conferences, for example, will suddenly open

23 to Americans that simply were not available. And sometimes

24 that happens with very short notice, and there are no funds

25 available to send someone.

1 For some reason or other, they continue to flood.
2 The world continues to flood Johnstown, Pennsylvania.
3 And several years ago we were asked to move some books in
4 the library up above the water level. Those are --

5 : It's a good question.

6 : Yeah.

7 : I think -- I know you didn't
8 intend, but I think if I wanted to abuse it I'd rather
9 leave it as Chairman's grants than emergency grants with
10 no burden of proof. But it's partly to get me out of the
11 firing line.

12 I was called, once, to a meeting where I was
13 asked for a Chairman's grant for \$600,000. And this kind
14 of thing does happen. So it takes me out of the firing
15 line where I should be, and I think frames the thing --
16 frames the thing correctly.

17 And, again, as before, these requests will be
18 reviewed by divisions and recommended through the Deputy
19 Chairman to me.

20 : Yeah.

21 : Well, I was struck by this
22 because this is Common Cause suit.

23 : Yeah.

24 : And I -- I would not like
25 to see you go from the end of one breezy limb to the other.

1 : Yes, sir.

2 (Laughter.)

3 : I think that --

4 : Appreciate it. Maybe John
5 Agresta (phonetic) can prepare a paper on emergency.

6 (Laughter.)

7 : I -- to review, for newer
8 members of the Council, the authority here limits the in-
9 dividual awards to no more than \$30,000, and it also lim-
10 its the total amount the Chairman may make under this au-
11 thority to no more than 10 percent of the definite funds
12 of the Endowment. I don't believe we've ever approached
13 three percent of the Endowment budget under this auspices,
14 and I don't think we're going to.

15 I might say, by the way, we've ~~never~~ approached
16 three or four percent with this or the contract mechanism
17 combined.

18 : All right. Let's move
19 along.

20 Continuing support for institutions and projects.
21 Mr. Marshall.

22 MR. MARSHALL: This is on the agenda at the re-
23 quest of several people. One, we got formally a request
24 to consider it. But it's the issue which confronts, I
25 won't say every Division, but I believe every Division has

1 a specific instance or two of this issue, that is, there
2 are certain grantees of the Endowment who have, perhaps,
3 close to an unbroken string of grants from the Endowmen,
4 a relationship that goes back over eight years, ten years,
5 twelve years. And while each of the applications is a
6 self-contained thing with a beginning, a middle, and an
7 end, and its own number, and its own review, and so on,
8 nevertheless, there is a spectrum which doesn't have hi-
9 atus in it. And the issue has come to the Council sev-
10 eral times, and I think continues to be one that needs
11 review.

12 Should we have special procedures, for example,
13 for a continuing grantees, should it be different from
14 Division to Division. For example, in the Fellowships
15 Division, it is not possible to have a fellowship for
16 independent study and research year after year after
17 year.

18 On the other hand, the basic position taken by
19 the Council to this point has been that each application
20 will stand on its merit and that if an applicant who has
21 comes to us several times continued to come with sound
22 applications we can consider each of them in sequence
23 and make the decisions as it goes along.

24 But that's the context for this. And examples
25 include the National Humanities Faculty in Education, it

1 includes the New York Public Library, it includes the
2 American Council of Learned Societies, it includes other
3 grantees of that stature and that kind of programming
4 that have been repeaters, frequent repeaters with the
5 Endowment.

6 : Discussion.

7 Okay.

8 : I didn't hear the policy.

9 I heard --

10 : Oh, I'm sorry. The ques-
11 tion came to us about whether we should reexamine the
12 policy. I was perhaps not clear enough. The policy that
13 we have so far is simply this, that every application is
14 acceptable on its merits and we review it. Now that can
15 produce and has produced --

16 : Okay.

17 : I had one concrete sugges-
18 tion which is that the track record of applicants be in-
19 dicated by the staff within their report, where this is
20 an interesting consideration. Where it isn't relevant,
21 there's no reason to use up the staff time and computer
22 space.

23 But I think that we ought to know two things.
24 Number one, the fact that there have been a sequence --
25 that there has been a sequence of earlier grants. And

1 number two, and more important, ~~the~~ staff -- the staff
2 members' own opinion of the successful completion of
3 these grants, of the stated purpose, what the staff mem-
4 ber thinks of the result, and so on.

5 I think that with that information we don't
6 have any more problems about ongoing people.

7 : Fine.

8 : One other point to make,
9 and this just amplifies what Jeff was saying with some
10 specifics. Anybody coming in to a job like this, the
11 job I have, you meet with people. I've had several meet-
12 ings of this sort where people say, well, you know our
13 arrangement with the Endowment. What's that? Well, we
14 get so much every year. That's been agreed. Where's it
15 been agreed? Oh, I have a piece of paper somewhere.
16 These pieces of paper don't exist.

17 And we've made it pretty clear that people come
18 in each year and have to make the case. And that point,
19 I think, has been made emphatically to, one might call,
20 the usual suspects or the regulars, whatever you want to
21 say.

22 And that, again, as Jeff said, no penalties for
23 an institution that is good, that continues to come in
24 with good proposals, but no conclusive presumption either
25 that they will be funded simply when they appear at the

1 door.

2 : That's simply that the com-
3 mittees ought to have the facts in hand --

4 : I think we can --

5 : -- as the staff can gener-
6 ate them, --

7 : I think that's a good point.

8 : -- if they're relevant.

9 : Yep.

10 : We can do that.

11 Anita.

12 : I think I'd like to get a
13 somewhat more detailed record than simply staff opinions,
14 because staff may not have been present for the total re-
15 lationship with the applicant.

16 And I wonder whether applicants which do make
17 recurrent applications could not be asked simply, as we
18 have vita, to prepare a few pages summarizing the reports
19 that they have to send in to the Endowment anyhow, so
20 that it would be a handy record that staff could pull out,
21 and then Council members would be able to question staff
22 about the accuracy of the reporting on those institutional
23 vita.

24 : I think that's a good sug-
25 gestion too. And I think we can take steps to implement

1 that.

2 : This is a problem which has
3 troubled the Council at least ever since I've been on it
4 and will continue to trouble it, I think, as long as the
5 Endowment is in existence.

6 One thing. I think that the Research Division
7 began to think about quite seriously a couple of years
8 ago is that there are two kinds of financing of long-range
9 big projects. The first is the seed money technique, when
10 you put up money to get something started with a reason-
11 able expectation that other funding will develop.

12 There are other projects for which other fund-
13 ing is not really a reasonable prospect. I --II-- I've
14 two examples of the kind of thing. If you start a big
15 archeological dig, the dig may go on for four or five
16 years before they're ready to publish. At that point,
17 you've done all the digging, you have all the artifacts,
18 you have all the data. If it's not published, you wasted
19 all your money. So if you start down the road of financ-
20 ing a great archeological project, you'd better be clear
21 as to where the money's going to come for the publication
22 of the results, maybe six years from now, 10 years from
23 now.

24 One other example. There's an Indian -- there's
25 a Hindu poem, the Maharabatah (phonetic), which is,

1 literally, almost endless. And a Chicago scholar began
2 the translation and publishing volumes of the translation.
3 Once you start that, the prospect of anybody picking that
4 up is very slim. And you can't leave the translation
5 two-thirds finished.

6 So at least in that Division, and I think in
7 other Divisions, we've got to be aware of the problem.
8 Certainly the recent reduction in our budgets have taught
9 us that our budgets don't continually go up every year.
10 So that I -- in all the Divisions, I think we must be
11 conscious that there are projects which once started,
12 maybe we don't have any sort of a legal or even a moral
13 obligation to finish, but we have obligation to the hu-
14 manities to finish a project.

15 And it's better to think that through prior to
16 the initial funding than half way through.

17 : Thank you.

18 Harold Cannon likes to talk about not ending
19 encyclopedias with the letter L. I was just thinking how
20 this ideal form now, the endless poem, can be used in
21 your hands for various --

22 (Laughter.)

23 : I'm sure we'll be seeing
24 that. This is only half way through the endless poem.

25 : Let it be.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 : Let it be.

2 (Laughter.)

3 : Always. Never any further.

4 That's right.

5 Jefferson Lecture. Yesterday at coffee we dis-
6 cussed the Jefferson Lecture, and members of the Council
7 suggested that an ad hoc committee be assigned to meet
8 relatively soon to discuss the use, nature, and purposes
9 of the Jefferson lecture. The committee, I take it, would
10 poll the Council for issues and ideas on this subject
11 prior to the committee's first meeting, and then prepare
12 a report to the full Council in advance of the February
13 meeting for discussion at that meeting.

14 I would like to ask the following persons to
15 serve on the committee. George Kennedy. Richard Himmel-
16 farb (phonetic). Leon Stein. Anita Silvers. Jack Nus-
17 sener (phonetic). Ellis Sandos (phonetic).

18 You may wonder why you were selected. The pro-
19 cedure was simple. If you spoke yesterday --

20 (Laughter.)

21 : -- your odds of getting on
22 this committee were pretty good.

23 George, since you didn't say much, I'd like you
24 to serve as Chairman. --

25 (Laughter.)

1 : -- of the committee, if
2 you're willing. I'll ask Mark Kingston --

3 MR. KINGSTON: Here.

4 : -- to be the staff person.
5 If any of the people that I've asked cannot serve, would
6 you please tell Jeff at the coffee break.

7 I'm pleased the Council's taking this opportunit-
8 y to approach this question and ask these questions
9 about the Lecture. I look forward to the report in Feb-
10 ruary. Okay. All right.

11 The humanities and social science, some issues
12 of mind and intellect, and, therefore, we turn to John
13 Ogresson (phonetic).

14 MR. OGREGSON (phonetic): Thank you. Let me,
15 for a few seconds, review how this issue arose. It arose,
16 last time, because of two questions that came up. The
17 first was that there were certain proposals in the Divi-
18 sion of Research program, in the Research Division, and
19 the Chairman asked the question whether those proposals
20 were legitimately and properly within the humanities or
21 whether they were merely social science proposals.

22 And second, connected with that, Ellis Sandos
23 (phonetic) raised the question of whether we were doing
24 enough to welcome those professors in the social sciences
25 who were during work that seemed more in the humanities

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 than properly in the social sciences.

2 So the question came to be how do we both ex-
3 clude and include, how do we push aside and welcome the
4 proper and the improper parts of the social sciences.

5 Bill asked if I would write a paper. What I
6 did was write what you -- I gave to Bill was might be
7 considered either a very short paper or a very long memo,
8 kind of like a long memo. And I tried to get at both of
9 those questions at once. What do we -- what do we see
10 as proper to include and what do we see as outside the
11 ken and role of humanities.

12 The paper meets with all the obvious difficul-
13 ties. It becomes an almost impossible task to define
14 what the humanities are, to define them not only in them-
15 selves but then to define the social sciences becomes the
16 second impossible task, and then to find the bridge and
17 links between them is almost as hard.

18 I didn't think, when I wrote the paper, that I
19 could say anything new. And going over history of past
20 Councils, I think that's true. This debate arose in ex-
21 actly -- in almost exactly the same manner in the mid
22 and late '60's. And three papers were written at that
23 time, two by Council members, one by staff. All three
24 papers were rejected out of hand by the Council sitting.

25 I took those papers to heart, because, in fact,

1 what those papers tried to do was to give a different
2 definition of the humanities than the legislative defi-
3 nition.

4 We all know the inadequacies of the legislative
5 definition. It's merely a list of disciplines. But I
6 think what we saw, and I can easily give to any Council
7 member who would like to see further, the difficulties,
8 in fact, the greater difficulties in trying to make up
9 something that was, in fact, a proper binding iron-clad
10 definition of the humanities, and, at the same time, a
11 definition of the social sciences.

12 So there's in fact nothing I think terribly new
13 in my memo. I don't think that in defining the humani-
14 ties we can go far beyond the legislative definition.
15 And I also think, as I say, in the memo, that that's not
16 all bad. For, in fact, that legislative definition does
17 give us, in fact, a certain way, a certain avenue by which
18 we can look at certain proposals in the social sciences
19 and say, yes, they really are welcome. For if, in fact,
20 they partake of, or have the nature of, or are essential-
21 ly proposals in history, or proposals in philosophy, or
22 proposals in jurisprudence then there's no reason to ex-
23 clude them, no matter what the nominal departmental affili-
24 ation of the principal investigator.

25 I go on in my paper to take some issue with the

1 way many of the guidelines, although not by any means all,
2 many of the guidelines presently divide the humanities
3 from the social sciences. That's on the basis of quanti-
4 fication or empiricism. I'm not sure that that really is
5 the sharp dividing line. I'm not sure that the humanities
6 are never empirical. I'm not sure that if, in fact, --
7 I'm not sure that we want to say that hard social science
8 is always quantifiable, nor do I think, to go back to
9 something that seems rather current and is, in fact, on
10 some older guidelines, do we want to make the distinction
11 between humanities and social science rest on values.
12 For, in fact, if social science, if any thing, it treats
13 values, to use that now rather debased term, it treats
14 values almost at the core of the social sciences, although
15 it calls them attitudes.

16 So what I have before you, I think now the paper,
17 the memo is before Council members and Division Directors,
18 and we can have a discussion of it if we choose.

19 : Anita. Anita Jordan.

20 MS. JORDAN: John, I'm in agreement with you
21 that attempting to provide a definition of the humanities
22 is probably a fool's errand. Nevertheless, judgements
23 are made and applications are rejected on the basis that
24 these are too much like social sciences rather than hu-
25 manities.

1 And one thing, I think this may be because this
2 is a memo rather than a paper, but I have some concerns
3 about the emphasis on what philosophers and historians do
4 and the analogs to that, because immediately I began to
5 think of cases which we typically or traditionally have
6 funded that might be very difficult to construe on this
7 model, and I'm wondering whether we might pursue this just
8 a little bit more.

9 I believe, for instance, that the Research Di-
10 vision staff has not had a chance to analyze your paper.
11 I was curious, for instance, about whether ethnography,
12 which I don't quite understand, but whether ethnography
13 could be reduced to either history or philosophy.

14 It seemed to me, John, that the thrust of your
15 argument was an antireductionist argument. And much as
16 I, I guess, as an article of faith believe that everything
17 could be reduced to philosophy -- ethnography is left out, person-
18 ally. (Laughter.)

19 MS. JORDAN: -- I'm not clear that it would be
20 fair to impose that without some detailed investigation
21 of particular cases.

22 : I, too, have no hard and
23 fast knowledge of what ethnography is, nor do I wish, as
24 I said in the memo, history and philosophy seem to be the
25 closest humanities disciplines to much of social science

1 that seems to be welcome, here; but I really did mean,
2 I think I meant to say, if I didn't say it exactly, that
3 the whole list, which included literature, linguistics,
4 archeology, and jurisprudence, that that whole list is
5 applicable to social science, not just philosophy, and
6 philosophy, and history. But philosophy and history tend
7 to be the ones that come the closest the most times.

8 : Yes. George and Peter.

9 : I liked the paper. And I
10 would like to move that the Council endorse it as the
11 basis of policy. I don't think the language of the paper,
12 with all of its contracted verbs, and it's somewhat per-
13 sonal style, is exactly a public document, that one would
14 circulate to applicants. It perhaps ought to be rephrased,
15 if you want something that you can hand to people who in-
16 quire about this.

17 I don't care if ethnography is left out, person-
18 ally. It doesn't seem to me that it fits the definition
19 of the humanities.

20 Could I move that the Council, perhaps, endorse
21 the paper as the basis of a statement of the distinction.

22 : Second.

23 : Mr. Chairman.

24 : Yes. Discussion.

25 : I think we could even

1 approach a greater degree of clarification, if we offered
2 along with the paper some example of what we mean, taking
3 one topic and sort of radiating it out toward the social
4 sciences, and then taking the same topic and indicating
5 the areas in which it could be treated under our umbrella.
6 Such a subject as cities, for example, taking a very broad
7 subject, it goes both ways. And I think that might help
8 clarify the thing. At least to me it would.

9 : I think that was very help-
10 ful.

11 : Okay.

12 : Yes, Mr. Hart.

13 MR. HART: It seems to me that we ought --

14 : I'm sorry. Mr. Stanless
15 (phonetic), if you don't mind.

16 : Okay.

17 : I think, Anita, everything
18 can be reduced to fiction more than philosophy, --

19 (Laughter.)

20 : -- including most philoso-
21 phies.

22 (Laughter.)

23 : The second time somebody in
24 --

25 : Okay. How about Mr. Hart

1 then?

2 (Laughter.)

3 : Go ahead.

4 : I wonder if the question
5 can partially be clarified by a stricter consideration of
6 means and ends, that is, the means may be mechanistic or
7 naturalistic or non-humanistic, but if the ends are hu-
8 manistic, it seems to me that even a fairly technical or
9 mechanistic project may be construed as within the human-
10 ities, if the spirit of the humanities is there, then it
11 would seem to me that it's a discretionary judgement, and
12 I think prudence has to enter in to these decisions, be-
13 cause it's an area rather than a strict line that has to
14 be drawn between strictly technical subjects, let's say,
15 and humane subjects.

16 : Mr. Hart.

17 MR. HART: It seems to me we ought to postpone
18 action on this motion until the next Council meeting, be-
19 cause I'm sure not all Council members have had a chance
20 to ponder this, undoubtedly excellent paper; and perhaps
21 we should discuss it in our committee meetings before
22 acting on it.

23 : Is that agreeable to those
24 who made the motion? Is that -- is that all right? Okay.

25 : I think there's an

1 additional reason. I think it's at least a matter of
2 courtesy to let the Division Head take a look at it, --

3 : Yeah, sure.

4 : -- before we use it as a
5 basis for policy.

6 : See, my notion of the pol-
7 icy here, if I may, correct me if I'm wrong, is that this
8 paper is introduced so that we can have further discus-
9 sion on it. I think the best thing would be for Council
10 members to discuss with Division staff the appropriate-
11 ness of this paper serving as a basis for a statement,
12 either long or short, in our guidelines about this ques-
13 tion as it arises in the work of the Division.

14 Is that -- I think that's what we're driving
15 toward.

16 Mr. Nussener (phonetic).

17 MR. NUSSENER: One thing we mustn't forget is
18 that we are -- we are, I believe, mandated to deal with
19 sociology and anthropology.

20 : Yes.

21 MR. NUSSENER (phonetic): And we can't exclude
22 ethnography. The reason that my colleague George Kennedy
23 is somewhat impatient, as I am, is that that's the point
24 where we keep saying, well, what's humanistic about all
25 this.

1 I think we might be helped if John Agresta (pho-
2 netic) would join us for Thursday meeting, at least for
3 some of the papers, and give us some help. I think that
4 might sharpen the paper. We might end up agreeing to be
5 exactly where we are now. But I think the basic paper was
6 a considerable contribution.

7 : I think that's fine.

8 Yes, Ms. --

9 : Mr. Chairman, I wanted to
10 endorse what you just said. I would be, I think, reluctant
11 to endorse this paper, admittedly excellent though it is,
12 (inaudible) that the -- as a basis for policy. I think
13 that the best thing for us to do is consider the ways in
14 which we could translate some of the ideas in the paper
15 in to something that could be put in the guidelines.

16 : Fine. Just as long as John
17 doesn't have to take too much time at these meetings. If
18 you treat him as an intellectual, it's going to diminish
19 his usefulness to me, you know.

20 (Laughter.)

21 : Mr. Chairman.

22 : Yes.

23 : I want to say that I admire
24 the way in which Mr. Agresto (phonetic) has marched in to
25 this mine field, somewhat at my behest. And I hope that

1 his colorful prose will not be totally homogenized by
2 this process of consideration and refinement, since it
3 has more charm than the usual Government communication.

4 (Laughter.)

5 : Okay.

6 : That's the nicest statement
7 of the day.

8 : We want you -- let me re-
9 vise then your adventure here in to intellectual life in
10 the life of the Endowment to be sustained but not terminal,
11 if that's agreeable, or exclusive of other activities.

12 Okay. Fine. Thank you, John. Thank you very
13 much.

14 Shall we carry on and go through a few items
15 until we get to 10:05, is that agreeable? Okay.

16 Committee reports on policy and general matters,
17 challenge grants. Mr. Dill. (phonetic).

18 MR. DILL (phonetic): You have before you, I
19 think, the minutes of that meeting. Let me talk about
20 the three points that we covered.

21 The committee was, first of all, notified that
22 a thorough revision of the guidelines was underway aiming
23 at greater clarity and less ambiguity, and that a draft
24 would be sent to us soon.

25 Secondly, the issue of second awards to

1 institutions and organizations, which has often come be-
2 fore this Council Board. We agreed that successful ap-
3 plicants should be allowed to make -- to seek second awards,
4 with two conditions beyond all of those everyone meets to
5 be met. First, no proposal could be submitted until two
6 full -- we describe it as two real years had passed since
7 the official closing out of the first grant. That, among
8 other things, would allow our second condition to be met
9 that a full evaluation be made, by some means, we did not
10 describe, of the results of the first grant to make sure
11 that it was clear and certain that the purpose of the
12 grant had been met. We agreed that an applican'ts grant
13 could not exceed his reach.

14 Third, I would like to report on a discussion
15 that we had in the closed session. We were in closed
16 session because we dealt with some examples. They will
17 not be part of this report. We agreed that the Endowment
18 should continue to accept the matching of grants with
19 gifts of property, following the usual careful review and
20 evaluation that characterize such things in the past.

21 It was also agreed that such gifts of property,
22 either be closely connected to the purposes of the grant
23 or that they either be converted in to cash or produce
24 cash income. Those are the considerations and the conclu-
25 sions of our committee.

1 : Thank you very much.

2 Any comments, discussion?

3 (No response.)

4 : Fine.

5 State programs, if we may then, Ms. Kerr (pho-
6 netic).

7 MS. KERR (phonetic): The State Committee had
8 no applications to review yesterday, so we spent a good
9 deal of time on policy matters. The discussion opened
10 with the -- a report, I am pleased to say, from three of
11 the members of the six-member committee who had attended
12 orientation sessions for the new State Council members,
13 all of us in St. Louis, in this case.

14 There were several observations of those ori-
15 entationssessions which I would like to share with you,
16 and they are in some ways part of the policy or -- our
17 discussion yesterday.

18 It was generally agreed that it was a very well
19 organized symposium. And for that we are -- they were
20 well organized sessions for which we thank the staff.
21 In general we were impressed by the quality of the Coun-
22 cil members and the seriousness with which they undertook
23 their tasks. They are volunteers, as we are, and they
24 serve as Board members as opposed to advisory members in
25 the way that we do.

1 If I may, and other committee members can cer-
2 tainly join in, I may report that Walter, in particular,
3 said that he was impressed by the public members of those
4 Councils, perhaps in some larger degree than he was imth
5 pressed by the academic members. I think it was because
6 they were so superior as opposed to just theesuperior
7 quality of the academic people.

8 Another general impression that we came away
9 with, which was puzzling -- not puzzling but showed us
10 how deep our task is, is that the States themselves are
11 quite various and complex. And speaking to the members
12 of those Councils, we were reminded of how disparate our
13 -- their State constituencies that they are expected to
14 serve.

15 We were also -- that discussion was followed
16 by a remember which I would share with you that the State
17 Federation, the Federation of State Programs, will be
18 meeting next week. Several of our members will be attend-
19 ing. And I understand that several other members of the
20 Council, as a whole, will be attending. I invite you to
21 consider whether or not you might want to go that meeting
22 where representatives of all of the Councils will be and
23 there will be a general discussion, I think. Bill will
24 be a participant as well as Don. And they would welcome
25 your presence. If you would like further information, you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 can talk to Don Gibson.

2 The bulk of our meeting was spent discussing a
3 position paper presented to us by staff at our request.
4 The paper outlined a series of initiatives that the Com-
5 mittee and the Council, we would hope, might undertake in
6 our relationship to the States.

7 The premises of that paper, it seemed to me,
8 were that the States having for the most part been in ex-
9 istence for ten years or so are now firmly established.
10 They are achieving a great deal of positive recognition in
11 their localities, and they have, now, generally sound ad-
12 ministrative and technical practices.

13 Most of the programs -- all of the programs are
14 approaching maturity. And they now have the capacity to
15 address more directly the program substance as opposed
16 to the program process and procedures.

17 The initiatives which were approved yesterday
18 by Committee and which we are recommending to you today
19 are intended to give more concrete guidance from us to
20 the State Councils as they strive to strengthen and deepen
21 the quality and the content of their programs. The in-
22 tention of these initiatives is to inform the Councils
23 of the criteria which we will use to judge their programs
24 and, at the same time, a criteria which we suggest to them
25 that they use to judge the re-grants that they will be

1 judging.

2 The initiatives were these. The first item was
3 stated -- this are labelled by the staff -- a clear and
4 strong articulation by the NEH of the intellectual pur-
5 pose and standards of the programs. The Committee dis-
6 cussed and approved an outline of criteria against which
7 the State Council programs and the individual projects
8 that they fund can be assessed. Those criteria -- list of
9 criteria -- will be used by the panels, by the outside
10 reviewers, by the staff, by the Committee, and by the
11 Council, and I presume, ultimately, by the Chairman, as
12 measures against which their programs will be judged.

13 The degree to which the Councils fulfill the
14 standards which are set forth in those criteria will de-
15 termine the degree to which they will be reward or, as I
16 said last time, reversed.

17 The second item for discussion was entitled
18 Rewards for Excellence and Enforcement of Standards. It
19 was proposed and the Committee agreed that a system of
20 ranking should be developed that the panels can use; and
21 the entire review process can be used to help us more
22 nearly determine in a more quantifiable way the degree
23 to which the criteria and the standards we outlined above
24 are being met.

25 We did ask the staff to prepare for February a

1 more specific and detailed discussion of what the ranking
2 system would be, what it would mean, and how we would ap-
3 ply it.

4 We also asked the Council -- the staff to pre-
5 pare for February a list or to outline more fully and
6 describe more fully the kinds of rewards that might be
7 given to those who achieve high ranking and the kinds of
8 the reverse that might be used against or for those Coun-
9 cils which are not reaching the standards over a fairly
10 long period of time. We need that more specific informa-
11 tion fairly quickly, so that we can discuss it, so it it
12 can be commicated to the States, and they can include
13 those in the proposals that they will be making for our
14 review in July, and so that we may have those standards
15 available by which to make judgements when we go through
16 our next round.

17 The third item that we discussed was entitled
18 Modification of Re-Grant Principle. As you are all aware,
19 our relationship to the State Councils is one in which
20 we grant them funds, they re-grant the monies to indi-
21 vidual projects. It was proposed to the Committee and
22 the Committee agreed that it would be a good idea to at
23 least try, in some -- for some small proportion of the
24 Council funds, -- that it be suggested to those State
25 Councils that they could in their program proposals

1 outline programs that would be State Council initiated
2 and run. Those -- the entire proposal would, of course,
3 still go through the regular review and, thus, this spe-
4 cial non-re-grant program would go through regular review.

5 We will begin that process, I think, for the
6 next round.

7 The fourth item for discussion was entitled
8 Strengthened Efforts at Orientation and Education, that
9 is to say strengthened efforts on the part of the Divi-
10 sion to communicate the standards which we are setting
11 and to communicate all of the proposals that we are talk-
12 ing about today.

13 Included in such activities would be such things
14 as special studies prepared by the staff to communicate
15 to the Division, and continued orientation conferences,
16 and continued and greater communication with this Division
17 and other Divisions -- information from other Divisions
18 to the State Councils.

19 The final item that we discussed was an item
20 entitled Continuation of the Special Competitions for
21 Awards for Excellence. These, as you will recall, were
22 the incentive awards, the Chairman's awards which were
23 given out in the last round. After a lengthy discussion,
24 discussion on which the debate revolved around whether
25 there should -- whether the awards should continue, number

1 one, and, secondly, whether there should be a special
2 focus to the awards. We made two decisions and are rec-
3 ommending them to you, that the awards, the incentive
4 awards, be continued and that the next -- that this next
5 round, at the very least, be specified only to the degree
6 that we encourage Councils to propose self-initiated,
7 Council initiated, and Council run programs, that in this
8 particular round we do not want to have re-grants. We
9 decided specifically not to focus on a particular subject,
10 or a particular discipline, or a particular format, that
11 was the extent of our specificity in that particular recom-
12 mendation.

13 The Committee has urged the Division staff to
14 expand its consultation with the State Councils and with
15 the National Federation of State Humanities Councils in
16 order to identify with the greater coordination of programs
17 among Councils and with other Divisions of the Endowment.

18 If the other members of the Committee would like
19 to add anything, I would be happy to have you do it.

20 : Thank you very much.

21 : Mr. Chairman.

22 : Yes.

23 : I share with the general
24 sentiment to the report, and I have no differences to find
25 with it. But I do want to say that in the immediately

1 previous period I had the opportunity of attending, at
2 Don's invitation, his kind consideration, the conference
3 in Columbia, Maryland. And, in the same time, I have also
4 attended a meeting of the New Jersey Council. They've --
5 they're kind enough to invite me once in awhile as their
6 guest, since I moved to New Jersey. And I recommend to
7 all of us that we attend one or the other or both kinds
8 of meetings once in awhile for our own good benefit.

9 I don't -- I had to be reminded, because I once
10 did serve on the New York Council, of the intensity with
11 which the review process works at a State Council level.
12 And it's quite refreshing because they're very close to
13 the activity that they initiate. And they serve as the
14 reviewing body. And I would think that everybody on the
15 Committee at least ought to make the rounds. Perhaps
16 they do, but I don't know if that is so. It gives you
17 a very good insight.

18 : Thank you.

19 Ms. Silver.

20 MS. SILVER: Are we going to have an opportu-
21 nity either here or in closed session to look at the de-
22 tailed criteria that are going to be used for assessing
23 the State programs? I have a specific reason for asking.

24 : Well, I could outline them
25 for you here, but it would take a long time. I'm sure

1 I could show you the paper if --

2 MS. SILVER: Well, let me raise one question.

3 : That would be the easier
4 way to do it I would think.

5 MS. SILVER: How have these criteria been ad-
6 justed to take account of severely reduced funding which
7 is going to be disparate from State to State depending
8 on size?

9 : It is my impression -- and
10 I do hope that Committee and the staff will respond --
11 it is my impression that, for the most part, these simply
12 are the articulation of standards which have been kind
13 of amorphous and not stated in the past. It is my judge-
14 ment that this -- that the kinds of criteria that we are
15 talking about -- and I might give you a couple of examples
16 -- that the programs be centrally routed in the humani-
17 ties, and that justification of that be given in the pro-
18 posal, that part -- that the intended public and the pro-
19 posed professional humanists who will be involved be a
20 part of the planning process. It seems to me that that
21 has very little to do with funding. It has to do with
22 the kinds and quality of the programs that are to be fund-
23 ed.

24 : But it does seem to me that
25 in making a judgement about a proposal from the applicant

1 such as State Council there is a tendency to take a look
2 at what that State Council has done, and that we ought
3 to expect, unless there is absolutely no relationship be-
4 tween funding and product, that there will be some dis-
5 tinction in product with severely reduced funding.

6 : Well, --

7 : I'm not sure that -- I un-
8 derstand that this is being kicked to the State Councils
9 in order to deal with it, and that's appropriate, but
10 I would hope that there is some clear --

11 : What I might -- I did neg-
12 lect to say that one of the papers that was requested and
13 approved by the Committee as a whole -- Walter suggested
14 that along with the other items that were requested for
15 February that another kind of information that we needed
16 was a set of guidelines for us about the problems and
17 possibilities as general categories that States face.
18 For example, when there's a transition in staff, that often
19 causes some problems. We will use that as a guideline
20 for judging proposals as well.

21 : I want to -- I want to thank
22 Don and the staff for the preparation of this very good
23 document. And I want to particularly thank the Council
24 Committee for its attention to it. I think we're off on
25 a very good foot here. The encouragement and affirmation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 to the State committees that their work be centrally
2 routed, I think you said in the humanities, and, at the
3 same time, our flexibility here, inviting them to submit
4 their own ideas to us in two places, in general programs
5 and in the competition. I think this is very good. And
6 I very much welcome and encourage the interest, the con-
7 tinued interest of Council members.

8 : And I might say that that
9 specifically was one response to the reduced funding.

10 : Yeah.

11 Mr. Burns and Mr. Stanley (phonetic), briefly
12 if you will.

13 : Yeah. What Leon says makes
14 my inquiry relevant, I think. I went to St. Louis. In
15 fact, I went on the same plane with Carol, and Nancy, and
16 Don, and Gary and found out, after I got there, that it
17 cost the Government and the Endowment 200 and some odd
18 dollars to fly them on that plane and 400 and some odd
19 dollars to fly me, and the difference being that I bought
20 my ticket, as I usually buy tickets, through a travel
21 agent, and these people bought it goodness knows where.

22 (Laughter.)

23 : No comment.

24 (Laughter.)

25 : How difficult is it -- how

1 difficult would it have been for me to ask Don to get me
2 a ticket?

3 : We can do that.

4 (Laughter.)

5 : Is that it, Walter?

6 (Laughter.)

7 : Yeah.

8 (Laughter.)

9 : It's important, trying to
10 reduce funding in support.

11 (Laughter.)

12 : Yeah. I had to pursue that
13 at all, except it's a very good point. If the Council
14 is involved in travel related to Endowment work, if you
15 will ask us to help get tickets, there are arrangements
16 that we can do that, in fact, make these savings possible
17 for the Government. So we'd be delighted to do that when-
18 ever you are travelling for us, to make those travel ar-
19 rangements for you.

20 : Do you add all the money
21 they spent on the plane to figure --

22 (Laughter.)

23 : I'd like to make a connec-
24 tion between the State report and what Jack said earlier,
25 and that is a question of quality and the general program

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 on the national level of the Endowment is what you're con-
2 cerned with. And, of course, it's to reach the largest
3 possible public, and the State programs are specifically
4 geared to that end. Now, is there any connection between
5 the general program, as sponsored by the Endowment, and
6 the State programs? And, if there isn't, I think it ought
7 to be explored, because I think there is a correlation to
8 be drawn between the general program -- in fact, it might
9 solve the problem of the general program if it did have
10 some effort to reach an audience on the State or regional
11 level. It might also have a good effect on those States
12 where the programs are not particularly high in quality,
13 so much of that depends upon their leadership.

14 But if we did have some sort of liaison between
15 the general program on the national level and the State
16 programs, it seems to me that both might benefit from
17 that kind of relationship. The general program would have
18 a specific audience, and the State programs would have some
19 feedback from the Endowment to keep them up to par in terms
20 of what are legitimately humanistic subjects, and so on;
21 so I think there could be a mutual benefit between those
22 two programs. And I wonder if it's been explored.

23 : Sure enough. Don, do you
24 want to comment briefly, or Steve.

25 : Yeah. Steve can throw in

1 second. We are eager, that is, in the Division staff and
2 I think the States themselves are eager to expand coordin-
3 ation and cooperation of activities with the Division of
4 General Programs in all of its manifestations. I think
5 it's best to say that we are exploring that at this point.
6 Certainly the Federation has expressed great interest in
7 doing that. And I think there is a great deal to be gained
8 from cooperative --

9 : If I could, there's just
10 one point that needs to be made historically. And that is
11 that as things have changed in the law and in our circum-
12 stances and so on, we have had a fluctuation in the close-
13 ness of the relationships. State programs began in the
14 precursor to the general programs. It was one of the
15 parts of that, like the museum program or media program.
16 It then became its own division, as it is now. There have
17 been changes over time in law and so on. So that you're
18 point is one that would be interesting to look at his-
19 torically. They have been very closely related, each
20 filling a separate niche at one point. Then they became
21 separate. Then the law encouraged even further separa-
22 tion. And now we're at a point, I think, where we're
23 bringing both groups back together more closely and ex-
24 ploring in detail.

25 It's a very good point right now. But it has

1 an interesting history.

2 : A last comment.

3 : Mr. Chairman, I'd just like
4 to make a comment that goes back to what Anita was saying
5 earlier. One thing I think should be stressed that is in
6 -- in the criteria that we approved yesterday, one of the
7 items that -- that Louise omitted was the explicit guide-
8 line that a State was to be judged by what it did with
9 its available resources rather than against some ideal
10 that's sitting out there that we say this is the ideal
11 humanities program and people have to approach that.
12 And obviously one of the elements of that in days of re-
13 duced funding is the amount of funds available.

14 And so I think that what you are talking about
15 is indeed taken care of in the guidelines we approved yes-
16 terday.

17 : Allright.

18 Louie, yes.

19 : I'd always been under the
20 impression that there was no necessary connection between
21 State programs and general programs, in this respect;
22 a State might choose to put most of its money in to re-
23 search in State history and the publication of a history
24 of the State. And I would hope that the States would
25 try to have projects in research, perhaps in education,

1 even award some scholarships and have some general programs.
2 And I think we start the States' Committees down a dan-
3 gerous road, if we think that all their programs should
4 be general programs, because I'm afraid we may find then
5 half-baked television programs, and the kind of things
6 that many States have done thinking they're general pro-
7 grams when they don't -- when they really turn out to be
8 quite unproductive projects.

9 So I would think just the kind of thing Jack
10 talked about being the danger of general programs that
11 danger is multiplied many fold on the State level. So
12 I would hate to see us keep telling the States your job
13 is outreach; it's public education, rather than your job
14 is the promotion of the humanities within your State all
15 the way across the board.

16 : Last comment.

17 : Yes. It may be of some
18 interest to you to know that up until very recently the
19 same committee did what was then called public programs
20 and State committees. They were -- it was a part of the
21 same committee work. I personally was very delighted to
22 see them separated, partially because of the reasons that
23 Louie explained. And I can remember, and if a paper is
24 done on the history of this, that we actually had a case
25 where one State gave us a tremendous amount of problems

1 because it literally wished to do the kinds of things that
2 Louie talked about. It saw itself putting all its money
3 in to media, for example. And it was not -- it was not
4 doing a balanced job or promoting the humanities in its
5 State, which is its job, not to be a general -- a program
6 of general programs in a State, and it's quite different.

7 And there was some very interesting history in
8 specifics that I think you would enjoy reading, and per-
9 haps someone will put together a paper like that that
10 people can take a look at, see what the history of all
11 this has been.

12 : Okay.

13 : I didn't intend to water
14 down the State programs at all in my suggestion. I --

15 : We wouldn't let you do
16 that.

17 : I hope that we would raise
18 the level and that it would be truly humanistic. I rec-
19 ognize the danger that you're pointing out. But I think
20 we could reverse that danger. And I know that some State
21 programs always make it a criterion, any program they
22 put on must be open to the public and reach as large a
23 public as possible, which I understand is a built-in prin-
24 ciple in many of the State programs.

25 : Right. Fair enough.

1 Shall we -- shall we break? Can we come back in
2 a little less than ten minutes? There are a number of
3 airplanes this afternoon, and I would like to stay on
4 schedule. Thank you.

5 (Whereupon, a brief break was
taken off the record.)

7 : Stop leaking to the "Wash-
8 ington Post."

9 : If I could take a minute
10 before Mrs. Ermond (phonetic) resume the reports for
11 general programs to do something which occurred to us
12 this morning. It has been a long time since we have done
13 it. We have a new class of Council people. First, I
14 forgot to mention a person, and I am embarrassed about this,
15 the decision came again late, and I failed this morning
16 in talking about changes in the Endowment.

17 I'd like to acknowledge the fact that particu-
18 larly because of a considerable volume of work this time
19 that the Committee I know saw and was familiar with the
20 Endowment is also losing Nadina Gardner, who is leaving the
21 Endowment soon, and from the Division of Basic Research.
22 And we are sorry to do that. We need to do one more search
23 to find a good humanist administrator, and this is a real
24 challenge.

25 What we have done for awhile, and I'd like to do

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 again is to introduce to the Council members some people
2 who are always present in this room on Friday, and who
3 make possible a lot of our work, and yet are not as fa-
4 miliar to you. They're just a few, and I'd simply like
5 them to stand, if they would be willing to do so for me.

6 Just for a minute, I'd like to introduce these
7 people. First, Vic Locklin (phonetic), who is our Ad-
8 ministrative Officer for the Endowment in charge of our
9 entire administrative side. Next to him, David Johnstone,
10 who is the Director of the Office of Personnel. Sheldon
11 Bernstein is here. Sheldon, where are you? Sheldon is
12 our Audit Officer, and a very interesting work that some-
13 times can be.

14 Let's see. David Wallace is here today. David.
15 David directs our Grants Office, which is incredibly com-
16 plicated. It's the part of our work which deals with the
17 grantees once the work on a Friday is finished. And it's
18 at that point, often, that the complexities grow a lot.
19 And because there's been no opportunity yet for there to
20 be a round of grants in this connection, and just one
21 meeting with the Committee, could I ask Tom Kingston to
22 stand, who is the Director for the Challenge Grants pro-
23 gram? We'll see Tom in February when there are awards
24 to consider.

25 So I wanted to introduce those people to you,

1 even that briefly.

2 : Let me just, if I may,
3 follow up with amplification by way of making a point here
4 for the purposes of the Council.

5 Tom, would you stand again and remain standing?
6 Sheldon, would you stand? John Agresto (phonetic) would
7 you stand?

8 (Laughter.)

9 : Now this is John Agresto
10 (phonetic), that is Sheldon Bernstein, and that is Tom
11 Kingston.

12 (Laughter.)

13 : If you'll indulge me just
14 thirty seconds more, reminiscent of an old television
15 show, would you each say my name is John Agresto (pho-
16 netic).

17 (Laughter.)

18 : You can tell. I'm the tall
19 one.

20 (Laughter.)

21 : When Sheldon told me that
22 he was complimented twice for his paper on social science
23 and the humanities,--

24 (Laughter.)

25 : I figured it was time to

1 do something. Thank you, gentlemen.

2 : They hadn't seen Sheldon's
3 paper.

4 (Laughter.)

5 : Okay. We all know who you
6 are. Thank you.

7 What's next? All right. General programs.
8 Miss Zimmerman.

9 MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes. We have, as you -- as we
10 have referred to before, general discussion of the memo-
11 randum, which the Chairman sent us about the mission, if
12 you will, of the Division of General Programs. Following
13 that discussion, Steve Kahn (phonetic) indicated to us
14 that at the February meeting of the Council, where our
15 load will be very, very light, we'll have very, very few
16 proposals, brought to us, I think only those brought to
17 us will be those that we can refer to this Council, that
18 we will have an unusual opportunity to concentrate on
19 what is the general philosophical issues that underlie
20 our grant making in this Division, and to that end we are
21 going to be seeing a revision of the guidelines for our
22 Division.

23 Now I have discussed this further with Steve
24 and requested that since we have a very -- we have a very
25 full Committee, full in every sense of the word, full of

1 ideas, full of conflicting opinions -- being the Chairman
2 of this Committee is something like riding a bucking bronco,
3 it's exciting, and it's dangerous, and it certainly is
4 never dull.-- I have requested that a very early draft of
5 those guidelines be sent to our Committee, that is, pre-
6 ferably at the middle of January, so that this Council
7 Committee will have opportunity early on to have input
8 in to those guidelines. I don't want that -- I don't
9 want it to happen that the guidelines will come to the
10 Committee after they have been not completely set in con-
11 crete but very close to it. I want this -- I think this
12 Committee deserves the opportunity to have input in to
13 those guidelines at a very early stage, and I think this
14 will be much to the benefit of the Division.

15 After we discussed that, we also went on to --
16 I'm skipping around from open to closed session, because
17 I'm dealing with matters of general policy -- we then
18 went on to a discussion of Division-wide procedures for
19 the evaluation of proposals. This is a matter which has
20 concerned us seriously. It continued a discussion that
21 was initiated at the last meeting of the Committee. And
22 one of the issues that we have raised is the relationship
23 between the panel and outside specialists' review. And
24 after careful review and discussion, we agreed that in
25 all proposals -- programs of the Division proposals should

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 first go to the panel and then proposals that panels judge
2 to be competitive would be sent for review by specialists
3 in the field, that is, where we see -- where the panels
4 raise questions then the proposals will go out for spe-
5 cialists to deal with those questions, so that it will be
6 possible to trace the logical development of the review
7 process when it comes to us and also so that there will
8 be uniformity of process across the Division, which we
9 feel is very important.

10 This, as I say, enables the staff to target is-
11 sues of concern or specific problems raised by the panel
12 and therefore develop the documentation that will lead
13 us to more conclusive recommendations.

14 There are two other issues that I'd like to
15 raise in -- concerning the review process. We spent a
16 lot of time talking about the quality of outside evalu-
17 ators. Without going in to any detail, we feel that it
18 is extremely important that the uni- -- that the outside
19 evaluators of all our programs be of uniformly high qual-
20 ity. There -- we perceive that there is some unevenness
21 from project to project. We're very fortunate that we
22 have people on our Committee who are really quite capable
23 of evaluating that. And the quality, the uniform qual-
24 ity of outside evaluators from project to project is not
25 always apparent. And that's something that we care about.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 And, further, we have spent a lot of time discussing the
2 use of consultants. We are still not satisfied that we
3 have a sufficient check on the use of consultants, that
4 they are thoroughly involved in each one of the projects
5 at all of the steps along the way. And we are looking
6 for some -- Helen Rictus (phonetic) says -- in writing.
7 We'd like to see it in writing that they are, in fact,
8 consulted all the way along in the project and they're
9 not just there in literally name only, and that means at
10 the end, too, when the finished product -- that they have
11 something to say about it right all the way through to
12 the end. And we are not going to be satisfied, as a
13 Division, until we know that that is happening and that
14 we have a way of checking on it. And this is part of --
15 I suppose it's got to be written in to the guidelines some
16 way or another. But these are -- these are already inputs
17 that we want -- that we are having informally in to what
18 we want to see in those guidelines. Those are things that
19 we feel strongly need to be strengthened.

20 We also discussed what I suppose you could call
21 the rating system. First of all, we want it uniform
22 across the Division. We experimented with numerical rat-
23 ing systems. And we decided that we don't like it, as
24 a Committee. The problem with it is the numerical rating
25 system, that is, rating projects, one, two, three, four

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 or whatever, tends to lead to averaging, and averaging we
2 find, as a Committee, is not helpful to us at all because
3 it does not allow us to see what we want, which is the
4 range of opinion that there is in the panel, let's say,
5 or in the -- on the outside, in the case of outside eval-
6 uators.

7 We want to know if five panelists think a pro-
8 ject is excellent, and four think it's good, and one thinks
9 it's fair. That's much more helpful to us than to hear
10 that a project got a 2.2 evaluation. That really doesn't
11 tell us what we want to know. And we don't feel it's
12 helpful.

13 : Testing, one, two. Test-
14 ing one, two.

15 MS. ZIMMERMAN : -- called excellent; that
16 means that highest recommendation; a very good project, and
17 strongly recommended; a good project, that means recom-
18 mended; then project has potential, but is not recommend-
19 ed, that's a very common thing here, where a project does
20 have that kind of potential, and we turn it down, but we
21 ask them to resubmit, and that happened, I understand,
22 in every Division, and a project is not recommended,
23 that is, there are five categories, but they make it much
24 clearer for us to understand what it is that is being
25 recommended to us. We really are strongly opposed, as a

1 committee, to the numerical system, because we, as I say,
2 don't want to have averaging, we don't find it helpful
3 at all.

4 Now, we also looked at the revision of deadlines
5 in all our programs. And the intent of these alterations
6 is to equalize the work of the Council across the year.
7 We feel that with the diversity of programs that we have
8 to consider in our Division that would be very helpful.
9 And we also think that it will increase the time available
10 for the evaluation of applications.

11 We noted with pleasure that something that we
12 are encouraging, that is, the humanities program for chil-
13 dren and youth are going to be strengthened, there's going
14 to be a special deadline in March for humanities program-
15 ming for children and youth in the media program. And
16 after that special deadline, proposals for children hu-
17 manities programs will be eligible at all deadlines of
18 the media program. Programs for children's programs at
19 museums will also now be eligible for every deadline of
20 that program as well.

21 That concludes my report, Mr. Chairman. If any
22 other members of the Committee would like to add anything,
23 I'd be delighted to have them.

24 : Any other members of the
25 Committee?

1 : Mr. Chairman.

2 : Yes.

3 : We also spoke about the
4 difficulty of setting up a routine for a subject that is
5 a film subject that keeps changing under your hands as
6 it goes. So that whatever you ask your reviewers, and
7 your panelists, and even your consultants to do, while the
8 subject is in the form of either a plan or a general pro-
9 posal, begins to change once you've arrived at the stage
10 of film. And very often the beginning is not at all like
11 the end or the other way around.

12 It does raise questions of perhaps multiple re-
13 view. I don't know how you can control that. But very
14 often a very bright proposal becomes a very intelligent
15 script and an impossible shooting document, so they change
16 it in midstream and it becomes something slightly differ-
17 ent. And the people who have endorsed this thing as a
18 plan when it began sometimes can't even recognize the sub-
19 ject in midstream. And for me personally, I've had some
20 personal experience of this thing, it raises all kinds of
21 problems. I have twice found myself bound in a film sub-
22 ject where it seems that I am saying something that I never
23 intended to say. This is the result of either out of con-
24 text quotes on film, etcetera. And we ought to be vigilant
25 about that because it is a commitment on film which is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 almost as permanent, in a sense, as a commitment in print.

2 : Thank you.

3 : Bill, actually, --

4 : Mr. Cohen (phonetic).

5 MR. COHEN (phonetic):-- we'll talk about it in
6 the closed session. There's one particular project that
7 we funded, and we saw the end result yesterday. I was
8 terribly, terribly disappointed in what I saw, for that
9 wasn't what I originally voted for. This whole question's
10 of seeing what the end result is as distinguished from
11 what it is in words.

12 : Yes, thank you.

13 Mr. Nussener (phonetic).

14 MR. NUSSENER (phonetic): For the review that
15 you're undertaking in February, there's one question which
16 I think would be interesting to have -- see investigated.
17 Your Division comes as close as any to being a Ministry
18 of Culture in the outread that it can effect. And I was
19 interested in your drawing on parallels in such activities
20 in other countries and other cultures. What general pro-
21 grams exist that you would find worthwhile models or not
22 acceptable models? What rationale seems to inspire those
23 programs, particularly with the British Council and the
24 Canada Council. I think that kind of prospective would
25 help us in shaping a program appropriate for this country.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 : I think that's a very in-
2 teresting idea. I have had some connection with the Brit-
3 ish Council. And I know that they operate somewhat dif-
4 ferently than we in support of the arts and the humani-
5 ties.

6 I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we
7 have the facility --

8 : Mr. Chairman.

9 : -- to -- you'll have to
10 tell me whether or not we have the facility to draw on
11 that.

12 : Sure. And do a study,
13 yeah.

14 : And if you feel that would
15 be appropriate, I certainly think it would be very inter-
16 esting for us to have an opportunity to look at other
17 models. I would find that a very interesting opportunity.

18 : Okay.

19 : Mr. Chairman.

20 : Yes.

21 : In that respect, the in-
22 stance cited by Marcus Cohen (phonetic) was so bad that
23 it reminded me again of what we could be. And among the
24 things we could be would be the kind of thing that per-
25 haps my colleague Zimmerman has in mind here to do. Again,

1 I share with her some puzzlement as to how you go about
2 it. How do you -- some of us may have ideas of what we
3 would like to do, but it's -- I don't think we have the
4 means of doing this.

5 : Bill --

6 : I would like, for example,
7 to see a series in which we take the very heart of the
8 humanities, literary classics that we all ought to --
9 even if you are not a schooled citizen of this country
10 -- some of us have never had contact with it -- and I
11 would think that it ought to be somewhere the function
12 of this Council to stimulate, because it can't do it-
13 self, some project in lines that would bring these lit-
14 erary classics -- I want to be very specific -- on to the
15 television screen in a way that the general population
16 of the country could absorb them.

17 I can think of any number of instances that I
18 think would lend themselves to treatment and would make,
19 you know, exciting film or mystery story type. But there
20 are any number of classics.

21 One colleague on this Council and I have almost
22 orally written this script for Plato's symposium, I think,
23 that would go well. But it's along that line. I see
24 very little of that coming through. Virginia Woolf and
25 perhaps one other.

1 : Okay.

2 Marcus.

3 : Is there any way at all,
4 Bill, after we fund, for example, a film that we should
5 not be involved in it, in the sense of helping produce it
6 or anything like that, but some kind of a review process
7 as it is being done. In other words, that it'll have six
8 months to do it, at the end of three months is there a way
9 by which we can be involved to the extent of seeing what's
10 actually going on?

11 : I don't know.

12 Steve. Wendell.

13 : I --

14 : Jack.

15 : If I could just interrupt
16 a second. The -- if one makes the quick transition and
17 puts in something in the place of film, I think the prob-
18 lems here become evident. If we were talking about the
19 production of a book, --

20 : Yeah. That I understand.

21 : And I think that the -- the
22 critical function we've always felt has to come in the
23 review process, and that the product then is the responsi-
24 bility of the grantee not the Endowment. That is a ques-
25 tion to us about the quality of why one of the Adamses was

1 presented as they were in that film is not a question that
2 we need to answer, it's a question that the producer of
3 the Adams Chronicles need to answer.

4 It doesn't remove the basic issue though of
5 whether we should follow it a little more and be aware of
6 where problems come in. But I think you can see the sen-
7 sitivity we were have whether it's a film or a book in any
8 interference from -- and the appearance of interference.

9 No, I understand --

10 : I understand what the prob-
11 lem is. The question is is there any solution of that
12 particular problem.

13 : Yeah. I think, at the mo-
14 ment, we've felt no. But I could --

15 : I mean, I personally -- and
16 this is just a personal observation -- would feel that if
17 we are going to get in to the -- that kind of a mode where
18 we are monitoring, once we've made the grant, that we are
19 monitoring it like that, then it is something that we are
20 going to have to look at across the Endowment, because
21 I'm sure that there are grants in the Research Department
22 -- Division, and books, and so on and so forth that do
23 not live up to everyone's high expectations at the moment
24 of funding, lecturers that were given, fellowships, and
25 so forth.

1 And I would think that to single out one par- that such
2 ticular thing that we do and say that only in this we are
3 going to do this would be a mistake. I think that Jeff
4 is right on target to do the substituting. We either do
5 this with everything or else we don't. result in spending money,

6 I wonder whether somebody: All right. us, for instance, the

7 Yes, Mr. Sandoss (phonetic). cause I'd really like to

8 MR. SANDOSS (phonetic): I want to respond to terms of
9 Leon's idea there because we actually have talked about
10 this informally. But if it would be appropriate to do is the
11 so, I would actually move that a consideration be given, considered,
12 perhaps one more study, or perhaps something more direct
13 than that, to a series of films on classics of Western for us to
14 literature, which I believe would command good interest may not
15 out there not only among those who might be doing adapta-
16 tions for television or film but also for viewers either
17 in public television or even in commercial television. if it is,
18 There are a number of these series that many of us have hope
19 admired coming from a variety of sources. And surely one
20 of the very best ways of achieving this famous outreach
21 that all of us want to achieve rather than simply talking, we
22 to one another in these ivy-covered halls is through the and that
23 television. And what better way to do it than by estab- of the
24 lishing a film program in the Endowment within these pa-
25 rameters and soliciting applications for that, and whatever

NEAL R. GROSS GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW/VENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 the parliamentary situation may be, I would move that such
2 a proposal be considered formally.

3 : Ms. Silver.

4 MS. SILVER: Before we go -- before we take any
5 kind of action that is going to result in spending money,
6 I wonder whether somebody could get us, for instance, the
7 budget for BBC productions, because I'd really like to
8 have some sense of what this -- it would mean in terms of
9 our budget.

10 : This is a -- this is the
11 substance of my motion. I'm asking that this be considered,
12 which I suppose means that we have a study made as to
13 whether this is a feasible and suitable thing for us to
14 do, and then what the budgetary problems may or may not
15 be, and whether it's doable or not.

16 Several of us think it's a good idea. Maybe
17 it's a lousy idea, for very good reasons. But, if it is,
18 I'd like to hear why it isn't appropriate, and I hope
19 someone would second.

20 : I would second.

21 : You know, Mr. Chairman, we
22 have a wonderful model, I think, in front of us, and that
23 is the excitement that we all feel on the funding of the
24 project to bring out the new editions of the American
25 classics, and the extreme excitement with which they were

1 greeted in not only the scholarly community but also in
2 the general community. And there perhaps might be some
3 -- that might provide us with some guidance as to the
4 possibility of establishing a category within the Media
5 Division, as was suggested, where we specifically look
6 for applications. That would be a very appropriate one
7 following along the lines of filming American classics.

8 : Mr. Sandos (phonetic) may
9 I take your motion to be -- to direct us to look in to
10 the feasibility of this?

11 MR. SANDOS: (phonetic) ~~The~~ That's correct.

12 : I would second that.

13 : Mr. Chairman.

14 : Yes. Discussion.

15 : Out of our discussion yes-
16 terday in the Education Division it was proposed by me
17 that something like this, not necessarily what the spe-
18 cific focus on the classics -- but that some look be given
19 at media programs across the board in order that those --
20 there be some information given to various committees
21 that do media programs, which would, in fact, allow those
22 films that are made for students to be a little bit more
23 exciting than the ones my daughter sees, and to have those
24 scholarly, the scholarly -- because those are supposed to
25 be the scholarly-based ones, we understand, and to have

1 the ones that are out of Media Division be a little bit
2 more humanistic in our terms. And so we would -- I would
3 second that -- third it, I guess.

4 : My I offer the following
5 refinement, not refinement, just elaboration. As Steve
6 Kahn (phonetic) said, the next few weeks will be the time
7 for looking at the media guidelines. And I take the mo-
8 tion, if it passes, to be an ingredient in this reconsid-
9 eration, and that the motion is such that I think we will
10 feel obligated to respond to it to Council members before
11 February so that we can have a full discussion of it at
12 the time we are talking about new guidelines. Is that
13 agreeable?

14 : We are very happy to con-
15 sider that option as well as a number of others that have
16 been produced to us. One important factor to remember is
17 that we're not producers. We don't come up with ideas,
18 and go out and put the teams together and film them.
19 That's another business entirely. Just as in the Fellow-
20 ship Division, the Fellowship staff doesn't dream up
21 themes and then go out and try to find a scholar to write
22 on it.

23 We do have to respond to the projects that come
24 in to us. We would certainly be very eager to receive a
25 project of the kind that you're describing. In fact, in

1 the past we have done exactly that. And we have, as you
2 know, participated in support for precisely the project
3 that you're describing.

4 The other thing to remember, however, is that
5 the project that you described, the filming of classics,
6 is probably the most expensive enterprise that we could
7 poassibly undertake. And even where we have done this,
8 we are only one of a number of funders. I think it would
9 just be impossible for us to be the sole or even the major
10 funder of such an enormous enterprise as the funding of
11 a historical treatment of a novel, or at least to do it
12 in any size. A number of them would just, I think, bank-
13 rupt the Endowment, and not have room for anything else.
14 It is very expensive to do. And obviously there must be
15 a whole production team out there that wishes to do it
16 in order for us to participate in the funding.

17 But let me say that we are certainly interested
18 in it. We have done it in the past and we would more
19 than welcome applications that came in to do that sort of
20 thing.

21 : Mr. Chairman, I think that
22 this is precisely why the matter may or may not be the
23 next great idea for NEH. But I'm certainly thinking of
24 something somewhat more positive than merely being re-
25 ceptive to such proposals from initiative out there.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 I'm suggesting that this be -- this be posed as
2 a subject for submissions and applications from people
3 in the country, just as we have special, say, Bicentennial
4 kinds of proposals which we will receive and things of
5 this order. In other words, it is to give an emphasis, it
6 is to give a focus, and it's not necessary to do all the
7 classics in one year or in one ten-year period, it can be
8 -- it can be, as I visualize it, a permanent category for
9 this diminution of our work from now on. I don't think
10 that by the year 2082 we will have exhausted all of the
11 classics of Western civilization. And I'm aware that there
12 are very important financial constraints, but there's also
13 the possibility that good old Mobil Corporation and other
14 private contributors out there would want to do some part-
15 nership with us, as they have done with other producers
16 of such film.

17 : May I ask -- we're falling
18 behind -- brief comments, if you would.

19 Professor HimmelFarb, (phonetic), Mr. Stein.

20 : Yes. Just very briefly to
21 support what's just been said. We do not initiate indi-
22 vidual projects. We do initiate categories of project.

23 : What kind?

24 : And that's what --

25 : Categories.

1 : We do initiate categories
2 of projects, and that's what's being proposed now. This
3 is to be a new show, rather like youth grants, perhaps,
4 or constitutional conventions, and so on.

5 The other thing is there's no need -- there's
6 no reason to think that we would be the sole funding agen-
7 cy for these. We could be in a collaborative arrangement
8 with these, just as we are with so many other things.

9 But I don't think those are very serious objec-
10 tions. I think it's an excellent idea (inaudible) take it
11 under very serious --

12 : Yes, Mr. Stein.

13 MR. STEIN: Well, I don't think we have to fund
14 them either. If we do, then we're in real trouble. I've
15 had experience very recently in that field, and it becomes
16 very difficult to move in that field of film at all.

17 But I think we ought to consider -- I don't know
18 whether it's a good idea or not -- some incentive incre-
19 ment perhaps in this field; some device for holding it
20 together as a continuing program is an idea, and putting
21 a little bit more honey on the thing, because it falls in
22 to this category.

23 : Okay. Good.

24 Mr. Kahn (phonetic) did you want to --

25 MR. KAHN (phonetic): ~~Just two quick things.~~

1 First, I want to remind you we have, in fact, done the
2 filming of classics. The Mark Twain series has been sup-
3 ported as an example of that.

4 And, second, I would think if we opened the com-
5 petition and encouraged people to submit proposals to re-
6 ceive grants to then turn around and say, but, of course,
7 we don't have sufficient money in order to support the
8 grant that you have spent a lot of money putting together
9 to send to us seems to me a major problem. One doesn't
10 encourage someone to submit a proposal and then turn around
11 and say, thank you, we can support 10 percent of it.

12 : No, but I think --

13 : Mr. Chairman.

14 : And I don't want to -- we're
15 not going to conclude this discussion today. But one
16 could invite proposals in a certain area and say that the
17 Endowment is prepared to offer partial funding and support.

18 May I -- there is a motion on the floor. I
19 want to deal with it. Is it agreeable, and I'm thinking
20 of the constraints under which Steve Kahn (phonetic) is
21 operating, to come up with guidelines for February, that
22 the Council, the relevant Council Committee be the group
23 which discusses this?

24 Mr. Sandos (phonetic), would you like to be in-
25 cluded? I don't want to exclude you from it. I'm just

1 thinking of a workable -- a workable size group. If you

2 --

3 MR. SANDOS (phonetic): I'm at your disposition,
4 Mr. Chairman.

5 : Let's make the Council
6 Committee, if that's agreeable, be the screening, and
7 let's copy Mr. Sandos (phonetic) with drafts, if that's
8 agreeable to him.

9 There is a motion on the floor. Do we need to
10 restate it?

11 : Yeah.

12 : Yes. Mr. Sandos (phonetic),
13 would you restate your motion, please?

14 Jeff, would you?

15 : Can I try it?

16 : Would you, please.

17 : Sorry, Ellis, I'm really
18 not trying to be punitive.

19 (Laughter.)

20 : I believe --

21 : It's an excellent idea.

22 : I believe, in a nutshell,
23 the staff is being asked to consider the feasibility of
24 a grant category, or a request for proposals, or something
25 which would invite applications, make it clear that the

1 Endowment welcomes or encourages applications involving
2 the production of literary American classics.

3 : I didn't hear America.

4 : Didn't I?

5 : Yes. Western civilization.

6 : I didn't mean to modify

7 it. I'll take whatever the Council sense is.

8 : Classics.

9 : Classics, perfect.

10 : Let me see if I could say
11 it again.

12 : Good.

13 : Maybe I could. I propose
14 a study to see to consider the feasibility of establishing
15 a category of producing films devoted to classics of
16 Western literature, as part of the media program of the
17 Endowment.

18 : Okay. Is there a second?

19 : Second.

20 : All in favor.

21 (Chorus of ayes.)

22 : All opposed.

23 (No response.)

24 : It carries. Fine. Thank
25 you. Move along.

1 Research programs, Mr. Kennedy. Thank you very
2 much.

3 MR. KENNEDY: I can be very brief, Mr. Chairman,
4 since there are only two matters that the Committee asked
5 me to bring to the general attention of the Council.

6 One is that the U. S. newspapers' project is
7 now in place. Guidelines have been approved and issued,
8 and the Council can look forward to seeing some applica-
9 tions in this program, I believe, before the May Council
10 meeting.

11 It has been developed in conjunction with work
12 at the Library of Congress and involves the on-line com-
13 puter library center. And we're very optimistic about
14 the outcomes of it.

15 The second involves a study of the history, the
16 procedures, and the implications of the publications pro-
17 gram. The Committee asked the Division to prepare a re-
18 port on this, and it was done by Margo Backus and Harold
19 Cannon. It's a very good report, which we'd like to bring
20 to the attention of all members of the Council. The Com-
21 mittee asked me to propose the text be included in the
22 minutes. This strikes me, in the cold light of dawn, as
23 an attempt to convert the minutes in to something like the
24 "Congressional Record," and that I might be back at an-
25 other session inserting the text of Kant's "Critique of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 Pure Reason" in to the minutes, or something of that sort,
2 for the edification of the Council. So, with the permis-
3 sion of the other members of the Committee, I'm simply
4 going to request that this three-page report be circulated
5 to the members of the Council.

6 : Thank you. You win the
7 Chairman's award for brevity. Thank you very much.

8 There's another one available, Ms. Silvers.

9 (Laughter.)

10 : Could we --

11 : I'm sorry.

12 : Could it go in as an ap-

13 pendix?

14 : Yes.

15 : That means we won't get

16 it until the next meeting.

17 : We'll circulate it, too.

18 : We'll put in all the Coun-

19 cil members names so you'll be sure to read it.

20 MS. SILVERS : I'm going to lose the Chair-

21 man's award for brevity.

22 : Okay. Okay.

23 MS. SILVERS : But I think it's important

24 to give some prescriptions --

25 : Sure.

1 MS. SILVERS: -- of the studies that are being
2 carried out. The Committee heard reports on current stud-
3 ies relating to the humanities, and, as always, the reports
4 helped the Committee to see the humanities in perspective
5 within the total community of academic and research insti-
6 tutions.

7 We heard two reports of new HEP (phonetic) stud-
8 ies. You recall that HEP is the Higher Education Panel
9 of ACE, and that the Endowment helps support that panel,
10 and can use that panel to conduct surveys. The first is
11 a survey of graduate and undergraduate deans about their
12 beliefs concerning declining or improving quality of hu-
13 manities students. Jack Nussener (phonetic) pointed out
14 that the reports received will be somewhat impressionistic,
15 even though the survey -- the surveyed deans would be
16 asked to indicate the bases of their opinions, such as,
17 changes in students' achievement test scores, high school
18 records, and the hardest data of all, faculty perceptions.

19 Staff agreed, but pointed out that, in any case,
20 HEP was going to carry out a parallel survey about student
21 quality in the sciences for NSF. The Committee is con-
22 vinced that OPPA provides an essential service to the hu-
23 manities by ensuring that the higher education community
24 is kept as aware of states of affairs in the humanities
25 through survey results as they are about states of affairs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 in the sciences.

2 Jack Nussener (phonetic) suggested and the Com-
3 mittee concurred that future studies of opinion be designed,
4 if possible, to require somewhat more detailed responses
5 from those who are completing the surveys about their
6 sources of information.

7 Their second study, and that's a study of the
8 characteristics of humanities faculty, this study is sim-
9 ilar to the one that was done in 1979. It covers four
10 disciplines, English, history, modern languages, and phil-
11 osophy. These are the largest -- the population with the
12 -- the disciplines with the largest populations.

13 George Kennedy pointed out that the modern lang-
14 uage survey is not as useful as it might be because it
15 lumps together faculty in all of the modern languages, and
16 trends in the different modern languages may be diverse.
17 Staff agreed with that, but there is apparently a problem
18 in doing a survey. There are OMB restrictions on how many
19 questions you could ask. The staff thought that it would
20 be possible to do some specialized studies, but the Com-
21 mittee, on the whole, didn't see a need at this moment for
22 additional specialized studies.

23 There's a project that I think the staff is ~~now~~
24 nursing along, and that is how can we get the professional
25 associations to conduct some of these studies on their

1 own with their memberships.

2 Then the Committee heard about the Treasury fund
3 study. You will recall that at the last reauthorization
4 there was a mandate to do a study about the use of Trea-
5 sury funds specifically, but generically about the entire
6 gifts and matching process. Now this is an in-house staff
7 study, and it's the most complicated one the staff has
8 done. The study is designed to determine the usefulness
9 of the gifts and matching mechanism, and to try to balance
10 get an assessment of the balance of the burden of raising
11 funds as part of a project, as against the leverage that
12 the gifts and matching mechanism has for getting addition-
13 al external funding.

14 One thing we learned is that approximately 80
15 percent of the project directors surveyed had had no pre-
16 vious experience in fundraising. The study cover four
17 fiscal years, 1977 through 1980. It consists of three
18 parts. First, the staff has to build or retrieve a data
19 base. And that's because, although the Endowment has very
20 very voluminous reports, they are not in the form that
21 makes the requisite data easily retrievable.

22 Second, the staff sent out a questionnaire to
23 450 project directors. There was an 80 percent return.
24 And the return has resulted in an enormous amount of in-
25 formation about the attitudes and experience of project

1 directors. The remarks -- the directors' remarks were
2 notably consistent and notably helpful. Staff predicts
3 that there'll be no startling conclusions from this part
4 of the study. But the material is rich in suggestions
5 about administrative staffs which may be helpful to pro-
6 ject directors.

7 The third part of the study is going to be re-
8 ports based on site visits to twenty institutions of dif-
9 ferent types. Staff now is conducting meetings on site
10 with project directors, development officers, and senior
11 administrators.

12 The data, so far, have proven so rich that they
13 will be used to develop techniques to assist both NEH
14 Divisions and recipient institutions to use matching grants
15 most effectively.

16 Jack Nussener (phonetic) recommended that there
17 be a set of projects from this study in addition to the
18 mandated Congressional report. Our staff said that they
19 envisioned two additional kinds of projects. First, a
20 set of specialized reports for different types of organ-
21 izations which receive matching funds. And, second, in-
22 formation which can improve NEH programs which make gifts
23 and matching offers.

24 In addition, the Committee suggested and staff
25 I think will provide for Council members some of the --

1 some samples of the responses that were sent in by project
2 directors. These are narratives which describe what it
3 was like to conduct the project, to raise money, and to
4 continue to supervise the academic or educational parts
5 of the project. And we think that it will be very useful
6 for Council members to read these narratives, which are
7 quite brief, and also to read some of the site visit re-
8 ports to get a better detailed understanding of what it's
9 like to have an NEH grant.

10 : Thank you.

11 Discussion. Comment.

12 (No response.)

13 : Thank you very much. Ter-
14 rific. Thank you.

15 Fellowship program, Mr. Dill (phonetic).

16 MR. DILL (phonetic): There are three items.
17 The Committee acquiesced in the decision of the staff to
18 alter the summer stipend nomination ceiling. Previously,
19 and institution could nominate three people, one of whom
20 was a senior faculty member, and two younger faculty mem-
21 bers.

22 For reasons that seem clear, that is the aging
23 of faculties, the -- clear to us at any rate, there has
24 been a lag in the number of applications from younger fa-
25 culty members. As result of this -- well, under the new

1 guidelines the three nominations will be made up of one
2 senior and one junior faculty member, and the third, who
3 may be either. By junior faculty member we are not re-
4 ferring to age but to rank. So we acquiesced in that change.

5 The Committee applauded the staff for providing
6 us with summaries of panel and staff comments on proposals
7 we were considering for approval. I mention that because
8 this has been a question raised from time to time by peo-
9 ple who are no longer on that Committee.

10 Several further suggestions were made. And in
11 the absence of a consensus the staff promised to make what
12 it could of our conversations.

13 As a result of questions raised by two of our
14 members who had attended panel sessions, we discussed the
15 functions and usefulness of the interdisciplinary panel,
16 which further narrows the selections made by the specialist
17 panels in a program for fellowships for independent study
18 and research. By and large, we shared the concerns of our
19 colleagues. I would, if you want to know about those con-
20 cerns, I would be willing and my colleagues would be eager
21 to respond to any questions.

22 And we decided finally to ask -- to set up an
23 ad hoc committee to study the entire process, its history,
24 purposes, achievements, and failures, and to make a recom-
25 mendation to the Committee at the February meeting.

1 Members of the Committee will be Mr. Sandos (pho-
2 netic), Mr. Sandlos (phonetic), assistant to Joel Reed (pho-
3 netic), and two or three staff members selected by Mr.
4 Blessing (phonetic). I assume that the staff will nego-
5 tiate with the central office on the legitimacy of that
6 committee.

7 Further action resulting from this discussion
8 will be presented to you this afternoon in the closed
9 session.

10 : Thank you. Mr. Nussener (pho-
11 netic). Mr. Nussener (phonetic).

12 MR. NUSSENER (phonetic): I think that the ques-
13 tion you raised on the use of interdisciplinary panels ef-
14 fects more than your Division. It would be equally per-
15 tinent to Research, for sure; and I think it would be some-
16 what short-sighted to have such a committee consider such
17 an issue for itself alone. So, if there is to be such a
18 project, I would suggest that it be done among all --
19 (whereupon, the recording tape came to an end.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Continued on the next page.)

1 -- that follow the same procedure, and certainly ours.
2 And, I think that we should be represented on it, if I
3 may make such a suggestion.

4 : If I could clarify something, I
5 -- the issue of looking at the nature of panels, is an
6 important one. And, the fact of whether they are disci-
7 plined based or interdisciplinary. But, there is a spe-
8 cific issue here, because, only in this program, in the
9 endowment, is there a second level of panel review. And,
10 it's that which is at issue here.

11 That is, the fellowships for independent study
12 and research are reviewed first by a special -- special-
13 ists panels; English, History, and so on. Then, those
14 recommendations in turn, are reviewed by still another
15 panel, which crosses disciplines. And, that's unique in
16 the Agency, and I think that specific process is what's
17 being investigated here.

18 : A point of mine -- a correction
19 -- translation category does operate in that mode as well.

20 : Take it back, take it back.

21 : Well taken.

22 : Yes, Miss Lewis (phonetic).

23 : Well, I'm slightly disappointed
24 that I've been headed off at the pass, because, I came
25 prepared to have a concern about the relationship between

2

1 Senior and Junior Faculty in regard to summer stipend.
2 But, I wonder Rolland, (phonetic) was there a discussion
3 of how -- of the definition of Junior Faculty. Because,
4 Institutions, as you know, differ in when people are
5 eligible for promotion and there are Institutions in
6 which Senior Faculty make a lot less than Junior Faculty,
7 at what we call more advantaged Institutions.

8 : There were no discussions of that
9 sort. We thought -- I suspect that the greater flexi-
10 bility might meet any problem arising from those differ-
11 ences.

12 : Yeah. Would it be possible to
13 keep an -- a continuing eye on this? I take it that
14 this has come to people's attention because there were
15 Institutions that were not nominating Junior Faculty be-
16 cause they received no request from -- there are very
17 few Junior Faculty for these. Could that be kept an
18 eye on, such that, if it turns out that there continue
19 to be too few Junior Faculty, there might be some ability
20 to address the definition of Junior Faculty?

21 : In light of Mr. Newsters (phonetic)
22 suggestion, may I ask Mr. Kennedy to ask one or two mem-
23 bers of the Research Committee to serve with the members
24 of the Fellowships Committee to look into this question?

25 : And, Staff.

3 1 : And Staff, yes. Okay, thank you.
2 We'd like your advice, we'll handle the letters. Thank
3 you very much Mr. Dill (phonetic) and Miss Norton (phon-
4 etic).

5 : Mr. Chairman, I intend to compete
6 for the award for Browney (phonetic).

7 : Okay.

8 : The -- We did not have a long policy
9 discussion yesterday in the Education Division Committee
10 having exhausted ourselves with the State Policy discus-
11 sion.

12 We talked chiefly about the transition plans
13 to the new system of which you are informed -- the new
14 arrangements of the Education Division.

15 We will begin to see some effects of the new
16 system by the February meeting, because even though our
17 first deadline under the new guidelines will be February
18 1st, some applicants who applied against an October dead-
19 line, were informed of the new guidelines and we are told
20 have probably shaped their proposals in light of the new
21 guidelines. Even though they are technically applying
22 under the old guidelines.

23 The Education Division Staff has been working
24 exceedingly hard in this transitional period. The Commit-
25 tee would like to commend them for their work. Not only

4 1 for for the preparation of this Committee Meeting, but
2 also, in the holding of Regional Workshops around the
3 Country to inform the constituencies out there what the
4 changes are.

5 We also, our Committee is having a little show
6 and tell today. The new guidelines I'm told are avail-
7 able -- arey they? This afternoon, we'll have the new
8 education guidelines. They will have green covers to
9 coordinate with our green motion -- we are color coordi-
10 nated in our Division.

11 And, also, one last item. At the last Counsel
12 Meeting there was a considerable discussion of the issue
13 of the philosophy for children program, which NEH has
14 supported to some extend in the past. If any Council
15 members are interested in pursuing an interest in the
16 philosophy for children program, Fran Roberts, who runs
17 the Elementary and Secondary part of our Division, has
18 a series of brochures from that program in his office,
19 Room 501. And, Council members could pick that up at
20 some point.

21 : Thank you very much, Miss Silverman.

22 : Oh, may I make a request?

23 : Yes.

24 : Could there also be distributed
25 the actual books that are used in the schools?

5 1 : There are some examples.

2 : Good. I would --

3 : They are there.

4 : I would then urge Council members

5 to look at the actual text books that are used. I think

6 they give probably a more accurate picture than all of

7 the P.R.

8 : And, Mr. Eckman (phonetic) does

9 have a brief announcement.

10 : Not to be undone by Indian poems

11 without and or encyclopedias that only get as far as the

12 letter "l", this morning, the Division received the first

13 volume of a project funded in 1978 to the ACLS to pro-

14 duce a Dictionary of the middle ages.

15 The First Volume is now complete. It's a

16 beautiful document. It's worth pointing out, I think,

17 that Volume One does go from Accan to Augustinism.

18 (period of laughter.)

19 : Not even through the first letter.

20 : Thank you. Up the ante.

21 (period of laughter.)

22 : We'll keep trying.

23 : Yes.

24 (period of laughter.)

25 : I think we want to encourage this.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

6 1 Thank you. Now we come to items -- come to items I
2 through M. Mr. Stastillian (phonetic), we are on sche-
3 dule. If you will take us through these matters AT.

4 : Alright. The preparation for
5 the material for this Council comes too close to the
6 end of the fiscal year to permit us to include in the
7 Council Agenda Book, all the material that we would like.
8 So, you received, under this Tab E, the raw data on
9 application, which had been reviewed by the Council on
10 those recommended by the Council.

11 What I would suggest, is that rather than look-
12 ing at that, now that you've begun to, you might want to
13 pick instead, out of your brown folder. There's a pack
14 of memo's from me, with the clip. The first one of
15 which says, the final FY81 application report, which has
16 some summary data. And, if you turn to page 2, I think
17 that the comparison between 81 and 82 for the endowment
18 as a whole, is best represented.

19 And, there was a remarkable similarity in our
20 experiences between the two years. In that about one-
21 fourth of the applications received in the competitive
22 programs -- this memo on page one, by the way, describes
23 what this competitive programs are opposed to all the
24 other -- which programs are not competitive.

25 That about one out of four applications was

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

7 1 recommended for support by the Council. Because we had
2 a smaller -- smaller budget, the fact that we had also
3 a drop in the applications, which is shown on page three,
4 we were able to maintain approximately the same funding
5 ratio.

6 I think that, if you look on page three, and
7 at the chronological development of applications, you
8 will note there that the past two years have seen de-
9 clines. And the -- for 1982, the level was actually lower
10 then at any period since the mid 70's.

11 I think that this should be of some slight
12 concern, if applications to the endowment reflect in any
13 way, -- and we do not know in which way, the total amount
14 of activity which is going on in the humanities, par-
15 ticularly in terms of planning of new humanities projects.

16 I think that we would hope to see that level
17 increasing. Applications did fall the past two years,
18 partly, we know, because of reports we received from the
19 field of their views about the somewhat pessimistic views
20 of endowments existence, as well as budget prospects.

21 The sharp decline in applications we noted last
22 year in discussions, was as much as twenty-five percent
23 through most of 1982. That, then did level out, so that
24 we ended it up the whole year with only about thirteen
25 or fourteen percent decline.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

8

1

The experience for the past four or five months is mixed. And, I, at this particular point, we really don't have any good indication as to whether the applications will rise to their earlier levels, or whether we may be on a plateau for this full year.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Unless people have some questions or observations about that report, we can turn to the next one. The next item on the agenda, Mr. Chairman, is the experience with our Gifts and Matching Funds. Here on the next memo in the -- that pack that I just referred to, is a summary of the Gifts to the Agency and the release of Matching Funds.

13

14

15

16

17

18

First, about fourteen million dollars was received, which is about the same amount as last year. The -- these funds were received though, into a reduced number of matching offers. We began to tighten up on matching offers about two years ago, in view of the projected budget reductions of the Agency as a whole.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, Divisions have been increasingly urged to be very selective in the offers they made, so that the numbers of offers has fallen during the past two years. The fact that the amount of gifts received is very similar to last years though, indicates I think, that the projects for which funds have been actually offered, are either of a higher quality or more solid nature, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

9 1 therefore, able to attract funds, or that the offers
2 are being made on behalf of projects that appear to have
3 a very good liklihood of drawing matching funds.

4 About six percent of our definite funds were
5 used to match, so we drew not only on the full Treasury
6 allocation, but also from the definite funds.

7 The very last page of that pack, of this par-
8 ticular memo though, Table Two, I think, has an important
9 statistic on it. It's the reverse of the last page. If
10 you look at column four, that's the number of offers
11 which were closed last year. Many of them, after having
12 had a number of extensions. Thirty-one of those were
13 closed ~~without having~~ received any gifts at all. And,
14 that's about twenty percent of the total offers we closed,
15 as opposed ~~to the previous year when~~ fifteen percent of
16 the offers closed had not raised any gifts.

17 Anita mentioned the Treasury Fund Study that
18 we are doing on the wealth of information that's being
19 developed. From that, which we're ~~going to be~~ mining for
20 a full year or two. There are many implications in the
21 information and suggestions from the people who have been
22 surveyed, as to how the endowment might proceed in its
23 Gifts and Matching Grants. And, particularly, it raises
24 questions, the extent to which the Agency should take a
25 more active role in aiding grantees and raising gift

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

10 1 funds. Up until now, the endowment has by and large,
2 taken a fairly passive stance in this matter.

3 : Just one observation on the offers
4 closed with no matching funds released. They are nearly
5 all in the Research Division. And this is a matter of
6 considerable concern, because we thought that these were
7 projects that should go forward.

8 And, if the provision of the requirements of
9 matching funds means that they do not go forward with
10 our help, then we have not met our goal. I mean, this is
11 not a triumphant figure for the Research Division. It
12 means our judgment of what people can do is flawed.

13 : Harold, one of the --

14 : I think this is a matter of great
15 concern.

16 : Well, a number of those places
17 where no funds have been raised, Jack, the applicants
18 have come back through the process. And, we have made
19 some conversions you'll remember, in our motions from
20 matching to outright.

21 And, I think we do see them in the form of re-
22 submissions, too. So, I don't think things -- things go
23 away. Particularly, it's true where there's an on-going
24 project. We were talking earlier this morning about
25 continuous responsibility. We try to push those as far

11 1 as possible from the second round onwards in the matching
2 direction. But, if they do not succeed, then there's
3 the case in which, as the Chairman said, we do want to
4 keep those things alive, so -- so, I think we're in the
5 business of preservation too.

6 There are, of course, some of those instances
7 where we don't hear any further from the people involved.
8 So, we really don't -- we're in total ignorance as to
9 what happened all together. But, I don't think that in
10 all of those cases, that's so.

11 It's a high risk business. It's very diffi-
12 cult to predict where there is going to be matching
13 money. We've been continually pleasantly surprised at
14 the number of private donors there are in this Country.
15 for what we regard, perhaps from a snobbish point of
16 view, as rather exotic projects -- that are not likely
17 to raise any money for the endowments.

18 : Okay. Thank you.

19 : Mr. Chairman.

20 : Oh, Mr. Burns, I'm sorry.

21 : If I might refer to the previous,
22 with respect to the ~~decline in the number~~ of grants, I
23 found that an interesting phenomenon, but I don't know
24 why it has occurred. It's a concern to us I suppose,
25 only if there's been a commensurate decline in the quality

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

12 1 of applications. And, my question, therefore, is has
2 there been any inquiry among members of Staff as to that
3 -- whether that has occurred?

4 : The Division Directors, I think,
5 probably could respond for their own Divisions. Generally,
6 the fact that the Council has recommended support for
7 approximately the same percentage of application, and
8 those recommendations draw on the expert reviewer, panel,
9 and Staff recommendations; that would suggest that the
10 overall quality of the reduced application batch, is the
11 same.

12 : Not necessarily, it seems. Be-
13 cause, the amount of money that would be granted would be
14 determined by the amount of money available.

15 : To a great -- to a great extent.

16 : Except that we -- just as a re-
17 minder on this, there are two other factors that are diffi-
18 cult to weigh. One is, we have no way of knowing, of
19 course, what didn't come in because of whatever chilling
20 factor was at work.

21 And, secondly, I think pretty consistently,
22 panels are asked not to consider the money question, but
23 only the quality question. So, we try fairly hard, I
24 think, in the panel process not to have the budget avail-
25 able be a factor of consideration for the panel itself.

13 1 It's a consideration for us and for the Council, but we
2 hope that the panel is not looking at what's available.
3 So, there not trying to -- to spend up to some limit, but
4 instead, to argue that these are the ones that ought to
5 be recommended.

6 Now, that doesn't -- the issues still --

7 : I -- I think though, that the
8 panels are generally aware of what the endowments budget
9 situation is. And, I think it has tended to make them --
10 last year when they knew that we had a reduced budget from
11 the previous year, I think this tended to make them much
12 more selective.--

13 : Sure.

14 : -- and a little bit harder in
15 their own judgments.

16 : Go ahead Harmon (phonetic).

17 : We're on to item K of FY82 Program
18 of Administrative Funds. There was a general summary
19 memo in the Council Agenda Book, and we have fold that
20 up with the details on each program in a memo in your
21 brown folder. As regards the overall status as we ended
22 the year, we were able to obligate all of the funds that
23 we had available with the exception in the Administrative
24 Funds, as noted in the memo in the Agenda Book.

25 We were able to save about \$800,000, which were

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

14 1 returned to the Treasury. Those funds do not carry over.
2 Those savings came about as a result of a number of fac-
3 tors. I don't know if the Chairman wanted to say any-
4 thing about that.

5 : It's worth saying just in passing
6 however, that when one things about the endowment and
7 spending, and end of the year, and all the rest of that,
8 I think that Council should be aware that that's a sub-
9 stantial sum of money that we were able to return to the
10 Treasury of the United States and did not -- were able
11 through various ways to make available to other parts of
12 the Government. And, we, I think, are generally pleased
13 with being able to report that to you.

14 : Well, with all our -- with all our
15 critics, it's been somewhat remarkable to me, that noone
16 has commented yet, on our returning \$840,000 to the
17 Treasury in Administrative Funds.

18 We are proud of that, and I am grateful to the
19 Administrative Staff for their work and efforts -- the
20 work of everyone in keeping this -- making this possible.

21 : What percentage of the appropriated
22 funds for the Administration does that represent?

23 : About eight percent.

24 : Is that right? A little less,
25 maybe -- seven percent?

15 1 : It's pretty good.

2 : The detail of the programs, which
3 was in the memo in the brown folder, reflects the kinds
4 of shifts that we talked about in August, so they should
5 not come, I think, as much of a surprise. A total of
6 one-hundred fifteen million dollars -- over one-hundred
7 fifteen million dollars was awarded, supporting about
8 eighteen hundred new projects and about three-hundred
9 fifty continuing projects.

10 Most of those were gifts and matching projects
11 funded -- or recommended for approval early in the year.
12 Gifts came in last year, so for a total of about 2,149
13 projects going on in the Country funded by our money this
14 past year.

15 : Could I say something about the
16 number of projects again, just to keep Council aware of
17 something.

18 When we count projects, which have been supported
19 by the endowment, we are not including, in those counts,
20 State Program Re-Grants, and we are not counting the
21 number of applicants, nor participants in such things as
22 summer seminars, Institutes, and so on.

23 So, that when one thinks about what endowment
24 support made available, you might find one grant to the
25 ACLS. But, in fact, that grant supported the Pyrex or

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

16 1 supported SSRC and so on. And, the number of projects
2 may very easily double or triple -- ~~the numbers we are~~
3 preparing here. So, that -- I just want to remind, par-
4 ticularly for new people, that the figures that you see
5 are not the entire story of what's taking place in the
6 United States with endowment support -- that's for others
7 too.

8 : One of -- of further follow-up
9 item on 1982 funding I should have mentioned, -- the
10 memorandum in the Council Agenda Book, and then the
11 follow-up letter of the Chairman to the Council last
12 week, described the situation with the 5.2 million dol-
13 lars, which we had sought re-programming for in order to
14 make special initiative grants to independent research
15 libraries.

16 As the Chairman's memo had mentioned, we had
17 to seek OMB approval for the use of that money and we
18 were very pleased that OMB has released the money to us,
19 and we are now proceeding with negotiations in order to
20 make those grants.

21 If there's any -- to be any discussion of those
22 particular grants, it should be held in the -- ~~the~~ closed
23 session.

24 On to item L, which is the 1983 appropriation
25 request still pending in the Congress. There hasn't been

17 1 -- there hasn't been any change from the status which
2 was described in the memo under Tap H of the Council
3 Agenda Book. We are still operating under a Continuing
4 Resolution. The Congress is still in recess. It will
5 be returning at the end of November.

6 The major item for the Congress to attend to
7 is the Appropriation process, however, ~~our reports from~~
8 ~~the hill are~~ that no one is very confident that all of
9 the Appropriation actions will be completed before the
10 Congress goes out of session.

11 It's quite possible that we could continue to
12 be on a Continuing Resolution into January or February.
13 Because of the uncertainty of our appropriations, many
14 of you had recommendations coming from your programs to
15 prioritize the applications, so that we could move ahead
16 with the funding of certain -- certain number of appli-
17 cations recommended for approval.

18 As soon as the Council is over, and others will
19 be held in abeyance until we know more about our actual
20 funding for this fiscal year.

21 Any questions about our status? No. We can
22 move to the next item. The next item is divided into
23 two parts. One part for this public session, and the
24 other part for closed session.

25 Any discussion of specific funding figures,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

18 1 specific allocations for the total amounts of money be-
2 ing requested, should be postponed until the closed ses-
3 sion.

4 In this session, we have already had a -- some
5 preliminary discussion, I guess, about the budget request
6 beginning with Jack's comments. And, we wanted to use
7 this open session simply to invite any discussion or com-
8 ments people might make about two things.

9 One, is the general priorities, directions of
10 the Agency, the general distribution of funding, which is
11 reflected in the budget. The numbers in that budget
12 should be quite familiar to you by and large, because,
13 they received extensive discussion attention in August
14 in Committee meetings and Council meetings.

15 However, the -- to see them in black and white,
16 and what they say about where the endowment is, and where
17 it's going, you may wish to discuss it further.

18 The second general item is we are always inter-
19 ested in, and Jack touched on this early this morning,
20 about the argumentation and the presentation of the pro-
21 grams, the program descriptions, the examples which are
22 used, the general impact and impression that you think
23 the budget submission would make on the average citizen.

24 We wish to improve our budget documents as much
25 as possible. I think that this one has been a particularly

19 1 good one, due largely to Bruce Karns (phonetic) although,
2 all members of the Program Division Staff and Chairman's
3 Office, have been very much involved in the process.

4 : I just want to underline that I
5 agree very much that this has been overall, a very clear
6 and very accessible statement. It's brief -- you follow
7 a clear outline, so that at each point, you know what
8 kind of information you are getting.

9 You answer this question of why are we doing
10 something -- does anyone else in Government do it, over
11 and over again. And, I really learned a great deal, and
12 I'm sure many others did too. It's the usual good work.

13 : Yes.

14 : Never taken for granted.

15 : May I refer to the cover letter?

16 : Sure.

17 : In this session? On page two, in
18 the letter to Mr. Stockman, at the top of the page there
19 is a reference to the possibility of higher funding.

20 : I don't --

21 : I don't want any numbers -- I
22 don't want any numbers.

23 : Okay, okay.

24 : I was just wondering whether or
25 not, that will refer specifically to level 4 and 5, or --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

20

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

: No, to three.

: No, to Level Three

: Oh, to Level Three. That would
be what you would be discussing?

: No, it is to -- no, because Level
Three is in the budget --

: Yes, that's what I --

: It's in the budget -- it's

: So that you --

: It's funding on top of -- in
addition to the highest level, which was described there
at that reference.

: And this letter -- this memo
being specifically to Mr. Stockman, would this also be
the case if you were -- would -- are you now free to be
able to do this if you are asked by the Committee -- the
Congressional Committee?

: Well, we wouldn't be asked by the
Congressional Committee until we had hearings, which
would be in March, April, May. And -- before that time,
the President will make a decision about what he pro-
poses to recommend. That decision will go to the hill
in January. We will then follow it up with a detailed
-- on what that overall level means, in turns of our
individual programs. When we meet with the Committee's,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

21 1 the Committee's may well ask us, as they did this past
2 year, and then the Chairman would respond accordingly,
3 depending on --

4 : My understanding, however, was
5 that last year there was some perceived constraint on
6 discussing that with the Committee. Is that correct?

7 : That -- that's true, but subse-
8 quently, OMB did enable the Agency -- this Agency, as
9 well as other Agencies to discuss that and to provide
10 alternative budgets at higher levels.

11 : Okay. We should carry on, and
12 the meeting will be closed to the public. At this point,
13 stretch for a minute, but please, no one leave whose not
14 supposed to. But, everyone whose supposed to, please
15 leave.

16 (pause for a brief break.)

17 : We shall continue. Ida Mann.

18 : That's all right, go ahead.

19 : Ida Mann.

20 : I thought I would say just a few
21 words about the OMB Hearing that we had about two weeks
22 ago. All Agencies, after they've submitted their request
23 to OMB, meet in a Hearing with their Budget Examiner and
24 usually one or two higher levels at OMB.

25 Participating in our meeting, was our Budget

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

22 1 Examiner, Terry Holperd (phonetic). She was here last
2 2 August. You may recall that she was introduced. She
3 3 will be leaving this area and we will have a new Budget
4 4 Examiner in another month or two.

5 Her boss, Barry White (phonetic), whose the
6 6 Head of the Education Division Examination -- Budget
7 7 Examination at OMB also was there, and one or two other
8 8 Representatives from other parts of OMB.

9 Mr. White, I think it's important to note,
10 10 began by emphasizing the stringent budget situation of
11 11 the Federal Government. But, he went beyond the usual
12 12 stringency, and even alluded to the possibility that the
13 13 Agency might -- funding might have to be reduced, and,
14 14 therefore, it was up to the Agency to make a good case
15 15 as to why even what was called the planning level, which
16 16 is the in effect, the President's request for 1983 --
17 17 ninety-six million dollars.

18 That a compelling case would have to be made
19 19 even to get the planning level for 1984. The -- we then
20 20 turned to a discussion of fairly broad ranging policy
21 21 questions. These were more typically OMB-type questions
22 22 asked of Agency Management usually, year after year. At
23 23 least every four years.

24 Questions concerning the overall justification
25 25 for Federal support. About how any Agency goes about

23 1 determining need -- what need means. The extent to
2 2 which we engage in any kind of systematic review of need
3 3 and of the effects of our programs on meeting that need.
4 4 Much discussion, particularly about the evaluation and
5 5 how we go about trying to judge the worthwhileness and
6 6 utility of our efforts.

7 And then the second-time challenge grants also
8 8 received considerable mention. Asking why, if the Chal-
9 9 lenge Grant Program is such a success, second-time grants
10 10 should be necessary.

11 They then followed these general questions for
12 12 discussion. We spent about two hours at OMB with forty-
13 13 six written questions. This was more -- a higher number
14 14 of questions for the record than we had ever been asked
15 15 to respond to before. As a matter of fact, I thought it
16 16 was probably more than the past five years combined.

17 I think it also further suggests the very tight
18 18 kind of review which OMB is giving to all Federal Agencies
19 19 and increasingly to the two endowments.

20 The questions ranged from fairly specific
21 21 issues in our Administrative Budget and Program Budget,
22 22 as well as overall kinds of questions.

23 I think I ~~am~~ with that, I'll just leave that.
24 24 I just wanted to give you some -- somewhat of the flavor
25 25 of -- of the review and how it seems to reflect the very,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

24 1 very hard kind of review that all Federal Agency Programs
2 are receiving, and that we are receiving.

3 : Would we benefit from studying
4 the questions and the answers?

5 : We could -- we can certainly make
6 them available to this -- they're quite extensive --

7 : What were they like?

8 : Very much like hard questions that
9 Council members have. How do you --

10 : Then, we would benefit.

11 : They are. I mean, how do you
12 evaluate what you're doing? Or, how do you decide to
13 put money in one place as opposed to another? How do
14 you determine the success of a Program?

15 They are very hard pressing and appropriate
16 questions.

17 : Would it be proper to send copies
18 of that to those who might want to review them?

19 : Sure. Yes.

20 : A delayed question. I didn't
21 ask before. In your report Harmon, you -- well, one
22 thing that's obviously troubling, is the number -- the
23 great decline in the number of applications through the
24 endowment.

25 And, can you just say that the answer -- are

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

25 1 there other reasons besides the fact that there were
2 concerns about the future of funding and the future of
3 the endowment?

4 And, the second question, which is part of
5 that is, part of the new philosophy coming from Charleton
6 Heston and others, is that there is going to be, or
7 should be an increase in the participation of the private
8 sector, in terms of funding. Have we seen any indica-
9 tion of that as of yet?

10 : In response to the first question,
11 applications fluxuate up and down every year. And, a
12 large part of that fluxuation we can usually explain
13 either through the Institution of new programs, or in
14 additional deadlines which have been instituted in a par-
15 ticular program.

16 Part of the reason for the decline of the past
17 two years is that we have not held a challenge competi-
18 tion in these two particular fiscal years. The last com-
19 petition was actually three years ago, but that was for
20 money which became available two years ago.

21 There were some deadlines which fell in one
22 fiscal year as opposed to another fiscal year. So, part
23 of the reasons are explainable. Then, those reasons,
24 lets say, which are explainable in part of what the
25 endowment has done -- actions the Agency has taken. Then

26 1 there's a large part in particularly, this year and last
2 year. There was a very large part, which was not ex-
3 plainable by any of those specific actions. And, that
4 is the part that we prescribe to -- to this particular
5 perception by the field.

6 The -- on the other question about private
7 support, there has always been, under every Administra-
8 tion and particularly from the Congress, -- Republican,
9 Democratic; so it's equally very strong pressures for
10 the use of Federal money in order to leverage private
11 money.

12 I think this Administration has -- is even
13 emphasizing that even more. And so, there were questions
14 about what the endowment is doing in order to try to in-
15 crease private support. Either through our very specific
16 Gifts and Matching challenge approach, or to other kinds
17 of, you might say, advocacy measures which might be taken
18 by the endowment in order to both reduce the Federal role,
19 as well as specifically to increase private support.

20 For our own part, in addition to the challenge
21 in matching, we have targeted private support -- non-
22 Federal support for the Humanities as a special priority
23 for study in OPPA. And, the Matching Fund Study came at
24 a very opportune time because, it's providing a wealth
25 of information for us. But, through Planning and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

27 1 Assessment Studies, as well as through the HEP (phonetic)
2 device, we are trying to get a much better handle on what
3 funds are available out there that don't come from NEH.
4 Who provides them, what they are used for, and how they
5 then complement ours.

6 : The -- I thought your question
7 was, is there an increase at large apart from the endow-
8 ments effort. I've read a number of studies. You can't
9 make them all consistent in terms of figures but, the
10 one consistency that emerges is that there has been an
11 increase in private sector giving for all Institutions.
12 Hospitals, Universities, Churches, and the Arts and
13 Humanities percentage, again, varies. In 1981 it went
14 up about thirteen percent. I'm putting together two or
15 three studies that your office has passed on to me, so
16 there has been a fairly dramatic increase.

17 : In answer to the first question,
18 then, another question is, is it necessarily to give all
19 that \$800,000 back to the Government. Could that money
20 be used instead, to possibly promote an effort -- an out-
21 reach effort by Officials of the Endowment to go out
22 into the field and save the endowment for the humanities
23 alive and kicking and well.

24 You should apply and hear the procedures by
25 which you can apply.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

28

1

: Go ahead.

2

: There are two parts to that. One

3

is, the administered funds can only be used in a restricted

4

way. So, for example, we could not have made grants with

5

that -- with those funds.

6

But, as far as using it to do the kind of pro-
motion of the endowment that you are describing, in fact,
that's what we have been doing with it. But, the savings
accumulated over the course of a year.

10

We have increased the amount of travel and so
on that we're doing about the endowment. Speaking about
the endowment has helped, the Chairman has done a lot
recently, and you'll begin to see we'll -- we think we
will see more of that, and the use of those funds this
year than were reflected in the last year.

16

Education is traveling, ~~as~~ was mentioned ear-
lier, extensively, to describe their new guidelines. The
same thing will happen in general programs subsequent to
the February meeting, and so on.

20

I think the results over the next eighteen
months will be dramatic, as far as that's concerned. In
fact, one wonders a little bit about what the cause and
effect is here and how great it will be. Will we suddenly
have the other difficulty of a whole new flood. We just
don't know yet. But, it's a good point and we have --

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

29

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

: Mr. Chairman?

: Yes.

: We localized among the Divisions where the drop in the applications are --

: Uh huh.

: -- and where the increase in support is. Is is in the document?

: I was going to say, the meme in the -- excuse me, it's not a memo, it's just the raw data. In the Council Agenda Book shows you the application received and its recommended support in each program.

And you'll -- what you'll note there is that

: Where is that?

: It's under Tab E?

: E.

: E. That's right. What -- what's interesting to note there, and because this had really escaped me during the year, is that every Division -- every Division had a drop.

Now, there will be up and downs within a particular Division, but every Division had a drop. With the exception -- if you will move to page, the last page of that memo, once we combined the old public programs with the special programs ironically, there was an overall increase. Now, the old public programs had a drop.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

30 1 However, the old special programs had a increase there,
2 due to special initiatives. One on the bicentennial and
3 one for the childrens media.

4 Otherwise, there was a general across the
5 board decline. The State program figures there are a
6 little misleading because of the -- they pertain to some
7 request for gifts and matching funds.

8 There was an increase in the Planning and
9 Assessment Studies, but generally, for the Divisions
10 it was an across the board kind of decline.

11 : It's a -- we have been trying to
12 get -- get out the word in a dignified manner. One of
13 the things that I objected to when I came here, were
14 some notices that we were sending out that started with
15 things saying things, such as, "this is a very good year
16 to get money from NEH." I just don't think we should be
17 operating like that.

18 But, we have been getting a great deal of
19 publicity about our programs, and people can't both read
20 that publicity and then think that we are out of business.
21 The --

22 : Mr. Chairman, where -- could you
23 cite where that kind of thing was written?

24 : Sure. In one of the Youth Pro-
25 grams that we have.

31 1 : I'd like to see that.

2 : Sure. You can see it. I think
3 that's pretty close to it, but --

4 Second, some funny things happened when rumors
5 start about the demise and reduction of their -- we had
6 dramatic decreases in some of the programs. At the same
7 time, that organizations and individuals associated with
8 what one might identify as the constituency of that pro-
9 gram, putting a great deal of pressure on Congress not
10 to eliminate the endowment or to reduce. They were put-
11 ting so much effort into that, they were neglecting to put
12 in applications for funding.

13 And that, -- I've said that I've been public
14 about that in talking to the groups. That they can cer-
15 tainly put the pressure on Congress they want, but should
16 not at the same time, neglect putting in applications.
17 That's just silly. Anyway, we'll see.

18 : I -- I would say, that I think
19 there is great merit in doing what one reasonably can,
20 in the direction of public relations. I think that it
21 will have benefits in terms of increased applications and
22 also, building our small but true constituency out there,
23 to continue to secure our foothold in the Federal Govern-
24 ment.

25 There's some facetiousness perhaps, in going

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

32 1 out and evangelizing in the favor of the National Endow-
2 ment, but I think, short of that, we ought to do every-
3 thing that we can and perhaps those Administrative funds
4 if they can be utilized in tasteful ways or in vigorous
5 ways to do that, that would be absolutely all to the good
6 as far as I can see.

7 : Yes. Since the matter was brought
8 up, may I say that reports that I have had in Minnesota
9 about the Education Committee's visit, have been uniform-
10 ily positive. And, I would guess that if we had an immed-
11 iate payoff, the number of applications -- (inaudible).

12 : So I've -- and, so I've heard.
13 Harmon (phonetic), do you want to continue?

14 : No, I think that's all -- this
15 information.

16 : Okay. Mr. Wilkey (phonetic),
17 Chairman's Grants.

18 : If you turn to -- to Tab J in the
19 Agenda Book, there are two memoranda. The first deals
20 with Chairman's Grants, which were awarded between July
21 and -- July 1 and September 30th.

22 Are there any comments or questions
23 about those grants?

24 : Was this the one where we had asked
25 for some -- oh, for some notion of why these were ever-

33 1 emergency conditions, or was that going to be below, as
2 I recall?

3 : I'm sorry. I don't recall.

4 : No, I'm not sure either.

5 : Wendell (phonetic), do you recall?

6 : No, I -- would you -- Jack, you
7 were interested in a further elaboration of the basis
8 for these awards?

9 : Well, the question that we had
10 raised in general -- although, this may not be the appro-
11 priate place is, a sentence saying, why was it an emer-
12 gency? Wasn't that brought in last time?

13 : Well,

14 : Well, that was for ones departing
15 from Council recommendation, but, maybe it was for both.

16 : I assumed that too. It was for
17 ones departing from Council's recommendations. But,

18 : I think as a matter of policy, we
19 ought to know why something was an emergency, and there-
20 fore, taken out of the normal review process.

21 Although, I'm not positive that this is the
22 place where you would have wanted to say something.

23 : Well, that's easily enough pro-
24 vided.

25 : One sentence or a phrase on any

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

34 1 grant I think would be of interest.

2 : The -- the -- also, the, I would
3 say too, that the emergency question is one that is after
4 all, new to us. As you see, it's in this book at the
5 same time this is. But, each of these again, just as a
6 general reminder, each of these has been reviewed in the
7 Division's and so on and went forward. And, there has
8 been at least, some considerable scrutiny of them before
9 the Chairman ever decides to go forward.

10 But, I -- we can easily add the additional
11 sentence or two to describe.

12 : Following up on Jack's comment.
13 It seems to me that there are two types of Chairman's
14 Grants. The Emergency Grants and the New Initiatives.

15 I would think that the Council would be par-
16 ticularly interested in those grants which represent new
17 initiatives of the endowment.

18 : Some -- perhaps in some instances
19 there will be a self-evident reason that there was a
20 rush. For example, foreign scholars now available, and
21 so on.

22 On the other hand, it doesn't seem that some
23 of these -- it's not as if we are presenting a cure for
24 cancer where someone will die if it's held up by three
25 months. I don't know if -- some of these strike me as

35 1 less urgent than others in that respect.

2 : Could we just take a minute to --
3 to describe briefly, maybe, Marjory Burlingorter Herald
4 (phonetic) would -- the -- now, the Exemplorary Emergency
5 Grant -- or one of them. The Baltimore -- that's with --

6 : It's on page three. It's in the
7 middle of page three, John Hopkins.

8 : This is the transfer and treatment
9 of the W. Horsley Gant Papers (phonetic), John Hopkins
10 University.

11 The circumstances are that the owner of these
12 papers died and he had owned two houses in a certain
13 neighborhood in Baltimore. And, the second house was
14 entirely devoted to his papers -- papers. They were of
15 great research value. He had correspondence with some
16 of the leading thinkers of the Twentieth Century in the
17 course of his life time.

18 The papers were rat infested. They -- the
19 School of Medicine had -- had already done a survey to
20 find out how human beings could go in to get the papers
21 out without a risk to their health. (inaudible)

22 It was essential that the papers be taken --
23 literally taken out of the house. And, that's what this
24 thousand dollars is for.

25 : That squat team of preservation --

36 1 (period of laughter).

2 : That does seem to be an exemplary
3 case and we hope the others would lead that --

4 (period of laughter).

5 : Never mind. Grants departing
6 from Council recommendation.

7 : There's a memo concerning actions
8 departing from Council recommendation. I'd just like to
9 note on page 5 of that memorandum, it lists the Illinois
10 Humanities Council as not receiving a Chairman's Award
11 for excellency. It should be the Idaho Humanities Council.

12 In any event, those three State Committee's are
13 listed both on pages three and five.

14 : Those States are just both sort of
15 out there somewhere, right?

16 : Yes, that's right. Somewhere in
17 the hinterlands.

18 (period of laughter).

19 : Don't look at him, he's from
20 Indiana. He doesn't --

21 (period of laughter).

22 : That's why I --

23 : Sure.

24 : Wendell, excuse me. Would it be
25 possible, or with how much difficulty would you be able

37 1 to give us the information about these departures. Espec-
2 ially the Committees I would think, but perhaps the entire
3 Council, at the time they are made.

4 I would say to you as specifically in this case,
5 with regard to the States programs, I felt placed in a
6 very difficult position when I found through the Federa-
7 tion Newsletter -- I mean, I had not been informed up to
8 that point, and I think that was almost two months that
9 the decision that was apparently made here, was not what
10 we thought it would be.

11 I think that it would be helpful. I have raised
12 the issue elsewhere, in general, about information that
13 in some ways -- well, that this Council member should
14 know about.

15 I would hope that there's some mechanism that
16 could be found that could give it to us in a very timely
17 fashion.

18 We're out there on that breezy limb and some-
19 times we are told things that we don't know about. Like
20 this. So, is there a mechanism?

21 : I can -- it's -- could you elaborate
22 a little bit, because I could see why you might be sur-
23 prised. But, you shouldn't be out on a limb.

24 : Well, --

25 : Unless you are doing something.

38

1

: No --

2

: Okay.

3

: Unless I'm doing something?

4

: No, I mean, why would you be on a

5

breezy limb. This is information known only to you.

6

: What, the --

7

: That is, there's no action until

8

the Chairman acts.

9

: Because, in this instance, what

10

happened was that I, at about the same time that the

11

Federation Newsletter came out, I happened to be speaking

12

to somebody from the Illinois Humanities Council, whom I

13

had not spoken to for quite awhile.

14

And, he said that we received the announcement

15

that there were five -- that there were five States. And,

16

I -- it took me quite by surprise. I was on the tele-

17

phone and anything -- I couldn't even figure out a way

18

to not show my surprise.

19

And, my surprise would have indicated that I

20

didn't know about it. That's the kind of -- that's what

21

I mean by being out on a limb. I couldn't even say, oh,

22

what were they?

23

I mean, I didn't -- I didn't know how to re-

24

spond to the question. I -- so, I said, -- I don't even

25

remember what I said. I think I said, oh. And, then I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

39 1 felt -- I felt as if even that might be -- I didn't know
2 how to respond to the question, because I didn't know
3 that that happened.

4 : Well, I suppose we can. I -- the
5 -- to do it in every case, I don't know. Maybe we can.

6 : Well, at least with items --

7 : The requirement that we report
8 at the next Council meeting --

9 : I would have to leave it to your
10 good judgment as to what you think is relevant for us to
11 know in order to -- so that we don't get caught by sur-
12 prises in such a way that whatever we say might be con-
13 strued in some way.

14 : In part that's probably, you know,
15 a matter ~~which can be related~~ between Committee Chairman
16 and Division personnel also. There's no reason why it
17 has to flow through the Chairmans office.

18 : Well, this is a specific instance.
19 But, there are other kinds of information which we read
20 about in the newspaper or through the Federation News-
21 letter or the National Humanities Alliance Newsletters,
22 or whatever. At least that's where I get my information.

23 : Mary Beth.

24 : Yeah. I think in this -- this may
25 have been a very special case Bill. Considering the fact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

40 1 that the Committee last time, did spend a great deal of
2 time discussing ten potential awards, and ended up recom-
3 mending eight. And then, all of us, I think, were very
4 surprised to learn, you know, that sometime later, that
5 in fact, only five had been given.

6 Not to say that, you know, it wasn't your pre-
7 rogative to do that, it's just that, especially in deal-
8 ing with the States, ~~perhaps it's a little different~~ than
9 dealing with -- with normal project Directors.

10 I mean, I know that I was also surprised, and
11 furthermore, when I -- when I got the information they
12 were firm, I didn't know which five they were, which five
13 had been awarded and, it put me in an awkward position,
14 as well. Although, Louise was much more on the firing
15 line in that regard than I was. She's the Chairman of
16 the State Committee.

17 : Well, I -- I have no -- I see no
18 objection, or I want to say that I have no objection to
19 -- when I make a decision that does depart from Council
20 recommendation, to having you know right away.

21 I'm just wondering if there are any difficul-
22 ties, either that Wendell perceives or Divisions per-
23 ceive in us doing that. If there's no problem, we can
24 make the report formal at the next Council meeting, but
25 informally inform you.

41 1

: Yeah, yeah.

2

: I have no objection to that.

3

: Bill, if you'll -- it seems to me

4

that a great many of these grants departing from Council

5

recommendations are that simple error -- from medical

6

error, somebody's been giving part outright and he gets

7

the full matching grant for the whole thing.

8

That kind of thing doesn't have to be reported

9

between the Committee or between Council meeting. It's

10

just where a major change has been made involving -- as

11

in one, you know, \$75,000 in a high visibility program.

12

: Bill, may I ask the question?

13

: Rule of reason.

14

: There's no question about your

15

right to disapprove of these four. Is there any policy

16

reason why we shouldn't be advised why you did that so

17

that we in turn can translate that as a matter of policy

18

when other issues arise. We'll know what your attitude

19

is.

20

: Yeah. Well, it's listed -- it's

21

listed there in general on page -- on page five. That

22

well characterizes the discussion at the bottom, and it's

23

just three that we are talking about, not four. The

24

fourth one -- the Colorado, has to do with something --

25

something else. Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

42

1

: I'm afraid that I find that reason

2

either obscure or **opaque**. The way --

3

: Which reason?

4

: The way that I read it, was to de-

5

termine the near unanimity was to be required at all levels

6

of review, and that the funded proposals should be truly

7

excellent in all aspects.

8

The only relation that I can see between those,

9

is that excellence is to be judged on the standard of

10

having attained near unanimity.

11

That is not a standard that is used in other

12

programs as far as I know. It's an additional standard

13

to the ones that we were aware of.

14

And, I really can't -- following up on Mark's

15

(phonetic) question, this does not help me understand

16

any reasons.

17

: Well, let me say two things. This

18

is the Chairman's Award for Excellence, and I was looking

19

for unanimity. And, when there wasn't unanimity, I was

20

disposed not to -- not to fund.

21

The second thing was, the Staff encouraged me

22

and I got the sense that the Panel encouraged me, that I

23

should be satisfied in my own mind, that -- this was ad-

24

vice given to me -- that these awards were excellent be-

25

cause, I would be called upon to speak about them, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

43 1 defend them, to hold them up as exemplary. And, in the
2 case of these three, I could not. ~~In no case~~, was I the
3 only person that raised objections about these.

4 I was working from and pulling on the objections
5 of others that were raised in the Panel process, and in
6 the review process throughout, and including Staff mem-
7 bers and individual Council members.

8 The third thing, I might add, is that the use
9 of this term "excellence," as I said last time, was --
10 created a problem for us. The general consensus of the
11 Panel Review of these proposals was that they were dis-
12 appointing.

13 We got only, I think one that was rated unani-
14 mously at four. That's what I was hoping that we would
15 have nine or ten. The general consensus of the Panel
16 was that they were disappointing set of applications, and
17 the ones at the very top could be called "good to very
18 good," but not excellent.

19 I had to sacrifice then, I felt, in giving the
20 five. But, I was not prepared to go -- go any further.
21 Yes.

22 : I think that it would be very use-
23 ful that if a special condition, such as unanimity is go-
24 ing to be imposed, that everybody be informed of that.

25 Because, I know I've been on Panels when I and

44 1 other people have raised worries and explored them. And,
2 those have turned out -- turned into objections. And, it
3 never was -- it was not my judgement that by raising a
4 concern and exploring it, that that would knock something
5 out because there would no longer be unanimity.

6 And, I think that if this is to be a special
7 competition using those standards, and I know that when
8 we discussed this originally, it never occurred to me
9 that that particular standard would be used.

10 : Near unanimity.

11 : Come on. Near unanimity --

12 : No, no, I --

13 : It seems to me -- It seems to me
14 that ~~unanimity~~ or near unanimity as a goal or standard,
15 is just as likely to lead to mediocrity.

16 : Alright, well, I mean. What I --
17 what I would suggest, if you really want to look into
18 this, is -- if Council members would like to -- would like
19 to look at these proposals themselves, -- the decision
20 has been made -- but, I would be happy to get your sense
21 of it.

22 It wasn't out of some sort of frozen procedural
23 accounting of whether there was unanimity or near una-
24 nimity only. It was the nature of objections that were
25 made. And, I would welcome Council members to take a

45 1 look at those.

2 : I think it would be useful for us
3 to see all the reviewing information.

4 : Yeah.

5 : Just a point of information. Is
6 the -- are the changes on pages two and three in the
7 Fellowship Seminars, is that for budgetary reasons that
8 there's no substantive change, or is that a reduction?

9 : Jim, do you want to respond to
10 that?

11 : Not so much for budgetary reasons,
12 although there were budgetary --

13 : Were you trying to spread it over
14 three years and not take all the money out this year? Is
15 that what this is, or are you actually cutting the appro-
16 val?

17 : No. That -- that -- something of
18 that sort would have been necessary, because we were over
19 budget. But, that's not, I think, the reason of these
20 first three. I think it was the result (inaudible).

21 I think it was the result of the discussions
22 that we had in the Committee, and the Committee's recom-
23 mendation and our own sense that we were not entirely
24 happy with the review process and the publicity processes
25 and some other aspects of these programs. That, on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

46 1 other hand, hadn't made our standards (inaudible).

2 And, what we needed to do was to improve, re-
3 vise -- make clearer our standards for -- in these re-
4 spects and the Board asked them to resubmit their applica-
5 tions this year in view of those --((inaudible)).

6 So, this was the result of that.

7 : What, sir?

8 : Well, I found this particularly
9 interesting, because I know that the last meeting was
10 spent the better part of the morning, debating precisely
11 this set of issues. With the result that the Committee
12 would eventually voted to recommend, as we did somewhat
13 against the -- over the misgivings of Staff. Then, in
14 effect, I have succeeded through the decision of the
15 Chairman.

16 I -- after about a three hour discussion, or
17 a two-hour discussion on precisely this set of issues
18 which was very heatedly waged, as I recall, with a great
19 concentration of attention on part of the Council Commit-
20 tee. So, I find this an interesting sequence of events.

21 : I -- we'd have to go back and
22 look again, but the intention here was not to do anything
23 other than to find the best way possible to capture, in
24 fact, the essence of that discussion.

25 I think that the -- because, I recall the unease

47 1 of the Council Committee was expressed to us on the basis
2 of the fact that we couldn't very well with-hold funds
3 from these Centers, because they failed to meet a standard
4 which we had failed to articulate. And, therefore, it
5 seemed inevitable, short of questions of law, -- his
6 point was put in those terms; short of questions of law.
7 It was not possible for us really, to say to the Centers
8 we can't provide the funds.

9 Well, in looking at that afterwards, looking
10 at the substance of the objections, we felt that we had
11 another way to do it.

12 And, the other way to do it was to in fact,
13 make a partial award, so that we did not in fact, delay
14 them because of their failure to fulfill an obligation
15 that we hadn't set for them.

16 But, not to go the total distance. So, we
17 weren't obliged to take them all the way to the length
18 of their application. So, we may have not it successfully,
19 but our intention was to in fact, meet the heart of the
20 Council objection.

21 : Would they have to re-apply, John?

22 : Yes, they have to apply at the
23 end of the current grant against the standards which we
24 now have articulated very clearly.

25 So, what we've achieved, is that we haven't

48 1 bound ourselves to the inevitability of a three year
2 Award simply because that's the kind of application we
3 got. We followed through for one year.

4 Now, we may have missed that key point. But,
5 that's the grounds on which we made the decision to go
6 forward as we did.

7 : Well, it -- it -- I'll not quarrel
8 with the decision, I'll simply say that was the recommenda-
9 tion of the Staff going in that the Committee -- the Council
10 Committee rejected and voted a three-year recommendation.

11 : Again, I -- I took it --

12 : As I recall it -- I --

13 : But, again, I want to say, to me
14 the heart of the issue was to resolve this question, which
15 had been a long standing question. And, I wouldn't want
16 you to interpret that that long discussion went for naught
17 because, that long discussion resulted in our statement
18 of this policy to these Centers in which they are very
19 pleased.

20 And, let me say that not one of them has ob-
21 jected to the requirement of re-application in light of
22 the greater good they see that we have finally resolved
23 this issue.

24 So, the big chunk was done by the Committee and
25 I'm satisfied and they are. Gwen (phonetic), is that a

49 1 fair statement -- reaction?

2 : Yes, I think that is a fair state-
3 ment. In some ways we liberalized the guidelines too, so
4 it will be advantageous to the Center to come in next
5 year, because there will be a benefit that couldn't have
6 been with the current guidelines.

7 : Okay. And, I don't want to go
8 too long. I want to -- Mr. Dill (phonetic), but before
9 you do I don't want this to sit too long. But, Louise,
10 I -- I misspoke, and I want to appologize publicly.

11 There are circumstances in which you can be
12 out on a limb without having done anything, and you des-
13 cribed one. And, I'm --

14 : That was the end of a phone line.

15 : That's right, and I'm sorry. I'm
16 sorry for that and I think -- well taken, the point about
17 public visibility of these programs. The sensitivities
18 of the people in the States, the hard work done by the
19 Council -- I think we just should have informed the
20 Council members. .

21 : But, to put it another way. It
22 seems to me that -- that as a Council member, I also have
23 some sort of obligation to be able to translate what --
24 whether I would agree with it or not, the policy that is
25 here. If ~~you~~ don't know that something is being done,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

50 1 and you don't know what the policy is when you are out
2 there -- and I mean, we are out there. And, I think that
3 it does make it difficult for us.

4 So, I do want to say that this was a specific
5 instance, but there are times when we out there, are in
6 the business of trying to defend and encourage the busi-
7 ness of the endowment, but we don't have information that
8 we should have.

9 : You bet. Fair enough. Thank
10 you. Mr. Dill (phonetic).

11 MR. DILL: Well, since I've had to cultivate an
12 air of smug know-it-all, which is very useful --

13 (period of laughter).

14 MR. DILL: No, I was going to say, I hope you
15 didn't escape any of us. That they tried to buy your
16 silence in this matter by balancing the reductions by
17 an increase to Louisiana State.

18 (period of laughter.)

19 : Okay.

20 : I wont repeat a story that I think
21 George Bernard Shaw told.

22 (period of laughter.)

23 : Tantalizing. May we move on?

24 : -- the story.

25 : Conflicts of Interest, Mr. Hector.

51

1

: Ellis. (pho-)

2

: Mr. Sandos (phonetic).

3

: Let Louie do it.

4

: Louie's on it? No, he just said

5

Ellis. It's pass the ball.

6

Oh, I'm sorry. One person who can't talk.

7

: This is a specific case of an

8

interpretation of the conflict of interest resolution.

9

Ellis Sandos (phonetic) was part of the team of six

10

Professors who were engaged by the Speaker of the House

11

of Louisiana, who was the Project Director of a project

12

financed by the State Humanities Council of Louisiana.

13

Humanities in the State Legislature -- these

14

six -- five political scientists and one Louisiana State

15

Historian, spent the full session of the Legislature

16

there at the Legislature advising and consulting on a

17

broad range of matters which were presented to the --

18

that Legislature.

19

The funds did ultimately come from us to the

20

State Council to the Project Director, and on down to

21

the employment of these six Professors of which Ellis

22

was one.

23

As is customary in many State Legislatures,

24

they're paid on a monthly basis throughout the year, even

25

though the Legislature only meets for two or three months

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

52 1 in the Spring. The State University system operated on
2 the same basis, so in affect, Ellis did his work last
3 Spring before he became a member of the Council. But,
4 his pay spread throughout the year and he won't get paid
5 until the next two or three months -- back payments.

6 Against that background, this being the second
7 time this issue has come up in the past. I mean, the
8 second time this issue has come up, we faced it about
9 two years ago with one of our Council members who had
10 engaged in quite a large project but he hadn't been paid
11 in full. He became a member of the Council and we de-
12 cided that he should be able to receive his final pay-
13 ment.

14 We can go either of two ways. One is to do it
15 -- is to approve a special waiver for Ellis (phonetic)
16 in this case. Or the second, is to adopt as a matter of
17 policy, that the prohibition against a Council member
18 personally receiving remuneration from the endowment,
19 be interpreted to mean, provided that he may receive re-
20 muneration for a project which has been completed or
21 substantially completed prior to his appointment to the
22 Council.

23 My own preference would be that since this is
24 the second time it's come up, and we have to parade some-
25 thing in detail like this to the entire Council, my own

53 1 preference is to enterpret paragraph two -- the conflict
2 of interest resolution that way, and let the general
3 Council then, the Chairman apply it. And, I would make
4 it a motion.

5 : A motion?

6 : Yes, to that affect.

7 : I second it.

8 : All in favor?

9 (a chorus of aye's.)

10 : Discussion?

11 (a period of laughter.)

12 : There is no discussion to take
13 place. There simply was no conflict of interest.

14 : No.

15 : Do you want to say something?

16 : All in favor?

17 (a chorus of aye's.)

18 : All opposed?

19 (silence.)

20 : Thank you. I've been passed a
21 note by Phil Schaffer (phonetic). I'm going to attribute
22 it to you. It's a comment on the thing Harold Kanner
23 (phonetic) was describing. The rodents and the papers.

24 He asks, was this a case of the rats deserting
25 the stinking script?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(a period of laughter.)

: With that, we should break for
lunch, I think. At 1:20 we will resume.

(Whereupon, a break was taken
for the purpose of lunch.)

: When did we get color coded , by
the way, Mr. Chairman?

: I don't know. When did we get
color coded?

: This is an experiment. And, it
was designed -- I don't know that -- all we had hoped
to do was to avoid some of the unnecessary scramble for
trying to find which Council motion that -- in this pile.

If it doesn't work this time, we'll be back to
basic black and white.

: Would you all please direct your
attention to the blue motion.

(a period of laughter.)

: We are not supposed to have fun
at Council meetings. Let's get --

: Well, God knows that we didn't
this morning.

(a period of laughter.)

: Alright. Let's move along to
Research Programs.

55 1 (a period of laughter.)

2 : Go ahead.

3 : Yes, sir.

4 : Please.

5 : Moving right along here. A motion
6 for the Division of General Programs begins with proposal
7 for Humanities project in media.

8 I'd like to call to your attention that it's
9 the first cycle of the media program. Twenty applications
10 out of 130 are being recommended. Of that number, three
11 are planning grants, ten are for scripting, and seven are
12 for production.

13 On the list of applications being recommended
14 for support. One proposal. GN20970 on page four from
15 the Morris County Historical Society to produce a film
16 on the Revolutionary War in New Jersey, 1779-'80. It is
17 being recommended for funding, pending Staff status satis-
18 faction with additional specialist review corroborating
19 one facet of the scripts treatment of the period.

20 The list of applications recommended support
21 ends on page four. I would like to note in passing that
22 four of these applications that were approved will not
23 receive award letters until the endowment knows what
24 the final budget for FY83 will be.

25 If you remember, we all had to go through a

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

56 1 waiting process that way. These applications are on
2 page four. GN20882, scripting grant for radio series
3 on black world traditions. GN20897, scripting award
4 for film of life and art of Virginia Woolf. GN20970,
5 production grant for the film about the Revolutionary
6 War in New Jersey, and GN20972, production grant for
7 and anthropological documentary on the Serbian American
8 Community in Chicago.

9 I would like to note that this does not rep-
10 resent any feeling on our part that these projects were
11 less worthy of funding than others, but rather, that
12 these were projects which, by their nature, could wait.
13 for their funding if they had to.

14 The list of projects on defers on page 20A,
15 here in the case of application GN20981, from Atobbey
16 (phonetic) Film Incorporated in New York, the Committee
17 recommended that this project be deferred until members
18 of the Committee have had the opportunity to study the
19 file in view of previously completed films from this
20 Production Company.

21 The final recommendation from the Committee
22 will be made at our February meeting. The list of re-
23 jected applications for the media program begins on page
24 five.

25 On page twelve, in regard to application GN20938,

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

57 1 to produce a second film in a series entitled, The Law,
2 The Courts, and the People, the Committee had the oppor-
3 tunity to review the completed first film of this series.
4 And, agreed with the Staff that this is not of the quality
5 that justifies the award of the President's grant re-
6 quest.

7 You see, if you are good in our Committee, you
8 get to go to the movies in the afternoon.

9 Applications recommended for support from the
10 Museums Program, begin on page twenty-one. There's some-
11 thing I wish to draw your attention to in particular. On
12 page twenty-five, which begins with applications not re-
13 commended for funding.

14 Applications submitted to the special projects
15 program begin on page thirty-four. On that page you will
16 find a list of proposals recommended for support from
17 program development.

18 On page thirty-five are the proposals not re-
19 commended for support from program development. On page
20 forty-one are the proposals recommended for support in
21 the Library's Program, and beginning on page forty-two
22 are those proposals not recommended for support from the
23 Libraries Program.

24 I would like to add, although I can not give
25 you the number, because it is not in my notes. One of

58 1 the programs, the Library Program, particularly pleased
2 us because, it's an application for re-use of materials
3 which we originally funded. And, we encourage that.

4 We have funded work which has been excellent
5 that we then get some more mileage out of some good work.
6 We are very pleased.

7 Mr. Chairman, I move you adopt and promote.

8 : I second.

9 : I learned that from Mary Beth.

10 : I withdraw the second.

11 : Five years it took me to learn
12 that.

13 If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to
14 answer them or the Staff will. Anyone?

15 : Just a technical matter.

16 : Yes, sir.

17 : Would it be too much trouble to
18 indicate in the media projects, whether it's scripting
19 or production, or what phase of the program we are talk-
20 ing about?

21 : Yes, I am sure that we could do
22 that in the future. We are -- we are working towards
23 clarity presentation. So, for example, this time our
24 Committee Book was paged. Next time, ~~there will even~~ be
25 an index. You'll be able to look up and see where project

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

59 1 Number X is, and what page. Yes. I feel that yes, we
2 could do that in our motion, so that you'll know which
3 is -- which kind of grant.

4 : You can always tell -- (inaudible).

5 : Not necessarily. Because, from
6 -- some Production Grants are actually so small enough
7 that they can be easily confused with the Scripting Grants.

8 Production Grants, for example, in Radio Pro-
9 jects, are small and you can't always really tell. We
10 do, of course, have a feeling on planning grants.

11 : I have a question, a general ques-
12 tion. I notice scattered throughout both the recommended
13 and not recommended, in all of them, a series of projects
14 having to do with the Constitution.

15 : Yes.

16 : I was wondering if the Constitution
17 Projects look any better this time then they did the last
18 round?

19 : My memory is that we only really
20 found one that we thought was outstanding. It's the
21 project from -- I suppose I should have noted that.

22 : Were there any others that are
23 really --

24 : There were a couple. I don't
25 want to speak for the members of the Council on this, but

60 1 we -- we were pleased with it.

2 : This time you were more pleased
3 with with the list?

4 : We were pleased the first time
5 around.

6 : Oh.

7 : I don't think -- I don't think it
8 was a question of very good and even better. I think we
9 did get some interesting planning grants the first time
10 around. And, I think there continued to be some progress.

11 : There were some planning grants
12 on the one or two, now that I think about that are. But,
13 the one that really comes to my mind is the one on Old
14 Sturbridge.

15 : Sturbridge?

16 : Yeah, that's a --

17 : Which?

18 : From Old Sturbridge? Is that the
19 one?

20 : Yeah.

21 : We have ~~also~~ well, in the media
22 cycle this time, we have two projects which are directly
23 related to the bicentennial. One is a re-scripting grant
24 GN20885, which is going to result in a three-hour film
25 on the making of the United States Constitution and The

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

61 1 Bill of Rights. Then, on page two the third project down
2 on GN20948 from GEH, this is a planning grant for a pro-
3 ject on film on Constitutional issues and how they relate
4 to certain contemporary questions of science and technology.

5 This brings together a distinguished group of
6 Consultants from the Kennedy School of Government at
7 Harvard, with the facility support from WGEH.

8 We also have -- (inaudible).

9 : Carol, do you want to mention the
10 one in the Museums area?

11 : Yeah, that -- I think that's the
12 one that was referred to. It too is a planning grant for
13 an exhibition on the effect of the Constitution on the
14 lives of the New Englanders.

15 : Before the discussion --

16 : But in answer to you Meredith
17 (phonetic), I will say that I am not thrilled. I thought
18 that given the subject, we would see many more -- more
19 really outstanding grants. It seemed to me that the sub-
20 ject lent itself. And, I don't feel that so far I've
21 seen as many of the quality that I would like. But, we'll
22 you know, we'll --

23 : There's also the phenomena I think,
24 in this particular topic of being five years in advance
25 of the event, and, in spite of the fact that the scholars

62 1 ought nought to find that at a distant horizon, I think,
2 2 maybe, that's slowing things up more than we might ex-
3 3 pect.

4 : Yeah, I don't -- that's probably
5 5 not so --

6 : Is there other discussion of the
7 7 motion from General Programs. If not, will all those
8 8 in favor please say aye?

9 (a chorus of aye's.)

10 : Those opposed?

11 (silence.)

12 : Motion carries. Research Programs,
13 13 Mr. Kennedy.

14 MR. KENNEDY: Our programs are in this color
15 15 packet, which is alternatively referred to as elitist
16 16 gold, and hunble fated pumpkin.

17 (period of laughter.)

18 MR. KENNEDY: The largest block of recommenda-
19 19 tions are in basic research. And, they are to be found
20 20 on pages one to five, using the page number at the bottom
21 21 of the page.

22 There are, of course, the priorities one and
23 23 two, and in the case of basic research in addition to
24 24 the usual financial consideration, there is also a matter
25 25 that we have to hold funds back because of the archeology

63 1 competition that will come at the next Council meeting.

2 Pages one to five then, the basic research
3 proposals that are recommended for approval. The Commit-
4 tee examined a number of these and discussed them, but I
5 don't believe that there are any special issues that need
6 to be drawn to your attention.

7 They are then followed on pages six to seven-
8 teen, by rejects. On page eighteen, is a single project
9 on transformation of Philadelphia and the Delaware Valley,
10 which comes under Regional Studies.

11 That, is then followed by two referrals on
12 which no action need be taken. Referral means that we
13 would expect ultimately, to recommend approval program
14 after some negotiation.

15 On page twenty, and continuing, I think, on
16 page twenty-one, Councils -- conferences. On page twenty-
17 two, conferences not recommended.

18 On page twenty-three, one project under the
19 old Humanities Science and Technologies Program, left
20 over from what we call sustaining development awards.
21 This, perhaps, will be the last in that category.

22 One project not recommended in that category
23 on page twenty-four and one deferral.

24 On page twenty-six, Research Resources where
25 there is one recommended and no disrecommendations. On

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

64 1 page twenty-seven, one recommendation in tools.

2 I move adoption of the report.

3 : Discussion? All in favor?

4 (a chorus of aye's.)

5 : Apposed?

6 (silence.)

7 : Thank you. Planning and Assess-
8 ment Studies -- is that right, Miss Silvers (phonetic),
9 that we have --

10 MISS SILVERS: Yeah. We have no motion, but
11 I wonder if I might mention two things that we did in
12 closed session.

13 We looked at the final program solicitation
14 which will go out in one or two weeks for the competition
15 in conditions in the humanities further analysis of exist-
16 ing data resources.

17 Six to ten grants of up to twenty-five thousand
18 dollars will be made, and while any humanities related
19 topic is eligible. Emphasis is being put on the follow-
20 ing topics: trends in financial support for the humani-
21 ties, elementary/secondary, and early undergraduate edu-
22 cation in the humanities, the status of scholarly communi-
23 cations, career patterns of individuals trained or employed
24 in the humanities, and trends on the demand for and use
25 of humanities resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

We also heard about the Hamp (phonetic) Study on humanities funding in higher education, which is in its final stages. It's the most complicated study Hamp (phonetic) has ever done, and we've looked at a preliminary compilation of the data, which has some rather striking information in it.

: Thank you. Alright, then lets move on. Fellowships would be Mr. Dill (phonetic).

MR. DILL: Ours emphasized teachers. You have before you, my recommendation for approval of 124 applications on the priority list. And, I would add to that, automatic disapproval of the remaining applications. I have no comments to make on those, and I move --

: You are moved separately. All in favor?

(a chorus of aye's.)

: Opposed?

(silence.)

: It carries.

: I do that because we do have a problem coming up in fellowships for independent --

: Could you pull the microphone toward you?

: Oh, yes. First of all, I would like to move approval of the 107 applications on priority

66 1 A list, pages one to twenty-one. I would follow that,
2 then, with a tentative motion covering a kind of approval
3 of the 118 on the priority B list, but we are going to
4 have to discuss that, and I hope that we can do that
5 briefly.

6 But, no matter what else we do, we do present
7 for you the 107 applications, and so I make that motion.
8 And ask for action on the 107 Priority A proposals.

9 : Alright.

10 : Pages one to twenty-one.

11 : Discussion?

12 (Silence.)

13 : All in favor?

14 (A chorus of aye's.)

15 : Alright. I said this morning that
16 we would discuss the use of the two Committee's; the
17 Screening Committee of Specialists, and the Interdisci-
18 plinary Committee. And, that came up again later as you
19 recall.

20 As a result of the concerns that were voiced
21 about that, we prepared a motion to come before you, ask-
22 ing for a further review of the items that had been
23 approved by the Screening Committee -- the first Committee,
24 and disapproved by the second Committee.

25 The motion, I must tell my colleagues on the

67 1 Committee, has lost something in translation to the agenda.
2 Since ours was a little more specific in asking that a
3 Staff Committee review those projects, assign them a
4 ranking number, and bring them back to us in February at
5 which time we would approve such proposals as there was
6 money for.

7 The motion that I offered, asked for approval
8 of the 118 applications on priority B list, subject to
9 further review unspecified and the availability of funds.

10 That motion, is then before you, and I would
11 like to add to my motion a series of questions. Does
12 the formation of the larger Committee this morning, make
13 it less than useful to pursue this question.

14 Secondly, I'll -- Ellis (phonetic), do you have
15 a comment on this? I think we all ought to throw into
16 this conversation what points we wish to raise, because
17 we are asking for -- we are asking for action which is
18 very different from any action I've seen asked for here
19 before.

20 And, that is to -- we're asking that you throw
21 out the decisions of the Interdisciplinary Committee. Re-
22 do that work, and that I think, is a major request that
23 the Council must act on.

24 : Well, I think the question of the
25 appointment of the Committee to examine the Interdisciplinary

68 1 Committee's problem is a separate issue of this right
2 here. The genesis of what you have before you is a basic
3 feeling of dissatisfaction in the results of the delibera-
4 tions of the second stage outside panels who considered
5 the fellowship pool as it had come through the first
6 stage of review from specialist panel.

7 We -- the Committee of the Council was not
8 satisfied that in all cases the quality of the decisions
9 really justified a rejection of the 118 applicants that
10 would have been rejected had we followed the procedure
11 that you are quite familiar with and is normal.

12 We, therefore, ask that a further review be
13 done of these 118, suggesting that this might be done
14 by means of an in-house Staff review.

15 This is the bases then, of the proposal. We
16 wish to defer final action on the 118 fellowships until
17 we had proposed the next meeting. Now, meanwhile, there
18 is an improvement in the procedure, which I think, under-
19 lies this language -- approval of 118 applications prior
20 to de-list subjects to further review and availability of
21 funds. Meaning, that we here give an approval of such of
22 those that are recommended out of a review process. In
23 the interim, they need not be brought before the Council
24 again in February, if I understand correctly.

25 : Joan (phonetic)?

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

69

1

: Could I add a bit to that report.

2

The basis for this dissatisfaction came from two members

3

of the Committee who attended one day an interdisciplinary

4

screening process and reported back to us that they ob-

5

served some comments and action that they felt were less

6

than objective. And, were more subjective in nature.

7

And, also indicated a dissatisfaction with the

8

screening that went on in that one Committee. Those of

9

us who did not attend, and I was one who indicated that I

10

felt it was difficult to judge an entire process by action

11

that occurred on one day in one Committee. Still we

12

were unable to determine whether or not the report coming

13

to us was of sufficient scope in order to change what

14

had gone before.

15

Also, there was an indication that there possibly

16

could be more funding come through and some of those who

17

had not been approved, might now, in a later time be

18

approved.

19

When I voted for that motion, I was not voting

20

that I thought that the Screening Committee had made

21

errors on 118 people, and that our Committee would be

22

more expert, or the Staff even more expert in making that

23

change.

24

What I was concerned with, was the conflict in

25

a report from the process and an inability really to vote.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

70 1 Therefore, we did make the proposal that the others should
2 be ranked, but we also, in our discussion indicated that
3 of the 118, we were clearly certain that a good number
4 of them would be thrown out.

5 And, I also did recall that on a previous
6 occasion that in our Committee we had not funded all of
7 the applications for which we did have monies. But, did
8 turn down some applications regardless of the fact that
9 there was money left in the pot.

10 Because we did not -- the Screening Committee
11 did not judge them approvable. So, this is a little
12 sticky problem in that respect.

13 : I don't want to blunt the major
14 point here. But, could I ask two questions?

15 : Go ahead.

16 : One, does the Committee have any
17 recommendation ~~or~~ a sense of things about the question
18 just raised. Is -- would the Committee be willing to
19 say that, of the 118, only that number which approaches
20 or reaches the amount originally earmarked for budget.
21 I'm -- I'm just trying -- I'm thinking out loud about
22 our budgetary question. If the Committee has any advice
23 on that.

24 And then, the second thing is, is it an impor-
25 tant part of the Committee's recommendation that it be a

71 1 Staff Committee. Is there some reason for not wanting
2 others than Staff to be involved?

3 : If Ellis would speak to the second
4 one, since that was his part of the motion, okay?

5 : Alright. Well, the answer is no.

6 I -- I -- I think we're looking for a check on the review
7 process that Peter Stanles (phonetic) and I observed. He
8 over two full days and I over a period of five hours in
9 two days, against the background of having been on Screen-
10 ing Committees for four consecutive years in this par-
11 ticular competition up to 1980.

12 Observing that in that particular context, I
13 frankly was extremely dissatisfied with the quality of
14 the deliberations and the way in which the judgements
15 were reached.

16 I need not -- I would -- I do not particularly
17 wish to rehearse the details of this, but it seemed to
18 me that a -- another look at these applicants and their
19 applications, was indeed derserved in the interest of
20 trying to identify proposals which are indeed of the
21 highest quality. And, therefore, ought to be supported
22 by this endowment.

23 It was in that spirit then, that I offered this
24 motion that we defer action until February and have this
25 task done, and I suggested the mechanism of an in-house

72 1 Staff review. However, that is no essential part of the
2 proposal, so I'm --

3 The only thing that is essential here, is I
4 believe, that out of a desire to do as we ought to do
5 here and support those who are most deserving of support,
6 that there are an undetermined number, but surely a num-
7 ber of applicants in the 118 list who deserve to be re-
8 considered.

9 This is the sense of our motion and whatever
10 else we do, however we want to phrase it, whether it is
11 done here perhaps for artful reasons or whether we go
12 perhaps outside to another mode of reviewing, these 118
13 need to be given a second look in our judgment.

14 : Okay. Thank you. Yes.

15 : I think it's important to follow
16 what he's said. That we are asking, in this case, for
17 reconsideration of a number of candidates who had been
18 approved by the Screening Committees, made up of specia-
19 lists, and not later approved.

20 We are not really in that way, at this point,
21 issuing a challenge to the system. Certainly that will
22 have to proceed out of the ad hoc committee's considera-
23 tion. Nor, are we asking that -- or are we suggesting
24 that there are numbers of candidates so worthy that money
25 ought to be transfered into the Fellowship Program from

73 1 elsewhere. We, I must confess, we thought we might have
2 used a little bit more of our own money -- if we may call
3 it that. I believe that's what it's called in Washington.
4 And, that certainly motivated us a bit.

5 : Is it also fair, just to be clear,
6 so that as we move toward implementation, that the re-
7 quest by the Committee is that while this screening takes
8 place, they are asking to have brought forward or funded
9 the applications that this screening group finds accept-
10 able. It's not any abstract number of those high, low,
11 or anything. It's not against the budget figure, it's
12 that if three people are found to be worthy, three go
13 forward.

14 : That's right.

15 : If it's ten -- okay.

16 : Now, we would assume that the
17 Committee, whatever it is, will have the -- will have be-
18 fore it, not only the decisions of those Committee's but
19 a pretty good summary of why one Committee found a pro-
20 gram good, and another did not find it good.

21 So, that it would be making not only it's own
22 judgement, but a judgement based upon a judgement of the
23 judgement of others.

24 : Right. But, the Committee recog-
25 nizes the other end, if you will, of Jeff's question.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

74 1 That is, some subject to availability of funds.

2 : Oh, yes. Yes indeed, yes indeed.

3 : I would add this. In the budget
4 as it exists, there's \$400,000 available yet, in this
5 particular slot for the Fellowship Program. And, the
6 conversations with the Division Chief is that if more
7 than -- that would be approximately twenty more fellows,
8 if more than that number are found to be indeed be of
9 the highest quality, then, as in the past, it has been
10 the practice of this Division and I think other Divi-
11 sions of the endowment, funds will be made available so
12 as to support all of these applicants who are truly of
13 the highest quality. Which is, indeed, our purpose in
14 asking for this reconsideration.

15 : Anita, and then --

16 : I just got lost about a factor. Is
17 it the case then, that a 118 applications were the sub-
18 ject of opinions by the Interdisciplinary Panel that
19 diverged from the opinion of the Disciplinary Panels?

20 : That's correct, yeah.

21 : One hundred and eighteen?

22 : There were two hundred and fifty
23 that roughly that -- this won't quite add up, but a little
24 under two hundred and fifty that came from the Disciplinary
25 Panels to the last two Panels, which are called Inter-

75 1 disciplinary, to make the final cut in roughly half that
2 number. So, they halved it by awarding 107 and rejecting
3 118.

4 : Well, may I follow this up a little
5 bit, so that I'm sure I understand it. Ordinarily, as I
6 recall, the Disciplinary Panels do some kind of ranking.
7 Do they not?

8 And, I would not call lopping off the lower
9 numbers -- those ranked lowest, a serious divergence.

10 : Well, you might not. But, what
11 was also striking about the deliberations of the Inter-
12 disciplinary Panel is that there was no information what-
13 soever provided them as to what had transpired in the
14 previous set of Panels.

15 : Oh.

16 : Each -- each of the two hundred
17 and, I suppose that I'm dealing with what -- twenty-five
18 here. Each of the 225, as far as I heard, and Peter was
19 there and I think he will more or less say that he heard
20 the same thing, was treated as an application denovo.
21 As though it had never been considered by anybody except
22 for the statistical fact that the -- these -- the Inter-
23 disciplinary Panel II, which is what I attended, considered
24 the application on its merits, as though it had no his-
25 tory of National endowment.

76 1 And, as to why it might have been recommended
2 by a previous Panel of Specialists in the field of His-
3 tory or English or Philosophy, or whatever, was never
4 clarified, either in writing or verbally to my knowledge.

5 : As the maker of the motion, let
6 me suggest two concerns that I do have beyond those al-
7 ready voiced.

8 One, is that in the course of ranking these,
9 a new Committee will rank over a wide range. And, we
10 will have people who got B+ getting C- this time. I don't
11 know what to do about that, except maybe invent a new
12 process of doing it.

13 That's unfortunate to people who have been
14 judged rather well and are still being judged as well,
15 but are getting very low grades as that is afforded to
16 them.

17 The second thing is that I do feel troubled
18 by having so many people told that subject to further
19 review, and the availability of money, they are -- their
20 decisions are deferred. When, in fact, we are probably
21 talking about less than half of those who might reason-
22 ably expect funding, or even -- even a third. I don't
23 know how to deal with that, either.

24 I guess that I'll leave it to an imaginative
25 Staff to deal with both of those things.

77

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

: We did decide that a late yes was preferable to an early no, however.

: Is the -- could I ask a question just to clarify procedure again? Because, the issue of how it's handled here on the motion may speak to that question of how we notify people.

I heard two different suggestions about whether the -- this new review would be brought back to the Council Committee. Could that be clarified? Because, if it is, then deferral is what is required and we would tell people that the decision was deferred.

If it's approved as category A, excuse me, as priority B, we could then act before February. People could learn before, and so on, but it would not be possible to come back to the Committee. I'm not sure which is --

: We may have to invite the participation of Counselor Woolkian (phonetic), on this one, because we have -- the motion that come out of the Committee was a motion to defer -- the motion that I put before you. There were rights that I have to do that, I do not know, was to have approval now, subject to review so that we're not going to have a terribly late yes if there is a yes.

: I see.

78

1

: To move it along as quickly as possible. Now, the question is, will people join me in the fiction that this is what we passed?

4

: They were also to be -- to be reviewed and ranked in order, and therefore, if a great deal of money came in, you would have a whole large number then that would be subject to approval. On the other hand, if you had smaller amount of funds that there would be a smaller number that would be taken.

10

Also, the notion was expressed within our discussion, that it might be possible in looking at all of the 118, that none might be deemed approvable.

13

: Well, that was Mr. Wilkey (phonetic) award at this point.

15

: Yeah, the question that Mr. Dill raised, it's easier for the Chairman to act where there has been a recommendation up or down, by the Council. Although, there are certainly --

19

: Well, I really meant that my -- my motion, which asked the Council to act on, is a motion that we put together after the Committee meeting, so the Committee really has a different motion to -- I don't know if this is important.

24

If nobody challenges this motion, then I think that we are alright. We are pretending this is the motion.

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

79 1 that passed the Committee.

2 : What is the motion that you are
3 making now?

4 : Which is approval now and not
5 deferment, and then, as money becomes available, the
6 Panel having acted, simply go down the list and pay as
7 many people off as --

8 : Well, it would be approval or
9 action in some form subject to certain specified --

10 : Yeah, that's right.

11 : Yes.

12 : Right. So, it doesn't have to
13 come back to us in February. That's the main point.

14 : That's the issue.

15 : That's what we had asked for, and
16 that's why I do not want to ask for it now. I -- ob-
17 viously, a simple and kindly people, we hope that maybe
18 \$800,000 from another source would come along. We could
19 spend all of that too, but, we are not asking for that.

20 : Professor Hill for Professor
21 Kerr (phonetic.)

22 : Is it not standard procedure that
23 the Interdisciplinary Committee not be given the ranking
24 results of the --

25 : Yes.

80 1 : It is -- that is a policy deci-
2 sion. Well, what has been called into question, here
3 then, I take it, is that policy.

4 : Yes.

5 : And the Committee will deal with
6 that.

7 : Oh, I see.

8 : The ad hoc committee will deal
9 with that, among other things.

10 : Yes, --

11 : Just as a question of curiosity,
12 what happens in the event that this second review takes
13 place, us having approved the 118 applications and zero
14 are approved -- zero go through?

15 We simply tell them we didn't have money for
16 any of you?

17 : No.

18 : No. The further review was not --
19 did not --

20 : Did not favor.

21 : Oh, so it's including the pending
22 few?

23 : Yeah.

24 : Okay. May I raise one other ques-
25 tion? What -- what was the Committees --

81 1 : No, no. The Chairman has got to
2 recognize you, not me. But, it's okay with me, I mean --

3 : But, he can't see me. What is the
4 Committee's view on what the basis of this review is going
5 to be. I mean, it's curious. Are these -- are not just
6 technical adjustments, are they?

7 : No, it's -- the concerns are many.
8 Basically, I think that one of the things that was felt
9 by people who visited the Panels, was that there was a
10 certain immodest certainty accompanying a rather modest
11 knowledgeability. And, the majority would follow anyone
12 who was certain enough that he was or she was right.

13 : No, I understand that, but how is
14 this new review -- this re-review supposed to adjust that,
15 if the persons who are doing the new review -- Staff may
16 have even less expertise in these particular fields. That
17 is what I am trying to get at.

18 : Well, the new Panel, like the
19 Supreme Court will have read the election results. They
20 know that we are after something and they'll kind of
21 figure out what it is.

22 : Well, we were also asked, if I
23 didn't -- if my notes are not wrong, to have the detail
24 of review -- previous review available. I mean, the
25 motion incorporates a modification of the process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

82

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

: Yes, but that's --

: Ah hah.

: Behind all of this, is a -- a real suspicion on the part of many people, including I must put myself, who believe the Specialists are in a very good position to make hard judgements. And that -- those judgements should be set aside. If not rarely, at least cautiously.

: Alright, this -- yes, Mr. Burns (phonetic).

: I want to ask this question about one particular grant here. I wouldn't be speaking to the motion so, --

: Okay, if you can wait, you know, one minute. I think that this is a somewhat unusual situation.

: It is. Very much so.

: I just want to be sure that we have canvassed opinion of the Committee or of the Divisional Leadership on this question.

Is there anything else that ought to be said before the Council considers this?

: I think that the Committee is satisfied here. The Staff may --

: Can we -- can we have the --

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

83

1 : I have no problem with whatever
2 the Committee decides. My question is whether the Commit-
3 tee is in agreement with the motion, you know.

4 : Well, I --

5 : We have the motion again, as you
6 see it.

7 : Could you repeat the precise mo-
8 tion?

9 : Yes.

10 : Alright. The motion is this. We
11 are asking approval of the 118 applications on priority
12 B list, subject to further review and availability of
13 funds.

14 Footnote that review carried out by a Panel
15 selected in whatever way -- of that permanent to be
16 selected. And, that it have -- and that the review process
17 be altered to the extent that more information is avail-
18 able to that Panel that is normally available to the
19 Interdisciplinary Panel.

20 : Okay. Let's stay in order. Miss
21 Kerr (phonetic), Miss Norton (phonetic), Mr. Burns (phon-
22 etic), Armond (phonetic).

23 : At the risk of, I hope not some
24 approbrian, it seems to me that since basically what seems
25 to be in question is the process which was used in this

84 1 particular round of applications. And, then some equity
2 being given -- equity of review, at least, given to the
3 applicants in question.

4 There is, and I would concur that that is a
5 possibility having served on the Fellowships Committee.
6 However, I think that perhaps another longer range ques-
7 tion might need to be raised in this instance -- or two
8 longer range issues.

9 One of them is that, indeed then, this one
10 group of 118, given this special treatment at this par-
11 ticular point and time, may be given inequitable -- all
12 of those who applied over a long period of time, having
13 gone through this same period, the same process, are --
14 will have been treated inequitably.

15 This will be an extraordinary circumstance and
16 the review process, it seems to me, is in some jeopardy
17 to have -- it being an extraneous one possibly.

18 The second, part of that is that I am not a
19 Lawyer, but it seems to me that there are some real
20 problems with the motion as it now stands in terms of
21 how you would deal with them.

22 And, again, being potentially on the other end
23 of the phone, out there I'm just not sure how you -- how
24 you respond to that.

25 Obviously, the fundamental question here is the

85 1 process as it has been up to this point. How one deals
2 with it, I think, we need to be very careful. This being
3 an extraordinary circumstance and an extraordinary action
4 that we will be taking. We had better be clear about the
5 responses and the rational that we are going to give it.

6 : I think that there are two answers
7 to that. One is that, if we assume that year after year
8 the number of good applications is about the same -- not
9 wide swings in the number of good and bad, a proportion
10 of good and bad, and if, this year we found many fewer
11 funded, perhaps there is a reason to think that the in-
12 equity would be in not acting rather than acting.

13 Secondly, I would say that it is an extraordinary
14 circumstance. We have not had too many looking into this
15 and I think the -- what happens here will provide some
16 data for their consideration.

17 : I -- I could clear one mechanical
18 question. There is no issue, I think, of the response
19 of these 118 applicants. They are not informed that they
20 have been awarded of something as the result of this
21 Council action.

22 : Okay.

23 : What the Council is recommending
24 is approval pending certain conditions. The conditions
25 may, in fact, eliminate all but ten of these applicants

86 1 so, I --

2 : What exactly will they be told, if
3 this motion is passed?

4 : The -- if they were to get the
5 standard letter proposed for priority B or priority C
6 applicant, they would simply be informed that they could
7 not -- that the endowment was not able, at this point,
8 to make a decision regarding their application.

9 : Basically, their point of view
10 would be referral.

11 : That's very helpful, Jeff. Very
12 helpful.

13 : That's right.

14 : So, the reason to propose approval
15 is simply so that the Chairman has a recommendation to
16 him. A deferral puts no recommendation before him and
17 he could not act until Council had.

18 : Right. Good.

19 : The same affect would be achieved
20 if the Council were to vote rejection of all 118. The
21 Chairman could then depart on the basis -- but, that
22 seems clumsy. I mean, as a way to go about it.

23 So, I think to -- explaining why approval is
24 here when we know, in fact, perhaps no more than a small
25 proportion of this is on the agenda, they will not be

87 1 informed they've been given an award.

2 : It's interesting, though, that
3 that formulation. Because, if you recommended rejection
4 and then I saved forty people, I would get the credit
5 for it.

6 (a period of laughter.)

7 : We are areforating (phonetic) 118
8 you know --

9 : I know, it's okay.

10 (a period of laughter.)

11 : Miss Norton and Miss Burns.

12 : I would like to speak in favor
13 of the motion. I remember back from my days as a Fellow-
14 ship Panelist that I was extremely upset when I discovered
15 the ratings of the Disciplinary Panels were not given
16 to the final Interdisciplinary Panel.

17 I thought that that was a mistake then, and I
18 think it's a mistake now. So, I think that this is a
19 move to rectify the immediate situation and that the ad
20 hoc Committee that we establish this morning will be able
21 to look in the long range situation.

22 : Okay. Mr. Burns.

23 MR. BURNS: I have an objection to the motion
24 as restated. And, more precisely to the, what was typi-
25 fied as or characterized as a footnote to the motion. As

88 1 I recall, Mr. Dill, what you said was, subject to review
2 by a Panel to be selected by, and then something to the
3 effect, in any way the Staff wanted to select the Panel.

4 I presume it really means the Chairman, doesn't
5 it? W

6 MR. DILL: Whatever way -- whatever way Panels
7 are selected is the way which this one will be selected.
8 What I -- what we did was eliminate the -- our recommenda-
9 tion that it be a Staff Panel and say no.

10 : Well, I presume it's a --

11 MR. DILL: Let the Chairman decide that.

12 : Somewhere up there, there's a precise
13 statement of this motion. I think there should be and I
14 don't think it should be as it was stated the second time.

15 : The motion itself is before you. The
16 implications were what I called "footnote." And, those
17 were the implications that I read into it. D

18 : Do we need it one more time? do you
19 think?

20 : Alright. I move approval of the 118
21 applications on priority B list, subject to further re-
22 view and availability of funds.

23 : Okay. Mr. Tashteny (phonetic).

24 MR. TASHTENY: Yes, I understand that you are
25 proposing a departure here from procedure in process. I

89 1 just would also wondering, are you also proposing, in affect,
2 a divergence from policy? The policy having been, in this
3 particular program, unlike any other endowment program.
4 That we are supporting only applicants whose applications
5 indicate the certain quality level rather than the highest
6 quality level?

7 : Yes, absolutely. That is --

8 MR. TASHTENY: So, it is not a matter of the
9 highest quality, it's rather whether these -- any of these
10 118 are of the same quality of the 107 so that once again
11 there would not be a ranking procedure ~~real~~ ranking pro-
12 cedure really does not apply here.

13 : Well, my yes was probably hurried.
14 What we are assuming, that is, the usual standards pre-
15 vail. This motion does not suggest that everybody and
16 his sister get a grant because, they've come in under this.

17 : Mr. Hector (phonetic).

18 MR. HECTOR: I have the same problem, I think,
19 that Walter has. In all prior occasions I can remember
20 when we say that we are approving subject to further re-
21 view, we say subject to further review by the Staff, sub-
22 ject to further review by an expert in television produc-
23 tion, subject to review by somebody.

24 This motion fails to state who's going to do
25 the further review, and I think that's the heart of the

90 1 motion.

2 : Alright, I would be very willing
3 to have, if the Chairman is willing to, to have his in-
4 troduction of a phrase, which I will make a part of my
5 motion.

6 How do you propose to establish the Panel, if
7 this passes?

8 : Well, how about -- I'll ask Wendell
9 to comment, subject to further appropriate review which
10 will be determined by the Chairman. Is that sufficient?
11 That is my motion, then.

12 Is that alright, Wendell (phonetic)?

13 : Yeah.

14 : Okay. Yes, Miss Ellis (phonetic).

15 : I just -- I'm sorry.

16 : Oh, I'm sorry.

17 : Well, I wanted to answer a ques-
18 tion that was brought up here. ~~From~~ From the standpoint of
19 the discussions in which I was taking part, never was I
20 considering that we were going to approve any applica-
21 tions that fell below anything -- any standards.

22 As the materials were presented to me, in the
23 discussion of the meeting, that they felt that it was ob-
24 served that there were, indeed, some applicants that met
25 the highest standards, but for some reason, capricious or

91 1 otherwise, they were disapproved. And, that's how I was
2 voting on it in the discussion. I was not voting for an
3 averaging or a lower than highest quality.

4 : I'm also trying -- I'm trying to
5 unpack the notion of the usual standard, which Harmon (pho-
6 netic) introduced to them, which I think is relevant. Is
7 it the case that, for this particular competition, there
8 were more departures by the Interdisciplinary Panel from
9 what might have been the rankings of the Disciplinary Pa-
10 nels then is usual. Or, is the usual standard a fairly
11 repletent departures?

12 : Yeah, something like that.

13 : It's somewhat larger number of
14 deviation.

15 : Okay, that's what -- so, it's
16 something unusual happened?

17 : Well, we had -- but you had -- let
18 me put it another way. We asked for Staff help. My under-
19 standing is, that there were, of course, as we have money
20 left over, fewer recommendations proceeding out of the
21 Interdisciplinary Staff.

22 I'm sorry -- I assumed the relationship to the
23 other -- Dave, why don't you talk.

24 : There would be (inaudible) -- It's
25 about the same as previous years, but you were saying I

92 1 think, is that of the total number of applications that
2 went through the Interdisciplinary, a smaller percentage
3 (inaudible).

4 Their -- their instructions were the same --
5 to give us all the applications (inaudible).

6 The percentages of the high ranking was the
7 same. It was about -- over both panels, it was seventy
8 percent of those of a very highly rank that were recom-
9 mended by --

10 : And, that is what typically
11 happens year after year.

12 : Well, I think that we've heard
13 all the questions and all the answers. They've been
14 badly matched, but I -- we -- they are all out there.

15 (a period of laughter.)

16 : Okay. We need a vote.

17 : Motion.

18 : All in favor -- we have the motion.

19 All in favor of the motion?

20 (a chorus of aye's.)

21 : All opposed?

22 (a period of silence.)

23 : Thank you. Yes?

24 : A particular question about a
25 particular one on page thirty. My eye just happened to

93 1 catch it. I'm puzzled by that because, unless it's an
2 unusual circumstance, I can not imagine why we shouldn't
3 be funding one of the values in the homes to buy system
4 in the Supreme Court of the United States.

5 That is, of course, the official history of
6 the Supreme Court of the United States. And, the authors
7 of the particular volume controls the part of the homes
8 to buy Committee. And, that is, of course, a very dis-
9 tinguished group.

10 : It was recommended.

11 : It's being recommended.

12 : There must be something --

13 : It's being recommended, isn't it?

14 : Yeah.

15 : It was recommended by the Screening
16 Committee, not by the Interdisciplinary.

17 : Does one of these come from here?

18 : That's one of the ones.

19 : Oh, this is one of the ones in
20 question.

21 : Oh.

22 : Oh, I'm sorry.

23 : Of course, there's another ques-
24 tion here too. Has the homes to buy lost all its monies,
25 so that it does not -- Oliver Wendell Holmes --

94 1 : No, I -- yeah, no, I don't know.
2 : It was recommended.
3 : No, this was one of the ones that
4 -- we just -- we just voted on. Right?
5 : Yeah.
6 : I've re-written summaries to you.
7 : This will be one of the ones that
8 will be reviewed again.
9 : Yeah. But, that is peculiar, isn't
10 it? Does some member of the Staff know why that --
11 : Yes, we'll have it here for you
12 in a second.
13 : I've got the summary.
14 : Good question.
15 : Here's the summary of the dis-
16 cussion that the Interdisciplinary had. One Panelist
17 quote, not indicating how his model illuminate the
18 (inaudible).
19 The distinction of the classic republicanism
20 in the eighteenth century, has long been known to scholars
21 of the religion. (inaudible).
22 Another Panelist complained quote, "White is
23 artificially narrowing his scholarly base. Confining
24 himself to court decisions in the official record, while
25 ignoring the rich research and other primary material."

95

1 Another Panelist was convinced by the mis-
2 givings, noting that White had (inaudible).

3 : Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not
4 the point to respond at length to that sort of thing.
5 But, this I repeat, is the official history of the Supreme
6 Court of the United States. It was funded by Oliver
7 Wendell Holmes goodby's to the United States. And, it
8 strikes me as very peculiar that a Volume of that dis-
9 tinguished and most official history, would not be funded
10 by the National Endowment to the Humanities.

11 And, Ellis Sandles (phonetic), if this sort
12 of thing gets screened out, I can understand your point.

13 : I'm so glad you asked the question,
14 Mr. Burns (phonetic).

15 (a period of laughter.)

16 : Okay. We took the vote. Fine.
17 Thank you. Do you have some more business?

18 : Yes. If we move on to the summer
19 seminars, I recommend -- I move -- I'm sorry, we must
20 have a motion disapproving of the remaining applicants
21 listed under FQ (phonetic). I move that this --

22 : All in favor?

23 (a chorus of aye's.)

24 : All opposed?

25 (a period of silence.)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

96

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

: Summer seminars -- the approval of the 53 seminars on Priority A list, pages one through twelve.

: You're moving?

: Yeah.

: You want to move the whole section?

: Alright. Approval of the 39 applications on priority B and C list, to the extent that funds are available. This is not anything unusual.

: Sure.

: And, disapproval of the remaining applications listed under Tab R.

: All in favor?

(a chorus of aye's.)

: Opposed?

(a period of silence.)

: Fine. Thank you. Education programs, Miss Norton (phonetic).

MISS NORTON: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, we have a green motion before you, coordinated to the Guidelines Booklet, which is now outside for those of you, who will be leaving immediately after my report. What?

: It's on the table.

97 1 MISS NORTON: Oh, it's on the table, sorry.
2 Yes, you've got it. Okay -- our guidelines, our new
3 guidelines.

4 The Committee, yesterday, did not make many
5 changes in the draft motion that was brought to us by
6 the Staff. Indeed, I wish to commend the Staff for their
7 excellent work not only in the area that I was talking
8 about this morning, that is the preparation of the trans-
9 ition, to the new guidelines and the new organization of
10 the Division. But, also with respect to this particular
11 meeting of the Committee in obtaining additional infor-
12 mation and external reviews on motions brought to us
13 since the preparation of the Committee Book, so that, in
14 fact, some motions that had been brought to us originally
15 as defers were able to be changed to approval or dis-
16 approval by the time of this motion, that is, at our
17 meeting yesterday.

18 And, also, so that some that were originally
19 listed as approval with conditions, could be changed to
20 defer because new reviews raised additional questions
21 about those materials.

22 And, I think the Staff has been doing an ex-
23 cellent job in getting somewhat more detailed reviews
24 then I think have been common in the past in the Divi-
25 sion. And, I want to commend them for that industriousness.

98

1 On the final motion for the Education Division,
2 there are a couple of things I want to point out before
3 I begin with the discussion of the application.

4 And that is, that you will note, that although
5 we are still operating under the old guidelines, we have
6 gone to new headings. And, in one case, a new prefix is
7 EB, in preparation for the new guidelines -- or our opera-
8 tions under the new guidelines.

9 So, that we have a situation in this -- we can
10 see the transition in the Division in this very motion,
11 where the heading of the second set on the first page is,
12 Central Disciplines in Undergraduate Education. And,
13 under that heading, we see mixed together, current pilot
14 and implemenation grants.

15 The -- also, I want to point out that, although,
16 the -- under that heading of Central Disciplines in Under-
17 graduate Education, there are no listings of priorities.
18 All those motion to be regarded as -- that are not listed,
19 should be regarded as priority one.

20 Everything that does not have a priority listed
21 after it, is priority one. That was an error or at least
22 an omission in the way the motion was prepared.

23 The motion begins with one previously deferred
24 item in the Elementary and Secondary Program, which is
25 now approved. The Auburn University proposal moves on to,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

99 1 as I indicated a minute ago, under the heading of Central
2 Disciplines, a combination of previously deferred pilot
3 program applications and new implementation grants.

4 The two previously deferred pilot programs are
5 on the bottom of the second page of the last two there;
6 Arizona State University and the University of New England.
7 I'll come back to those in a minute.

8 The item on the first page that received the
9 greatest amount of discussion from the Committee, is the
10 middle one of those three; ~~Yale University, Nancy Kaff~~
11 (phonetic); ~~Strengthening Women Studies at Yale~~. It was
12 discussed extensively by the Committee, and indeed, sev-
13 eral members of the Committee came in and read the pro-
14 posal.

15 The final vote on that was a vote of four to
16 two to recommend the funding of this proposal at the
17 reduced level indicated in the motion. Those of us who
18 supported the motion, thought that -- or supported the
19 proposal, recommending the proposal, thought that the
20 proposal was exemplary for a number of reasons.

21 First, because it proposes both, a development
22 of new courses under the egis of the Women's Study Pro-
23 gram, and/also provides for the integration of materials
24 on women studies into existing courses. And, indeed, has
25 within it the enthusiastic participation of a number of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

100 1 the Senior and most distinguished Professors at Yale who
2 are involved in the program, and would use this opportunity
3 to put information deriving from new scholarship on women
4 into their basic survey courses -- introductory courses
5 in their field.

6 We also thought it was useful because this is
7 Yale University. Because, it would be used as a model
8 since, the Yale Women's Studies Program has received a
9 good deal of attention, since its founding in 1979.

10 And, we thought that this could be an example
11 of the kind of exemplary project that could serve as a
12 model for how other Universities could go about in a
13 very scholarly and clearly -- what can I say -- in a way
14 that is clearly justifiable through the finest standards
15 of scholarship in working with some of the newer areas
16 of inquiry. In particular with women studies.

17 The two members of the Committee who voted
18 against the proposal, questioned whether or not Yale
19 University really needed our money to do -- to make these
20 changes in their courses.

21 And, also, I think to a lesser extend, raised
22 the issue of the value of what they were proposing to do.

23 On the second page, the -- I will just say a
24 couple of things about those deferred pilot grants. The
25 Arizona State University grant, the second from the bottom,

101 1 was a grant that we had previously considered in the Com-
2 mittee. This is, in affect, a special case of a sort of
3 reject and re-submit. I don't want to got into all of
4 the technical details of how this happened, but in any
5 event, it did.

6 It was a grant that had raised a good deal of
7 question in its earlier stages. The Committee believed,
8 after extensive discussion yesterday, following up on
9 extensive discussion of it several meetings ago, that the
10 Project Director had managed to answer a number of the
11 questions that had been raised in previous review.

12 But, we did agree to cut it from two years of
13 funding to one year of funding. And, I noteced, by the
14 way, that the term of the project is still listed here
15 as two years, which is an error.

16 We have to work it out with the Project Dir-
17 ector, but in any event, we did decide to have that kind
18 of funding. Althoug, we did agree to fund it.

19 The -- you see, then the deferrals on page
20 three, a series of not recommended grants. And, then
21 on page eight, we begin the second major set of proposals
22 that we considered yesterday.

23 Those which are in the old Higher Education
24 Regional National category, which are now headed, Exem-
25 plary Projects, Non Traditional Programs, and we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

102 1 understand what that SEC means. What?

2 It should be curriculum materials.

3 The major items that we discussed at some
4 length in the Committee meetings, in this Division, were
5 the very first one, The Renaissance Film Project --
6 (and, at this point, the tape ran out.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(continued on next page.)

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 : -- you'll see that the re-
2 quest was for 356 thousand dollars. We recommended 40
3 thousand. The 40 thousand dollars is basically an attempt
4 to fix up a script in what seems to be to us a fine idea
5 for a major film project of a series of films examining
6 the Renaissance and the impact of the Renaissance through-
7 out Western society. The script that was presented along
8 with the application was, by all accounts, not the best,
9 although the idea itself was a very good idea. And, so,
10 we have decided to recommend 40 thousand dollars to fund
11 an attempt to fix up the script and make the rest of the
12 project doable. We not necessarily expect them to come
13 back to us for the money to fund the entire project.

14 There was some discussion, indeed, of their
15 ability to get private funding for the project itself.
16 But we did think that it -- the project was worth salvag-
17 ing if possible, and that we thought that this would be
18 a good use of money.

19 A second proposal that was discussed, at some
20 length, although not as long as the Renaissance film pro-
21 ject, was the one that's the last one in this set, on the
22 top of page ten, the American Indian Higher Education
23 Consortium in Denver that recommended 308 thousand, and
24 we are recommending five thousand dollars, which is a fair-
25 ly stunning decrease. It is -- it is because the -- they

1 recommended a very ambitious project. All the reviewers
2 suggested and the panel suggested that they were simply,
3 at this stage, not capable of carrying out such a project,
4 and so we are offering them five thousand dollars to bring
5 in consultants and to discuss with them what it will be
6 feasible for them to do. They do wish us -- they do wish
7 to do a survey of humanities and Native American things --
8 offerings at the tribally controlled community colleges
9 that are members of this consortium. And we decided that
10 they were very needy, indeed, and that we could help them
11 along considerably by giving them a consultant grant.

12 One further point I'd like to call to your at-
13 tention. And this is on page twelve, the last one on page
14 twelve EH-20254, Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
15 This proposal came to the Committee with a recommendation
16 to fund not the entire proposal but a small planning grant.
17 The Committee decided that the idea of encouraging and
18 recognizing excellence in the humanities was a good idea,
19 but that this group was not, in fact, proposing what they
20 said they were, and that they were not even worthy of get-
21 ting a small planning grant the staff had recommended to
22 us that they receive.

23 And I'd be happy to answer any questions, or
24 if anybody on the Committee wants to add something.

25 : Could I ask a general --

1 : I just wanted to ask a ques-
2 tion about the motion on page two. Is that the correct
3 figure for Reed College? Is that what we approved? I
4 thought we were dealing with round numbers of 40.

5 : Now remember that was the
6 -- that was the -- we were told that yesterday in the Com-
7 mittee meeting that that was the new figure for Reed Col-
8 lege. The budget had just come in.

9 : Yeah.

10 : Yes, Mr. Chickering (pho-
11 netic).

12 MR. CHICKERING (phonetic): I'd like to ask a
13 very broad question. But I'd like to illustrate it by
14 referring to the Yale grant. In paying -- giving a large
15 grant to anybody to, quote, integrate material in to cours-
16 es seems to me is very similar to paying -- our paying
17 professors to revise their lectures or paying professors
18 to keep up with changes in their field. And my question
19 is that it seems to me this is the sort of thing that one
20 expects professors to do in the ordinary course of their
21 teaching, and I wonder, as a broad matter, if paying a rich
22 university like Yale isn't especially dubious to do this,
23 but really, in a broad sense, are we really established to
24 give grants to do -- to pay things to people to do things
25 which one assumes, in the ordinary course, that they are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 doing in the course of their work?

2 : I would like -- I would like
3 to make two comments on that. One is that, in fact, that
4 is precisely what we have been funding in the past. It's
5 true that we could change that policy, but that has been
6 one of the things that the Education Division has tradi-
7 tionally funded, that is, to release time to give profess-
8 ors extra time to rethink classes and to put new material
9 in to those courses.

10 A second response would be that in the proposal
11 Yale does make a case for the financial stringency of the
12 university in recent years being such that the university
13 has not itself internally been able to fund that kind of
14 release time for faculty, despite the overall image of
15 Yale as a -- as a wealthy university.

16 I think Rich has something to add too.

17 : For the better part of the
18 last decade, almost all the categories of support avail-
19 able to the Division of Education programs emphasize the
20 use of funds for release of time for faculty to revise
21 courses and design new courses. The new guidelines shift
22 that emphasis considerably, in part because the past prac-
23 tice has been fraught with problems. Surely when the na-
24 ture of course revision or development represents a leap
25 over a vast chasm of interdisciplinary distance, that sort

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 of release time may seem appropriate, particularly in an
2 institution with a very heavy teaching load. But what
3 we've found is that --

4 : But Yale is not --

5 : Excactly. In the case of a
6 great many institutions with a light teaching load, or with
7 plans in mind that were confined to a single field or close-
8 ly related field, it seemed unnecessarily lavish. And,
9 meanwhile, of course, categories were illsuited to provide
10 support for other sorts of things that might be more com-
11 pelling needs for the institution.

12 : I'll make one more comment,
13 which is that I -- one of the things that convinced me in
14 this regard, with respect to this particular proposal, is
15 the fact that many of the professors proposing to work
16 this material in to their classes are, in fact, people who
17 have not had very much prior exposure to the new scholar-
18 ship (inaudible) studies, and with -- and that it seemed
19 to me that we are, in fact, -- or that the Women's Studies
20 Program at Yale is, in fact, asking them or they are pro-
21 posing to do with -- in conjunction with Women's Studies
22 Program what regards major -- what would amount to very
23 major revisions of their courses, so it's not just like
24 adding a new book, or adding two lectures, but rather a
25 reall thorough-going review. And all I can say is that I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 teach at the university with what is regarded as a light
2 teaching load, that is, two courses a semester, and I
3 cannot find the time to do that kind of thorough rewriting
4 of my classes in -- within my normal teaching schedule.
5 It's impossible to do.

6 : I have Francis Rome (pho-
7 netic), Anita Silvers, Walter Burn (phonetic).

8 : My question did not tend
9 toward -- go toward this, but was another subject. Is
10 that --

11 : Can we hold on it till we
12 settle this?

13 : Sure.

14 : Anita.

15 MS. SILVERS: Yeah. Very quickly. Rich has
16 pointed out that different kinds of institutions have dif-
17 ferent work loads, and they -- it's very hard to attach
18 workload formulae to a type of institution. It might be
19 useful where released or assigned time is being requested
20 to ask the applicant to provide documentation of the work-
21 load formula for that institution.

22 : Walter.

23 MR. BURNS (phonetic): This morning Jeffrey Hart
24 passed a note across to me, asking me to read it. And it's
25 on this particular subject, I, therefore, feel obliged to

1 do it. And I supposed that what he really intended was
2 that it be noted somehow in the minutes. I read him word
3 for word: It seems to me that the Yale grant pays 200
4 thousand dollars in taxpayers' money to academicians for
5 doing what is clearly part of their regular jobs, that is,
6 one, course planning and, two, syllabus development, and
7 that grant is not justified.

8 So let that be noted.

9 : Okay.

10 Miss Kerr.

11 MS. KERR: I just wanted to point out what --
12 something that I think Mary Beth did not say, and, if she
13 did say it, I want to emphasize it.

14 This particular proposal was reported to this
15 Committee from the panel with explicitly saying that it
16 was the highest ranked proposal of all proposals that it
17 reviewed. And there were several of the reviewers who
18 said, specifically, that it was highly ranked not just
19 because of the substance, and not just because of the
20 people involved, but that because it was, in fact, Yale
21 as an exemplar, as an exemplar of an exemplary kind of
22 proposal.

23 : Mr. Dill (phonetic).

24 MR. DILL (phonetic): I have a little trouble
25 with seeing the value to the discipline, the new discipline

1 with recognized scholars being encouraged to do this. But
2 I doubt if they'll do it without encouragement. But I
3 really am somewhat doubtful about Yale as exemplary.

4 : Yeah, there are some people
5 --

6 : Well, let me give you the
7 point of view of the Committee.

8 : The faculty members, yes.
9 Scholars --

10 : If I can give one analagous
11 -- one example that comes out of our Division. It is --
12 it is the Yale Institute for Teachers, which was funded,
13 fairly small. And I can tell you that in my region, which
14 has great need for exemplars, that that particular pro-
15 posal from Yale, in working with New Haven, and I would
16 suggest that in this instance Yale could have without any
17 encouragement whatsoever -- should have without any en-
18 couragement from the Endowment pursued, in some way, its
19 work with New Haven. That has, in fact, become an exemplar
20 to the country precisely because it is Yale.

21 : But nobody would claim that
22 that represents a part of a teacher's normal teaching load,
23 teaching duty, which is the point we're talking about.

24 : It could conceivably be
25 construed as part of an academicians' role to be able --

1 to -- to construe their work with teachers. And I -- it
2 seems to me that the question that was raised here was
3 exemplars. Since the work of this particular Division in
4 the Endowment cuts across the board, then to support cur-
5 riculum as well as course revision, and this, indeed, is
6 curriculum revision, I, for one, from a Midwestern insti-
7 tution, which is not the exemplar that Yale is, do not
8 hold it against Yale that it is Yale.

9 : Ms. Norton.

10 MS. NORTON: I also want to make another comment
11 which is that if the argument here is that we should not
12 be funding professors to do what they should normally be
13 doing, we should, basically, be turning down almost every
14 other project on the recommended list, because, as Rich
15 said, that has traditionally been what we have funded in
16 this particular type of grant that is curriculum redevel-
17 opment, the -- and the release time for faculty to sit
18 down and totally work through their courses.

19 Now I think that Rich has also said that one of
20 the things that we have discovered over the years is that
21 there are, perhaps, better and more efficient ways to use
22 our money, and that's precisely what the changes in the
23 Educational Division are directed to. And we'll be seeing
24 fewer grants of this particular sort. But I think it is
25 basically unfair to penalize these people or the people

1 who are up here on this round just because they are the
2 last round of the old way of thinking about how we're go-
3 ing to deal with education.

4 : Mr. Dill (phonetic).

5 MR. DILL (phonetic) : I really think this is
6 not -- this is not really a very good question to ask.
7 We do this over, and over, and over again. I did it back
8 at MOREhead with twelve thousand dollars (inaudible words)
9 had been very bad.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. DILL (phonetic): The the better (inaudible
12 words) the less likely it is for him to take time off
13 from a very passionate pursuit to deal with something that
14 is a little bit aside. I think you have to -- you have
15 to encourage people to do that. And we have done it over,
16 and over, and over again. (Inaudible words.)

17 : Mr. Stanos (phonetic)

18 MR. STANOS (phonetic) : I'd like to throw in
19 a distinction in this discussion of prestige schools. I
20 think that among the great prestige schools there chief
21 prestige rests in their graduate schools not in their un-
22 dergraduate schools, and that I think the best undergrad-
23 uate schools are still the small liberal arts colleges,
24 Carleton, Middleburg. Swarthmore, places like that have
25 it all over the big -- over the -- over the so-called

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 prestige schools.

2 : Could I make a suggestion
3 that for purpose of voting here, because there's been a
4 good deal of discussion, that we lift the Yale proposal
5 out of the motion, vote on the rest of the motion, and
6 take up Yale separately to see. I don't -- I'm not guess-
7 ing as to what results are, but just simply so we have a
8 clear understanding on the part of the Council. I'd hate
9 for the whole motion to depend one way or another on how
10 people felt about this one. But I'd take your judgement
11 on it.

12 : I would object to that, Mr.
13 Chairman --

14 : Fine.

15 : -- unless someone wants to
16 move it. I don't really see any reason to do that.

17 : May I just ask for one
18 further clarification on the motion? On the bottom of page
19 eight, Rich, do we need to describe why we upped that
20 grant?

21 : Page eight?

22 : Yes. The bottom on the
23 Catholic University. Oh, fine. Do you want to explain
24 that, Rich?

25 : (Inaudible.)

1 : I will do it. I'll explain
2 it. I -- the -- what -- what happened was that we, in our
3 discussion, -- the program -- the proposal at the bottom
4 of page eight, Catholic University of America, it's for
5 a conference on classical rhetoric and the teaching of
6 freshman composition. One of the things we were afraid
7 about in the way the proposal was originally drafted was
8 that the people who are running the conference would,
9 in effect, be preaching to the converted, and we, basical-
10 ly, suggested in the Committee that five thousand dollars
11 be added to pay transportation costs for people to come
12 to this conference who would not, perhaps, normally attend
13 such a conference.

14 : So it will be truly cath-
15 olic.

16 : That's right.

17 : Ms. Rome (phonetic), you
18 had a question.

19 MS. ROME (phonetic) : Yes. My question was on
20 page eleven, for those that were being deferred, I notice
21 that all of them have something to do with studies of
22 foreign culture, and I didn't know whether or not the de-
23 ferral -- page eleven -- I didn't know whether the defer-
24 ral, and, incidentally, there's one there from Indiana
25 there that's in phase two right now, and I didn't know

1 whether the deferral means that these projects need to be
2 upgraded, or by deferral -- I don't know what your defer-
3 ral means.

4 : They're --

5 MS. ROME: (phonetic) : Permanently? Temporarily?

6 : Very temporarily. There
7 were particular problems in each of the cases. It's in-
8 teresting that you noticed that all of them are having
9 to do with foreign cultures. It did not occur to anyone
10 on the Committee that that was happening.

11 : Oh, really.

12 : Each of them -- they're
13 highly individualistic reasons why each of those are be-
14 ing deferred.

15 : Okay.

16 : Basically, we need more in-
17 formation of one type or another on each of them, that's
18 all.

19 : Thank you.

20 : It's usually a very differ-
21 ent sort of information that we need on each of them.

22 : All right. We have a mo-
23 tion. All in favor.

24 (Chorus of ayes.)

25 : Opposed.

1 (No response.)

2 : Fine. Thank you.

3 : Mr. Chairman.

4 : Yes. I'm sorry.

5 : I just wanted to clarify

6 something for the record. Occasionally when an issue
7 comes up and is picked at and tortured for awhile by either
8 a Council Committee or by the whole Council there is an
9 impression that some policy decisions or implications have
10 fallen out, even though those who have been picking at the
11 discussion did not mean that to occur. And I would hope
12 that the issue of whether it is appropriate to release
13 persons who are employed as faculty members from normal
14 assignments to do curricular development has not been de-
15 cided in any way, and that -- that there would be no im-
16 plication from this discussion that that's now less im-
17 portant.

18 : Okay.

19 Mr. Sandos (phonetic).

20 MR. SANDOS (phonetic) : Something has kept go-
21 ing through my mind, and perhaps it would be useful to
22 ask this, if we might not receive some kind of tabulation
23 on the percentage of our funds which are devoted to basic
24 research and the percentage of our funds devoted to other
25 principal activities. I'm thinking about these chaps

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1330 VERMONT AVENUE, NW

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

1 that we were looking at in the fellowship program awhile
2 ago and their 25 thousand dollar grants each, we're look-
3 ing at curriculum revision at Yale for 172 thousand what-
4 ever it is. We have all sorts of things which are doubt-
5 less of considerable importance that we do. And our friend,
6 Walter Burns, and I disagree about what may be the most
7 important thing,--it's all important, no doubt -- of our
8 activity, but I somehow have that academic prejudice that
9 the most important thing the Endowment can do is foster
10 our new understandings of the humanities in all their
11 riches, this means what we translate in to the jargon of
12 our business here basic research, I suppose. Two and a
13 half percent going to the fellowship program is not much,
14 it seems to me. That's the real vitality of our -- of
15 our activity, but -- and is there some useful time, ap-
16 parently there is, and doesn't fit in anybody's agenda,
17 to talk about this overall mission, and overall goal, and
18 things of this order, and where our priorities ought to
19 lie, and how much money we ought to spend in various areas,
20 and how these ought to be given some sort of priority.

21 I -- I don't know. There's obviously no right
22 time to raise this. And at the end of a two-day meeting
23 is surely not it. But, perhaps, we could at least find
24 out where the money's going in those terms.

25 : Well, no, fair enough. And

1 you've closed the circle. You came back to where I began
2 this morning, the second half of the meeting, of the two-
3 day meeting, that is, inviting this kind of comment and
4 discussion.

5 I think the fairest thing to suggest a good faith
6 response to your discussion is to remind you that the bud-
7 get, the Council Budget Committee meeting is in July, and
8 this is when we discuss -- I discuss with the Council Com-
9 mittee the recommended allocation from Division to Divi-
10 sion, program to program, and that we send out material
11 to all Council members before hand about that, and invite
12 all Council members to come. That's the time when that
13 issue comes -- really comes home.

14 : That's fine. I'll probably
15 avail myself of the invitation. But the thing that I
16 don't know, and I can't necessarily tell from looking at
17 the conventional budgetary categories across the board is
18 how do you -- how would you sort it out in terms of sup-
19 port for creative kinds of scholarship and how much in
20 all programs across the board. Is it -- would it be use-
21 ful to try to track that and get a number on it compared
22 with other kinds of activities that we do support?

23 : Armond. (phonetic). Yes.

24 : All right. Two things
25 here. First, in terms of the divisional percentage, those

1 are routinely provided, as a matter of fact, on page 15
2 of the '84 budget submission. In terms of other categories,
3 we have tried different breaks at different times. The
4 critical thing is whether we can get a good definition for
5 these categories. So, in terms of research, for example,
6 we would be able to look at Research Division programs,
7 and certain fellowship programs. When you branch that out
8 to creative scholarship across the board there is some of
9 that that goes on in many, many -- is a component of many,
10 many grants, and, therefore, it's very difficult for us,
11 really, to provide some kind of statistical break out of
12 that.

13 But I would encourage you to, say, develop a
14 category structure, and we would try to see what we can
15 do within that.

16 : I think you'll see, Ellis,
17 if you read, again, the budget submission that in so many
18 of our programs the answer is really mixed. There are
19 several kinds of things going on.

20 Let me just add, if I might take a minute, we
21 have not introduced IPA's, but I would like to give you
22 a progress report in the way of our IPA's, Ronald Herzman
23 (phonetic). If you'd stand, Ron.

24 You remember our special initiative here, our
25 new program on summer seminars for secondary school

1 teachers, and Ron tells me that for the 225 places avail-
2 able next summer we received in the first two weeks 2,000
3 applications from secondary school teachers to work on
4 major texts in the humanities. That's very encouraging.
5 Ron, do you want to comment or put a gloss on that?

6 : (Inaudible words) up to
7 3,000.

8 : Okay. That, too, may be
9 anticipated by people coming to the budget meeting.

10 We have just created a pressure group, ladies and
11 gentlemen.

12 Yes.

13 : Well, just -- I better just
14 put a gloss on that, that's requests for information.

15 : Requests for information.

16 : Armand (phonetic) now has
17 the statistics.

18 : Filled out applications,
19 isn't that --

20 : Right.

21 But I think I should respond in turn, it's just
22 requests for applications rather than application. But a
23 number of the people making the requests for application
24 have said how much will I have to pay to do this. When
25 they find out that they're going to get 25 hundred dollars

1 to do it, that's -- that's all I wanted to say.

2 : I move we remove the sti-
3 pend.

4 (Laughter.)

5 : Too late.

6 (Laughter.)

7 : (Inaudible words.)

8 : Anyway that's -- at least
9 there's interest in this program. We'll see where it leads.

10 I want to thank the Council for its trenchant ob-
11 servations, disscussion, and particularly for your looking
12 over things, and let's continue to do our jobs as repre-
13 senatives of the American people.

14 Thank you very much.

15 (Whereupon,

16 the Council Meeting was adjourned.)

17 - - -

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25