

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

SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

August 9, 1985

Old Post Office

1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE
12708 Valleywood Drive
Wheaton, Maryland 20906

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM

PAGE NO.

Opening remarks -- Mr. Kingston	3
Minutes of Previous Meeting	3
Introductory Remarks -- Mr. Agresto	7
Introduction of new staff -- Mr. Kingston	11
Contracts awarded in previous quarter	11
Dates of future council meetings	12
Application Report and Gifts and Matching Report -- Mr. Cherrington	12
Status of Fiscal Year 1985 Program Funds	15
FY 1986 Appropriation Request and Reauthorization Hearings -- Mr. Cherrington..	16
FY 1987 Budget Planning -- Mr. Kennedy	26
Institutional Endowments and Application Review -- Mr. Kingston	32
Challenge Grants -- Mr. Cohn	36
State Programs	62
Education Programs -- Mr. Dille	63
Fellowship Programs -- Ms. Himmelfarb	65
Research Programs -- Mr. Berns	68
General Programs -- Mr. Ritcheson	75

Closed Session

Emergency Grants and Actions Departing from Council Recommendation -- Disapprovals	82
FY 1987 Budget Planning -- Mr. Kennedy	98
General Programs -- Mr. Ritcheson	99
Education Programs -- Mr. Dille	123
Fellowship Programs -- Ms. Himmelfarb	125
Research Programs -- Mr. Berns	128
State Programs -- Mr. Hart	152
Challenge Grants -- Mr. Cohn	157

P R O C E E D I N G SOPENING REMARKS

MR. KINGSTON: Guests and Council members, we are ready to begin. Good morning. We are happy to call to order the 77th Meeting of the National Council on the Humanities.

The first item of business will be to review the minutes. I want to note two corrections: Robert Laxalt was definitely present at the last meeting. Mary Jo Cresimore should be noted as having abstained from discussion or vote on Application SO-20649.

In addition to the minutes is a letter that all Council members have received from Council member Rita Ricardo-Campbell. Without objection, we will enter that letter in full in the-- as an amendment to the minutes. We would also append, if there are no objections, the copy of the full telegram that is the subject of that memo.

MS. RHOME: I did not receive that.

MR. KINGSTON: The letter was sent to you independently by the Council member, I believe.

MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: It is not in the book.

MR. KINGSTON: It is not in the agenda book.

MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to speak to the letter. I was not present. I know this is an open session, but I think that matter is a policy. The grant, and in fact three grants were awarded in May of 1985 at a meeting I did not

1 not attend. I sent a telegram asking for deferral.

2 The grant period was September 1986 through some
3 time in 1989. I thought in all good faith that asking for
4 a deferral of a sizeable grant almost a year, in fact it is
5 over a year from when it would be awarded, going four-and-a
6 half years into the future would be honored. It was not.

7 And in the reading of the telegram, it was
8 omitted, the date. In reading the minutes, the discussion
9 centered on whether or not women were invited to this
10 particular group--

11 MR. KINGSTON: Excuse me. If we get into the
12 substance of that application, we will have to--

13 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: All right. Well then, we
14 have discussed the substance and the policy of the NEH in
15 how far forward they give grants.

16 I think, personally, going into 1989, a year-and-a
17 half, three years forward, that is four-and-a-half years. I
18 think that is wrong in tying up money. I think three-and-a-
19 half years would be quite sufficient.

20 I presume that policy would have to be discussed
21 whether in closed or in open session. Would you go over these?

22 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, certainly the policy of-- in
23 terms of the length of a grant would be a matter discussed in
24 open session. It is not a problem.

25 I would state as a preface that the program that you

1 are addressing, that it is not at all unusual for a grant to
2 begin a year from the time of the review of the application
3 and extend for a three year period.

4 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: It is also not unusual not
5 to give grants in May of '85 starting in September of '86, a
6 year-and-a-half ahead of when a grant began.

7 I don't want to get into details, but I think that
8 there would be a problem in tying up funds into-- through
9 1989, and I want that discussed and would want it discussed
10 in open session or in a closed-- it is okay with me.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, well, why don't we discuss that
12 particular issue during the open session of the Research
13 Committee report.

14 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: All right.

15 MR. KINGSTON: So we can continue discussion of the
16 issues.

17 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I understand there
18 was a letter (mailed) to every member of this Council.
19 I ask for clarification since I haven't received any such
20 letter.

21 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: We mailed them right away.

22 MR. RITCHESON: And I am lost about what Rita is
23 talking about.

24 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Could the letter be read?

25 MR. KINGSTON: I think the letter itself could be

1 read, but it would have to be read in closed session because
2 it refers to a specific grant.

3 If you wish what we can do is defer any movement on
4 this particular item. That is, inclusion of the letter in
5 the minutes until closed session and therefore, table the
6 motion for approval of the minutes until closed session. That
7 is no problem.

8 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Could you accept the
9 amendment of the minutes to include the telegram as being
10 sent.

11 MR. KINGSTON: I so stipulate an addition of the
12 full text of the telegram.

13 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you.

14 MR. RITCHESON: I move for approval of the minutes.

15 MR. KINGSTON: A motion has been made for approval
16 of the minutes as corrected and amended. This would be
17 the corrections I stated before and it would include the
18 addition of Rita's letter as well as the telegram.

19 Is there a second?

20 MR. : Second.

21 MR. KINGSTON: All those in favor, please.

22 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 MR. KINGSTON: The minutes are so corrected and

1 amended. The second item on the agenda is the introductory
2 remarks by the Acting Chairman, Mr. Agresto.

3 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

4 MR. AGRESTO: Thank you, Tom.

5 Well, I said to you the last time that the last
6 time would be my last time. I beginning to feel like the
7 permanent Kelly Girl at the Agency.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. AGRESTO: I think, however, we would like to
10 report, happily so, that this almost assuredly will be my
11 last time. We have a hearing date set for Ed Curan. His
12 hearing will be held on October 2. If all goes well, we
13 assume that he will be confirmed expeditiously after that.

14 Speaking of hearings, one thing I would like to
15 bring to your attention is that in the last five months, this
16 agency has had five congressional hearings: two appropriation
17 hearings, two reauthorization hearings. These hearings
18 will be discussed shortly by Mr. Cherrington who will bring
19 you up to date on them.

20 And one hearing before our Oversight Committee on
21 our stand on EEOC on the goals and timetables and quotas.
22 After the hearing that was held just recently, and I have
23 copies of my testimony if anybody would care to have it. We
24 did not send it out to the Council, but Mrs. Mets says if
25 you want to see it-- I would simply reaffirm this agency's

1 policy, this Council's policy on discrimination.

2 That is it on hearings. The last thing I want to
3 mention-- to bring to your attention is that a few short
4 weeks ago, we did in fact call together that meeting on
5 our relationships with the National Science Foundation
6 and our understanding and relationship with the humanities
7 to science and technology and what in fact this agency-- the
8 role of this agency should play in that area.

9 Because of actions primarily on the part of NSF,
10 our relationship with NSF and the EVAS (?) program seems to
11 have now come to an end.

12 That does mean, and the Committee that met took
13 very seriously, that we have to take very seriously what our
14 role is as a humanities endowment in the fields of science,
15 technology and the humanities.

16 We raised a number of questions. Perhaps the most
17 important ones were the continuation of the separate program,
18 separate HST program, the Humanities, Science and Technology
19 Program and the Research Division, whether that should be
20 continued as a separate item of research or whether in fact
21 it should be more agency wide. That is still under discussion.

22 And there was sentiment for a wider discussion and
23 perhaps even wider efforts in the area on the part of this
24 agency in science and technology and humanities. And in fact,
25 we will pull together a committee, a conference of professors

1 and others to discuss what role this agency should take, perhaps
2 even on an agency-wide basis, what role we should take in our
3 understanding and funding of projects in science, technology
4 and humanities.

5 So, we are going to review our activities in the
6 field and perhaps report back to you next time some changes in
7 the area.

8 Leon was at the meeting and if there is anything
9 more, I will let Leon add to it.

10 If there are any questions about it, we can answer
11 them now, or we can raise them at the open session of the
12 research group.

13 MS. CRESIMORE: Can you tell us as a point of
14 information who the members of the Committee were, or are,
15 whatever the--

16 MR. AGRESTO: The members who attended, Anita
17 Silvers was there, Bill Allen was there, Leon Kass was
18 there, I was there, Steve Cherrington, Tom Kingston, Rich
19 Ekman, Dan Jones.

20 The next meeting that we have, any Council member
21 of course is invited and I want to hereby invite anyone who
22 wants to attend to attend.

23 But we will then after that report back to you
24 on our findings. Leon.

25 MR. KASS: I think that is a perfectly fine summary,

1 Mr. Chairman, but I think maybe that it would be worth adding
2 that the people present additionally felt that there was a
3 good case to be made for lifting up to special view the
4 relationship between the humanities and science and
5 technology, that the concerns were not confined to research
6 concerns. We might be looking for opportunities to encourage
7 better activities in education and public programs and so on.

8 The main reason for calling together a special
9 working group was that we didn't feel that on this occasion
10 we had the competence or the time to really think through
11 what we might be doing so we are going to be taking this
12 question under study in the near future.

13 The next meeting is, I think-- it is to be
14 scheduled in October.

15 MS. CRESIMORE: Could we know the subject of the
16 discussion of these meetings because I think this would be
17 of great interest to fellow Council members if it is an
18 open meeting.

19 MR. AGRESTO: It is going to be open to Council
20 members.

21 MS. CHRESIMORE: Yes.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. I would like to introduce
23 the new members of the staff. We do have a sheet in your
24 folder which gives the background of these individuals. I
25 won't read that, I will simply ask the individuals to stand

1 so that you can recognize them.

2 Peggy Babiarz is a new member of the Personnel
3 Office. Is Peggy here? Sorry, she is not here.

4 Wilsonia Cherry has been at the Endowment as
5 an IPA but has now become a permanent member of the staff.
6 Wilsonia back there. She is in the Division of General
7 Programs.

8 Doug Foard is a new member of the program staff.
9 He has dealt in state programs.

10 Ken Kolson has just joined the Fellowships Division
11 and will be the Assistant Director for Seminars and also
12 the Program Officer for College Teacher Seminars.

13 Steve Mansbach has also been at the Endowment as
14 an IPA and is now a permanent member of staff. Is Steve
15 here? He is not. Okay, thank you.

16 Tom Ward I saw earlier. Tom, was-- is with the
17 Fairfax County Public Schools and has joined us as an IPA
18 to work in the Education Division.

19 Martha Crumpelton has been with the Endowment as an
20 IPA but is now a permanent member of the staff, a Program
21 Officer of Essential Disciplines.

22 We are delighted to have these people with us.

23 The next item on the agenda is the list of contracts
24 awarded in the previous quarter. That is normally in Tab A
25 but since there were no contracts we can dispense with the

1 item.

2 The dates of future Council meetings appear in
3 Tab B. This is the result of the tally I sent out to each
4 of you with the overwhelming majority of you wishing those
5 dates. They will be promulgated in the Federal Register.

6 The question does come up, John, I think about
7 Council members whose term would be expiring the end of
8 January. We as yet have no action on the slate from the
9 White House so I think that you should presume that you will
10 be sitting until your replacements are confirmed.

11 MS. KENNEDY: Could we get your request that you
12 act expeditiously.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Use the mike please. I am sorry.

14 MS. KENNEDY: Would it be possible for us to put
15 on the record a request that the agency send out this request
16 for information about it as soon as possible so that we don't
17 also have to plan on May? To plan on May. Thanks.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Tab C contains the Application Report
20 and Gifts and Matching Report and also an addendum of your
21 file. Steve Cherrington.

22 MR. CHERRINGTON: I have the Application Report in
23 your folder as Tab C. This addition compares the applications
24 which you have reviewed and recommended for funding.

25 The first three Councils in '84 compared to the first

1 three Councils in '85.

2 The applications are down by five percent at this
3 point. No real surprises here.

4 As I explained before, summer stipends are down
5 a little bit, the applications for summer stipends. This is
6 something we have seen in several other fellowship programs,
7 applications down slightly.

8 Applications, for instance, to the summer seminars
9 are also down a little bit. Applications to centers,
10 Fellowship Centers for Advanced Study-- this may appear like a
11 decline, but actually as you know this is going to the
12 August Council this year and last year-- excuse me, going to
13 the May Council this year and last year in the August so there
14 is no real change there.

15 In research applications, the research part is
16 up. This relates to the special archeology deadline I
17 discussed before. The Humanities, Science and Technology
18 was also up slightly and this relates to our own competition
19 to this program.

20 Applications of private collections are also down
21 slightly, a brand new program seeking its real level
22 of applications-- we will keep an eye on that.

23 We also want to make (inaudible) to keep in this
24 program. (Inaudible)

25 In youth programs, applications were down. This

1 relates to a bit of a snafu in our application procedures
2 which we straightened out for next year. We may not have
3 enough lead time for the applications that are actually being
4 prepared.

5 State programs show -- actually, there is no real
6 change there except the exemplary projects went through a
7 different Council this time.

8 '84 is the highest year for applications received
9 according to this amendment. It looks like '85 will be
10 a record high year.

11 If there are no questions, I will go to the Gifts
12 and Matching Report that is also in your folder, it is Tab C.
13 Again, I will discuss this is a great year for matching
14 endowment. Gifts are up 62 percent at this stage.

15 We already have more gifts received this year than
16 we did for all of 1984. Matched funds are also -- released
17 are also up 34 percent.

18 You will notice the last column on my current memo,
19 I point out that offer is still open and that has declined
20 a little bit and this is because grantees are encouraging--
21 we are encouraging grantees to certify their gifts earlier
22 and they are doing this.

23 This is just a better way to proceed because it does
24 take a while to process gifts. Again, we specify the general
25 programs, in 1985 they have already raised \$2.5 million

1 in matching; in 1984 it was only \$829,000 the whole year.

2 In the fellowships area, matching is traditionally
3 a little more difficult to raise in the Fellowships Division.
4 In 1985 to date we have already raised \$378,000 whereas in
5 1984, the full year, it was only \$219,000.

6 In recognition of this phenomenal matching activity,
7 if Congress approves our request for 1986, we will have the
8 highest appropriation of funds in the history of NEH.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Are there any questions about the
10 Gifts and Matching Report, Application Report?

11 I would like to note for Council members if you
12 haven't been aware already, Steve Cherrington is now the
13 Director of Office of Planning and Budget and is one person
14 who has been able to strip that acting off his appellation.

15 Are there any questions of Thomas? We will move
16 on to the Status of Fiscal Year 1985 Program Funds.

17 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. There is nothing in your folder
18 on this. It is pretty straight forward. It looks like we
19 will have no trouble obligating all our program funds this
20 year.

21 We already-- we have, of course, through the end of
22 June which is nine months into the fiscal year. Seventy-five
23 percent of the fiscal year is over. We have obligated about
24 72 percent of our programming funds, so we are right on target.)

25 There will be no reprogramming requests necessary

1 this year. The last three years we have had to do that.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Questions or comments-- the FY '86
3 Appropriation Request.

4 MR. CHERRINGTON: As John mentioned, this has been
5 a year of hearings. There are two processes going on right
6 now. We have an appropriations process and an authorizations
7 process.

8 We have two hearings, one in the Senate and one in
9 the House for each process. The last time I talked about
10 the Senate and House Appropriations Hearing and the House
11 Authorization Hearing. This time I will talk about the--
12 okay. This time I will talk about the hearings that I didn't
13 bring up last time.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. CHERRINGTON: We have, on the appropriations
16 side, we do have a mark-up in the House Subcommittee which
17 is a mark-up, \$150 million. When it was reported to the full
18 House, however, a freeze took its place.

19 The freezes of appropriations for '86 (inaudible)
20 with \$139 million. We will see what happens. (inaudible)
21 the Senate, (inaudible) to act on anything.

22 In fact, the Senate is not giving an indication of
23 when they will actually act on appropriations this year.

24 The House mark-up in many programs actually had
25 reductions in the ~~budget~~ division, various programs for

1 adults and in treasury funds. And, John wrote a little letter
2 to the Congressman protesting this. It is attached to this
3 memo here.

4 The Senate also asked us for a Capability Level
5 Budget at \$139 million which we did put together and this is
6 also attached.

7 We have also had Reauthorization Hearings. Last
8 time I discussed the House Reauthorization Hearing. Since we
9 met last we had the Senate Reauthorization Hearing. At that
10 hearing, there were Senators Stafford from Vermont and
11 Hill from Rhode Island, Pell from Indiana and Dodd
12 from Connecticut.

13 Several issues were discussed here. Senator Pell
14 would like to involve the state governments more in the state
15 committees and one thing that he has suggested is to increase
16 the number of state nominees to the state committees from four
17 to six members.

18 Another thing Senator Pell is interested in, he
19 prefers the standing panels that the Arts Endowment has. We
20 prefer to have ad hoc panels.

21 He would like us to release the names of our panel
22 members before the panels meet. We do not like this. We
23 think it might invite force and pressure on the panel members,
24 but you may see something in our legislation about this.

25 There is also concern about our support of a business

1 projects. We don't think this is a problem. Our request
2 level in '86 has been appropriated-- we have requested
3 approximately the same amount for additions that we actually
4 were appropriated in '85.

5 At yesterday's Research Meeting, Mr. Ekman distributed
6 a chart describing our support of additions projects and I
7 think all who saw this chart will agree that there is no
8 problem.

9 The Senate also submitted some questions for the
10 record which we have since answered. Several concerned the
11 qualifications of Council members that we-- we have some
12 documents that we sent you to relay to them. Also, there
13 was concern about the qualifications of Mr. Curran.

14 The Senate-- we do have-- there has been a Senate
15 bill reported for the authorization, it does include the
16 provision we had requested to allow the state committees
17 to certify gifts. It also includes some things that we had--
18 this is-- these are discussed in the attachment in your
19 folder.

20 One thing is to have a Poet Laureate in the
21 United States. That bounced around from the Library of
22 Congress to NEH to NEA. (It) is a little uncertain,
23 but we may see something like this.

24 Senator Dodd has introduced a probably confusing
25 amendment to use fees generating copyright to supplement

1 funding the endowment. The way I understand it, it actually
2 comes out in March.

3 There is also a recent suggestion to limit Federal
4 support of indirect costs to 35 percent. This is also a
5 little bit uncertain. We don't know 35 percent of what.

6 People may have indirect costs sometimes in established
7 ways and other times it is total direct costs. We don't know
8 what he is meaning there.

9 The House, remember from last time, the House
10 had a series of public hearings on reauthorization. So far
11 we have had them in New York, Philadelphia, and one here in
12 Washington and there will be one in St. Louis in September.

13 So far, the public witnesses are basically in
14 support of NEH and are not really requesting any changes in
15 our authorization. There are attachments to my memos in the
16 folder describing some of these issues.

17 I am sorry for the length of discussion in all these
18 attachments, but this been the year of the hearing and we
19 thought you would like to be informed.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

21 MS. KERR: How are we going to respond to these
22 reauthorization suggestions, particularly the first two which
23 I don't think that you mentioned, one of them-- one that you
24 list in your memo.

25 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay.

1 MS. KERR: The first one which is, has the quote that
2 the National Council members must be-- that is not quoted so
3 I don't know if that is there intention-- must be selected
4 quote "from citizens of the United States who are recognized
5 for their knowledge of, expertise in, or commitment to the
6 humanities".

7 And also, the second item which you list which
8 apparently would authorize the funding for the next five years.
9 Are we going to respond to those?

10 MR. KINGSTON: John.

11 MR. AGRESTO: We have responded. He can take
12 the first one, I can speak to the second.

13 When it was first-- when we first heard that the
14 Senate was going to change the-- was thinking of changing the
15 rules over which the President would be bound in selecting
16 members of council, the original suggestion was that the
17 President could only select those who had knowledge of or
18 expertise in the humanities.

19 This would effectively, at least by, I think by
20 interpretation, effectively eliminate the President from
21 appointing anyone who is not an academic to the Council or
22 who had scholarly ties with scholarly background. It would
23 effectively eliminate public members on the Council.

24 We, we held meetings with people on the Hill on
25 this and made phone calls, wrote letters. We finally got it

1 to read as it reads there, have knowledge of, have expertise
2 in or commitment to the humanities. I honestly don't think
3 it makes any change-- in fact, I think the way it stands, the
4 way we have rewritten this is a perfectly appropriate way
5 to write it.

6 Council members should have knowledge of, expertise
7 in or commitment to the humanities. I don't think it ties the
8 President's hands. I think it is a fair way to write it but
9 that was-- that was two weeks of back and forth.

10 MR. CHERRINGTON: Okay. On the second issue, the
11 Senate sets a figure that theoretically the House cannot
12 exceed.

13 They set an authorization figure and the actual
14 appropriations aren't supposed to be higher than that. We
15 have said that we wanted-- that we needed authorizations
16 this high to them.

17 MS. KERR: Our response is, we don't have any
18 figures, or we don't want these figures?

19 MR. CHERRINGTON: We have, we have told the Senate
20 that we think Endowment does not need funding this high, it
21 does not need an authorization this high.

22 MR. KINGSTON: (Inaudible)

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: Was there an opportunity at these
24 Senate hearings to respond to the suggestion that we have
25 standing panels and to object very vociferously. I would hope

1 to that suggestion.

2 And also, and much more seriously, to the idea of
3 releasing the names of the panelists before the meetings
4 actually occur?

5 MR. AGRESTO: Yes. During the Senate hearings,
6 Senator Pell raised this and he raised it rather strongly.
7 I was present at the time.

8 I objected and simply said I thought it would be
9 a very, very bad idea. For us to have standing panels--
10 they go together. You have standing panels, then people
11 do know the names of the people on your panels so then they
12 become-- it becomes one bundle.

13 I made the argument as strongly as I could that I
14 felt this would undermine the process totally and completely
15 that I certainly wouldn't want to serve on a panel where I
16 thought I would be badgered and heckled by people to support
17 their proposals. I think it encourages lobbying on the part
18 of people, wrongly, to the people that they know will be
19 on those panels.

20 Senator Pell's response was in the form of sunshine.
21 We should know at all times who are making decisions affecting
22 our lives.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: Before.

24 MR. AGRESTO: Before. His position is before
25 and that they have every right-- applicants have every right

1 to write the person and say, I want to introduce to my pro-
2 posal, I want you to think about the following, please give
3 me support or whatever the letter might read.

4 I think I have said and I am on the record as
5 saying I think that is pernicious.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: This is a patent invitation to
7 corruption and I think one could put it in those terms, I
8 think it is very hard to rebuff.

9 MR. AGRESTO: I do not think this will--

10 MS. HIMMELFARB: Is it serious?

11 MR. AGRESTO: I do not think we will see it. I
12 will put it in those terms as strongly if I have to.

13 (Simultaneous discussion.)

14 MR. AGRESTO: No one else on the Committee spoke
15 in favor of it.

16 MR. CHERRINGTON: He has had the same concern
17 before and it wasn't in our (inaudible).

18 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I would now ask at this
19 point is there other evidence of an aggressive intent on the
20 part of Congress to lobby members of this Council or to
21 exert pressures which I know to be improper on members of
22 this Council?

23 MR. AGRESTO: This-- what we are talking about now
24 has more to do with applicants lobbying. What we have seen--

25 MR. RITCHESON: I specifically think the discussions

1 to another area.

2 MR. AGRESTO: Okay. It is ordinarily a regular for
3 at least the Chairman of the agency to receive letters from
4 members of Congress saying one of my constituents has applied
5 to you, please give that person all due consideration.

6 Of the totally appropriate letters that I receive--
7 we answer them in a perfectly honest and forthright manner
8 saying this proposal is being judged by the following-- is
9 being judged within the next few months. We will let you know
10 the outcome of our results.

11 Every now and then we get letters a little bit
12 stronger than that and I take it that some Council members
13 get letters stronger than that.

14 I think it much less appropriate since you are in
15 some ways the more immediate judges of these proposals than
16 I. I think it much less appropriate for you to get strong
17 letters from Senators and Congressmen.

18 The last strong letter we got back-- not we got,
19 that I got, that was a letter from the total delegation of
20 one state in favor of a proposal. We not only sent back a
21 courtesy response, but we also laid out for them in great
22 detail what it is that we do and why it is that this is done
23 without any kind of outside pressure, going through the whole
24 process for them and telling them we would let them know how
25 it turned out in the end.

1 But, if you think you are getting untoward pressure,
2 I see every-- no reason why you should not and every reason why
3 you should contact your Congressman and Senator and say that
4 this kind of pressure is uncalled for.

5 MR. BERNS: My inclination is to respond in some
6 formal way. I, of course, would like not to do this as a
7 matter of individual prejudice, but for the members of
8 the Council collectively to respond to this letter that we
9 have received now from Congresswoman Claudine Schneider and
10 Congressman Jim Shoyer. I presume that is what you are
11 referring to Charles and--

12 MR. AGRESTO: Yes. I have not received this letter.

13 MR. BERNS: No, this is a letter that was sent to
14 me addressed personally to me as a member of this Council and
15 I presume every other member of the Council got that.

16 I regard it as most inappropriate for these Congress
17 persons to do this and I think we ought to respond to it.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Would you read the letter?

19 MR. AGRESTO: I will discuss this--

20 (Simultaneous discussion.)

21 MR. BERNS: Leaving all the references to the
22 particular-- Dear Mr. Berns: We wish to express our strong
23 support blah, blah, blah with particular reference to the--
24 the second paragraph makes one reference after another to the

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. BERNES: It is just filled with bleeps.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MR. KINGSTON: Would it perhaps be an advantage to
4 defer discussion of this to closed session and we could also
5 make-- shouldn't we have copies of the letter to circulate
6 to all Council members? I gather some Council members did
7 not receive this letter.

8 MS. : I didn't want it.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. AGRESTO: I see no reason why, if Council feels
11 a collective letter should be written that a collective
12 letter shouldn't be written.

13 MR. KINGSTON: Let's hold discussion of this issue
14 then for closed session. We will also-- if one of you will
15 lend us a copy of your letter, we will see that it is
16 duplicated and teh Council members have a copy. All right.
17 Other comments or questions about the Appropriation Request
18 and Reauthorization?

19 All right, two weeks ago many of you did meet here
20 to discuss the 1987 fiscal year budget request for the
21 Office of Management and Budget.

22 In the open session, we will talk about the
23 general principles. Mr. Kennedy will report on that meeting.

24 FY 1987 BUDGET PLANNING

25 MR. KENNEDY: About half of the Council members were

1 present at that meeting and I suspect, therefore, that this
2 discussion is partly for the benefit of those of you who were
3 not present and you would like to-- might have some questions
4 about it.

5 In your folder, dated August 1 is a copy of the
6 minutes, and if you read through that you will have the budget
7 plan for Fiscal Year 1987.

8 I think that some of that material was also cir-
9 culated by mail earlier. The general issues that were
10 discussed at the budget meeting included the following: the
11 use of Treasury funds in the various divisions; the matter of
12 evaluation of programs and of the results of grants, both on
13 a quantitative and a qualitative basis.

14 And you will notice in the section of those minutes
15 relating to Fellowships and Seminars, in the middle of page
16 two, Mr. Agresto directed the divisions and fellowships to
17 prepare a report for the Council summarizing participant
18 assessments of seminars, staff comments, and site visits
19 and evaluation reports of seminar directors.

20 There was also some discussion about the differences
21 among divisions an ability to fund applications rated good
22 or very good as opposed to those rated excellent and as we all
23 know, there is considerable difficulty in determining the
24 meaning of these terms or in explaining our usages of them.

25 There was an interesting discussion of the political

1 aspects of the budget planning. Some of the programs in the
2 Endowment have organized constituencies, others do not.

3 The Endowment thinks of the program as divided into
4 five divisions or six divisions if we add Preservation.
5 Congress has traditionally thought of the Endowment as working
6 in three areas; that is, states, general programs, and every-
7 thing else in various academic divisions.

8 So, there is always, I think, been some tendency
9 for the Congress to want to divide up the funding in
10 thirds, whereas the Endowment's position has generally been
11 that each of the five divisions should have approximately
12 equal (inaudible). And that was discussed.

13 There is relatively little change in the procedure
14 or forming of the budget or the results of the budget.
15 Perhaps it is not time for major rethinking since we are
16 expecting the appointment of the new Chairman.

17 I would draw your attention to the planned increase
18 of stipends in the Summer Stipend Program and Summer
19 Seminars, \$3500.

20 There was discussion as to whether or not the
21 stipends for independent fellowships should also be raised.
22 They were raised last year, and it was reported that the
23 present amount is rather high compared to the other Federal
24 programs. So, it seems inappropriate to raise it any
25 further at this time.

1 I will try to answer any questions. I will refer
2 them to Mr. Cherrington or other knowledgeable people. Are
3 there any? We can't talk about dollar figures. Yes.

4 MR. KINGSTON: Rita.

5 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: On page three of the
6 enclosures, I wonder--- I wonder is that-- it is under
7 Roman numeral three, the second paragraph: some Council
8 Committee members expressed concern about the level of
9 multi-year commitment to research divisions.

10 Staff replied the division is bringing in lasting
11 and long term commitment situation under control. Was there
12 any more specific answer that was made?

13 MR. CHERRINGTON: The Research Division had many
14 GM offers out, perhaps too many. Blanche and Rich have done
15 a great job as I mentioned yesterday in meeting these offers,
16 projecting in the '86-'87 how these offers could be met.
17 I don't have my numbers here, but we think that there will be
18 no problem in doing this.

19 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Perhaps the (inaudible) of
20 giving more specific answers.

21 MR. CHERRINGTON: All right. What is your exact
22 question?

23 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: How much of the budget is
24 committed to the -----?

25 MR. CHERRINGTON: Rich, did you--

1 MR. EKMAN: We first became aware of the dimension
2 of this problem a few months ago. We estimated that we
3 had a little more than \$1 million of potential extra commit-
4 ment within fiscal 1985 then we had originally planned for
5 and again estimating close to \$2 million looking ahead to
6 fiscal '86 that we might not have planned for.

7 Now as we have gotten further along in the fiscal
8 year and have gotten a better fix on these figures, it looks
9 as though both figures are somewhat smaller. We still don't
10 know exactly how much.

11 What we have done to get control of the question
12 is really two things. First, we have a much better tracking
13 system of grants as they come in and when they are likely
14 to need to be matched.

15 And second, we are much more cautious about making
16 gifts and matching offers that may come back a year or two
17 or three from now to haunt us so we won't have this problem
18 for more than this and the next fiscal year.

19 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

21 MS. KERR: On page two of the agenda or is it
22 page-- oh, no page one, the bottom of the page and the top
23 of page two. There was, at least I raised a question, after
24 it was, I think indicated, correct me if I am wrong, that in
25 the Education Division they are going to try to go away from

1 two year or from multi-year commitments. Is that correct?

2 And I just wanted to have it recorded that that
3 has some effect on the number of applications, the counting
4 of applications if, in fact-- or we might want to find out
5 if it has an effect. I think it does and I just wanted to
6 re-include that or include that in the minutes.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?
8 There being none, we will move to the next item on the agenda.

9 MS. RHOME: (Inaudible)

10 MR. KINGSTON: Yes.

11 MS. RHOME: We have just been given a number of
12 papers which we have just received which include letters and
13 things that have been written that we ought to absorb.

14 I am having difficulty absorbing the material that
15 is given and responding and hearing everything that is going
16 on.

17 I understand past commitments to time and problems
18 in that area, but if it would be possible since we all come
19 in a day early to have gotten some of these materials the day
20 before, it would have been helpful to me to be able to make
21 some comment.

22 MR. KINGSTON: I understand your point and we will
23 indeed try to get as much of this material to you the day
24 that you arrive.

25 MS. RHOME: Thank you. You are (inaudible) about

1 getting materials to us.

2 MR. KINGSTON: In this particular instance, of course,
3 the meeting was exactly two weeks ago today so there would
4 be no way of mailing it to you with the assurance that you
5 would receive it. Very good.

6 The next item on the agenda is the discussion
7 about Institutional Endowments and the policies and procedures
8 of the agency.

9 This discussion is in response to a specific
10 request from council members at the May meeting. You
11 received a general descriptive paper and presumably you have
12 discussed this at your Committee meetings as well.

13 We can either discuss the issue now or if you
14 wish in terms of your Committee reports, we can raise it.
15 Whichever you choose.

16 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask
17 permission to make my-- the first part of my report at this
18 time because it bears directly on the subject you just raised,
19 and I fear that if you proceed with the discussion before I
20 make my report that my report will be completely snowed.

21 So, if I may make my report.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Of course.

23 INSTITUTIONAL ENDOWMENTS AND APPLICATION REVIEW

24 MR. RITCHESON: This is a report from the General
25 Programs Committee, open session. During that session, we

1 received a report from the Division Director on recent
2 staff activities including staff travel.

3 Since the last meeting of the National Council, the
4 staff of the Division has made a number of trips for the
5 purpose of monitoring and evaluating projects, counseling
6 prospective applicants and representing the Division at a
7 variety of conferences and professional meetings.

8 The Committee was pleased to hear of these efforts
9 on the part of the staff, particularly those in the area of
10 project evaluation.

11 We next discussed Tom Kingston's memorandum
12 concerning institutional endowments. The following motion
13 was made concerning this matter: the Endowment should not
14 take institutional means into account in the evaluation of
15 applications, although this can be a consideration in the
16 determination of the level and type of funding awarded.

17 For example, we would consider it appropriate to
18 award matching funds rather than outright funds to an
19 institution with significant fund raising capabilities.

20 Three members of the Committee voted to support
21 the motion; Marcus Cohn abstained from the vote pending the
22 formulation of the recommendations made in Wednesday's
23 Challenge Grants Committee meeting.

24 That concludes the report, Mr. Chairman.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Do you wish to comment further?

1 Would the other Committee Chairs wish to report the con-
2 sequences of their discussions?

3 Do I sense, Charles, that this is-- you are forming
4 this as a motion before the full Council?

5 MR. RITCHESON: Yes, that is a motion which my
6 Committee recommends. That is, the Committee on General
7 Programs recommends.

8 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Would you restate the
9 motion on it.

10 MR. RITCHESON: The Endowment should not take
11 institutional means into account in the evaluation of appli-
12 cations although this can be a consideration in the
13 determination of the level and type of funding awarded.

14 That is the motion. A kind of gloss would state
15 we would consider it appropriate to award matching funds
16 rather than outright funds to an institution with significant
17 fund raising capabilities.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Is there a second?

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: This is, I take it, is entirely
20 consistent with the original memorandum. There is nothing
21 inconsistent about it.

22 MR. RITCHESON: I interpret it to be consistent.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: Entirely consistent.

24 MR. ALLEN: The motion originated within our
25 Committee from the prospective of wanting to state clearly

1 what present practice is so that we don't launch into the
2 discussion for a point of ambiguity.

3 MR. KINGSTON: Other further comment or question?
4 (No response.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, I will call for
6 a vote. I am sorry, yes.

7 MR. KASS: Since the original memorandum indicates
8 that the Challenge Grants Program might be an exception to
9 the general policy, I think there ought to be some report
10 from the Challenge Grants people as to how they regard this
11 motion.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Marcus, do you want to comment?

13 MR. COHN: Yes. Well, I won't comment, but can I
14 read the report itself which deals with the subject?

15 In its open session, the Committee turned first
16 to Tom Kingston's memorandum on institutional endowments and
17 the review of proposals.

18 In Challenge Grants, of course, an institution as
19 part of its application to NEH-- pardon me-- may request
20 funds to build an endowment whose income would be used for
21 the purposes of the humanities.

22 The fiscal implications and policies governing the
23 deployment of existing endowments an applicant institution
24 may also become a factor in the review of such proposals.

25 Since a major purpose of our Challenge Grants is

1 to strengthen the long term financial stability of institu-
2 tions whose missions and programs are important to the
3 humanities.

4 During the course of our discussion, some members
5 of the Committee expressed the hope that we would continue
6 to recognize the impact an NEH Challenge Grant can have on
7 the smaller less financially secure institution while still
8 retaining our primary commitment to the quality of an
9 institution's application and plan for a Challenge Grant.

10 The Commission concluded its discussion by
11 reaffirming the basic policy expressed in the memorandum in
12 the memorandum in regard to the evaluation of Challenge
13 Grant proposals, namely that quote "the fact that an
14 institutution's endowment might be large by relative
15 standards should not alone constitute either a positive or
16 a negative influence upon the competitiveness of the applica-
17 tion. What matters is how the endowed funds are and would
18 be employed", close quote.

19 Then, I will finish the entire report. It is
20 another paragraph or two but that deals with this particular
21 problem of Challenge Grants.

22 The Committee then heard a report on the current
23 cycle of applications that would be submitted for considera-
24 tion at our next meeting.

25 253 proposals, an increase of 13 percent from last

1 year, requesting nearly \$116 million had been received by the
2 program.

3 Roughly half of the applications are from colleges
4 and universities; another third from museums and historical
5 organizations with the remainder distributed among research
6 libraries, public libraries, university presses, media
7 stations, advanced study centers, professional associations,
8 and other not-for-profit organizations in the humanities.

9 The Committee expects to have an interesting and
10 I must add a very busy and long meeting in November.

11 The staff also presented some suggestions for the
12 modification of the Committee book which we thought would
13 indeed clarify the presentation of the information we need
14 to make our recommendation and also make the materials easier
15 and faster to read.

16 MR. KINGSTON: Okay, now the issue of course is
17 the motion before you. Walter.

18 MR. BERNES: The Research Division---

19 MR. KINGSTON: Would you speak up a little bit,
20 Walter, please?

21 MR. BERNES: The Research Division, of course,
22 discussed this although not at such lengths as we did in
23 the Challenge Grants and there was a general awareness of
24 course that the Challenge Grants Division was more likely
25 than any other division to take into consideration the size

1 of the endowments of the institutions and so forth and so
2 on.

3 The opposite extreme was the Research Division where
4 such factors-- or such a factor plays practically no role.

5 On this particular motion it strikes me-- I was
6 I suppose reassured by your assurances that the motion as
7 stated merely expresses present policy.

8 My inclination, however, is to think that that is--
9 it is stronger than present policy or it overstates present
10 policy. If you would like-- Charles, could you read the
11 motion again because I think I would have to vote against
12 it as stated.

13 MR. RITCHESON: I think the Committee's intention
14 to draft a motion that captures the logic of the memorandum.
15 We also believe that we are not departing from established
16 practice.

17 This is a policy-- a motion that states policy
18 and we tried to do it in the simplest form possible. The
19 Endowment should not take institutional means into account
20 in the evaluation of applications although this can be a
21 consideration in the determination of the level and type of
22 funding awarded.

23 MR. KINGSTON: If I may, Walter, when the words
24 level and type of funding come into play, I would consider
25 that to apply specifically to gifts and matching of funds and

1 to challenge funds.

2 MR. BERNES: Well as I say, the Research people
3 have no objection to that whatever.

4 I am not sure that Challenge Grants ought not to
5 object to this, or for that matter-- the subject was brought
6 up by Rita Ricardo-Campbell yesterday. She complained of
7 the vagueness of one statement in the memorandum. I will
8 read that one statement.

9 This is in your memorandum, Tom. If a proposed
10 project seems to embrace activities, evaluate towards
11 normally would expect the institution to conduct successfully
12 in any case, the applicant usually receives a negative
13 recommendation. That was, she thought, vague and wanted
14 some explanation and the best explanation was provided
15 by George Kennedy who suggested that if some division of the
16 Endowment were to receive an application from Yale University
17 in which Yale said it was renewing its interest in the
18 humanities and was asking for \$7 million in order to establish
19 a Department of English, ---

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. BERNES: -- that this would-- we would expect
22 Yale to have provided its own funds for a Department of
23 English and we would not, therefore, fund.

24 On the other hand, if it were a very poor insti-
25 tution that was expressing an interest in enhancing its

1 program in the humanities, would we not take the poverty of
2 that institution into consideration in making the grant and
3 would we not be prevented from doing so if this motion were
4 to be adopted?

5 MR. RITCHESON: I don't think so. I will read the
6 motion once more.

7 The Endowment should not take institutional means
8 into account in the evaluation of applications although this
9 can be a consideration in the determination of the level and
10 type of funding awarded.

11 I would say that it goes straight to the issue that
12 you have raised, Walter, and I would observe further that
13 I think we are in absolute harmony with the Challenge
14 Grants report which I heard Marcus Cohn read.

15 MS. SILVERS: I wonder too, (inaudible) Walter is
16 and ask for an interpretation of how Charles' language would
17 apply to the program in the Education Division which is
18 called fostering coherence throughout an institution.

19 One of the judgments, appropriately made, in
20 assessing those applications is something called a commitment
21 of the institution.

22 The commitment of the institution is at least in
23 part assessed by references to resources committed by the
24 institution to the proposed project and to the humanities
25 in general.

1 It is very difficult to interpret the commitment
2 by reference to the resources committed to the humanities
3 unless you take into account what resources exist in the
4 institution.

5 Therefore, it seems to me that there is an appro-
6 priate reference to available resources and I am sure that
7 Charles' resolution does not mean to rule out that kind of
8 consideration. But, the language could possibly be interpreted
9 that way.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

11 MS. RHOME: In my area, I am using an example, if
12 you go to the opposite example of the institution that has
13 absolutely nothing and very few resources, then I think we
14 have to read this again rather carefully to be sure that that
15 isn't excluded because of the-- the institution or group of
16 persons who are applying for a grant who have a very good
17 project and are in dire need of assistance in that regard
18 do come into some kind of consideration, I would think.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Bill.

20 MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I think part of the
21 spirit of the motion is precisely to declare that the dire
22 need does not enhance the rationale.

23 MS. RHOME: No, no. We are saying that---
24 (Simultaneous discussion.)

25 MR. ALLEN: Right, let me finish. I think I

1 understand what you are saying.

2 MS. RHOME: Sure.

3 MR. ALLEN: But, the spirit of the motion is to
4 declare that where you have a good project, the justification
5 for the project is not enhanced by the dire need. The dire
6 need is an additional circumstance which may very well make
7 that project stand out as compared to one equivalently
8 rated from an institution that does not have dire need, but
9 that decision as to whether the two institutions are equally
10 meritorious or equally necessitous, is a decision which is
11 made post facto, that judgment that you have made that this
12 is a good proposal.

13 So, I think it is fair to say that what is declared
14 here is that means testing is not a way to arrive at
15 judgments of centrality in the humanities or excellence in
16 the humanities.

17 And that the memorandum we had seemed to rely
18 precisely upon that kind of a distinction. Let me say one
19 other thing which I think is important and the reason that
20 we wanted to try to distill present practices, not just in
21 Challenge Grants because I have seen it elsewhere when we
22 come to talking about funding levels for specific grants.

23 We go through this process however unacknowledged
24 and one of the things that I think we need to bear in mind
25 is that in many institutions-- I will not say all academic

1 institutions certainly, but in many, the encouragement of
2 individuals and divisions to pursue grants is a calculated
3 part of fund raising on an institutional level so that this
4 is not a really academic question.

5 The question is, are we playing the game with those
6 in academic institutions who use indirect support and other
7 forms in order to raise funds to increase their ability to
8 operate and at that level are we going to judge them based
9 on whether they need our assistance in their fund raising,
10 or are we going to judge their proposal?

11 MR. AGRESTO: I think if this resolution does pass,
12 that the complete discussion would be appended to it, of
13 course and that this resolution as Mr. Allen says, means
14 to distill-- it is a distillation of present policy and that
15 would be interpreted as a codification of present policy and
16 that the authoritative interpretation of it would be this
17 discussion and Tom Kingston's memorandum.

18 If, in fact, it does pass, I think that is the
19 spirit in which it was offered and the spirit in which it will
20 be interpreted.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Louise first and then Mark.

22 MS. KERR: Given other discussions we have had
23 about the nature of our evaluation procedures as opposed to
24 our policy, the application of our policy, it would seem to
25 me that at some point the Council would want to if not have

1 to give some consideration the way that this is going to be
2 applied and in comparison with the way it has been applied.
3 If this is, indeed, a codification of the-- what we have
4 intended in the past, then it would seem to me that at least
5 theoretically we would want to blind judge proposals.

6 I mean, ideally, in the abstract you would want
7 to not know what institutions you are dealing with except to
8 look-- I mean, so that if you can't go that far, then
9 clearly knowledge of the institution to some degree affects
10 what Anita calls our matter of taste and judgment.

11 MR. BERNES: I would ask, Charles, to answer this
12 question. Supposing we have applications from, on the
13 one hand, MIT or Cal Tech, and on the other hand some
14 much less distinguished polytechnic institution.

15 In both cases, or in all three cases, the applica-
16 tion is for funds to build a humanities program or to
17 enhance a humanities program.

18 Has it not been the policy of this Endowment
19 to look more favorably upon the application from the less
20 well endowed and less pretigious polytechnic institution
21 and the policy of this Endowment to say to MIT, you have
22 got enough dough, build your own department-- Yale or
23 whatever-- of each. Has that not, in fact, been the policy
24 and how does this resolution affect it?

25 MR. RITCHESON: I think practice and policy are

1 different items, Walter. It may have been practice. Policy
2 is another matter.

3 I mean, we are obviously trying to hammer out a
4 policy complication here now. I-- my own personal view is
5 that we should be institution blind when we view-- when we
6 consider an application. That is the first step. Is the
7 application worthy of support no matter whether it comes
8 from Cal Tech which needs help with humanities, by the way,
9 or from some less well endowed institution.

10 Is the project, is the proposal sound? Is it
11 worthy of support? Is it excellent? That is the first step.

12 And, as the second step, I think, as the motion
13 indicates, we may legitimately take into account the means
14 of the institution which-- from which the proposal comes.

15 That is the way I would proceed and I believe that
16 is the interior logic of this motion.

17 MR. BERNES: May I just-- I don't understand
18 Charles to say this, that assuming that the program itself
19 has merit, we are more likely, under this motion, more likely
20 to make the grant to the less distinguished polytechnic
21 institution than to MIT.

22 MR. RITCHESON: Who has the right or duty to do that?
23 Whoever uses or wishes to grant latitude to, in the
24 judgment making process. We use the verb can for example,
25 not must.

1 I think these things-- I think these things have
2 to be-- it is very hard to generalize the sort of answer that
3 you seem to require, Walter.

4 MR. BERNES: The question to be specific is
5 if we were to allow this vote, this becomes the official
6 policy of the Endowment, would that prevent the kind of
7 action that I am suggesting that we have in fact made in the
8 past and probably intend to do in the future?

9 MR. RITCHESON: You mean favor less well endowed
10 instituttions--

11 MR. BERNES: Yes.

12 MR. RITCHESON: --over those better endowed. Is
13 that what you are saying?

14 MR. BERNES: Yes, would this motion prevent that?

15 MR. RITCHESON: No.

16 MR. BERNES: You see, I think that is in fact what
17 we have done.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Louise first.

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: We in our Committee, I must say,
20 considered the point precisely, sentences quoted by Walter.
21 What panel and staff and council members do consider as a
22 matter of course is a justification for a project, vis-a-vis
23 an institution's mission and resources.

24 If the proposed project seems to embrace activities
25 that we would normally expect the institution to conduct

1 successfully in any case, the application usually receives
2 a negative recommendation.

3 (Simultaneous discussion.)

4 MS. HIMMELFARB: No, all I wanted really was to
5 quote those two sentences from the memorandum that Walter
6 has already called to our attention.

7 When I asked you, Charles, whether your motion
8 was consistent with this memorandum, that is really what I
9 had in mind. That is what our Division was very much
10 concerned with.

11 MR. RITCHESON: The answer to that is absolutely
12 yes.

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: Yes, but it seems to me that the
14 wording of this memorandum is in fact more precise and
15 more pertinent, now that I am hearing this discussion, than
16 your motion and that your motion is, in fact, rather
17 confusing the issue rather than supporting it.

18 MR. RITCHESON: Well, it was attempting not to.

19 MR. HIMMELFARB: I am sure that was not the
20 intention, but I just want to register that is the impact
21 it had.

22 The first point you made, that is the first step
23 which every application has to undergo, the test of quality,
24 this goes without saying. I mean, no one is quarreling
25 with that this memorandum takes that for granted and so on.

1 We are all very much concerned about the second
2 step. And I think in relation to that second step, this
3 memorandum is, in fact, more precise.

4 MR. AGRESTO: Could we make a----- Could
5 the resolution simply read that it will be policy to say the
6 policy of this Agency on this issue is stated clearly in
7 the memorandum of Tom Kingston dated August first.

8 MR. RITCHESON: I don't think the memorandum is
9 all that clear.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: Rita.

12 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you. It seems to me
13 that the argument is between giving grants primarily on the
14 basis of excellence versus some countering of needs or
15 type of welfare grant or whatever.

16 Let me point out that past policy certainly has
17 not taken need as much into consideration otherwise why would
18 we have given sizable grant money to an institution
19 with \$115 million endowment very recently, an extraordinary
20 high amount?

21 I think-- I am not against, by no means, of giving
22 money to places with endowments. I thought Cal Tech was a
23 very fascinating example, having had a relative that was
24 teaching there in the humanities I may point out when they
25 let go almost all their humanities professors because their

1 endowment funds are all earmarked-- and I put this word in--
2 to the hard sciences.

3 So you have to look into the endowment and how it
4 is earmarked before you are going to consider it in the
5 fashion that has been mentioned. Mere dollar size may be
6 confusing.

7 There are earmarking of endowment monies in most
8 institutions. I, personally I am for excellence. I think
9 I lean toward support of Charles' proposal here because it
10 reinforces excellence in the grant and not on the mean side
11 that the desire of Cal Tech not to support its humanities,
12 I don't know much about this, but it is obvious that the
13 top administration, they could have gone out and tried to
14 raise more money, maybe not successfully, they could have.

15 But basically, Cal Tech could use help in the
16 humanities in their program. I presume they have a very
17 large endowment earmarked for hard sciences.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Let me take two more comments and
19 then let's call for the vote. First of all, Anita.

20 MS. SILVERS: Well, I was actually going to argue
21 to defer the vote just a bit for the following reasons.

22 I suspect that we are in some agreement about what
23 we would like to say. I think that our disagreement is about
24 what draft actually says what we want to say.

25 If there is this much concern about language,

1 indicating that I-- a number of council members find the
2 proposal subject to more than one interpretation. I think
3 that it would probably be prudent to wait a bit and try to
4 draft something that is more precise.

5 I have not tremendously much faith in council
6 adopted policies being interpreted-- in fact, even being
7 remembered to exist over a prolonged period of time.

8 The Education Committee, yesterday, had to deal
9 with what apparently was adopted by the Council as policy
10 in 1970 or '72 and was immediately forgotten. So, we are
11 a bit hesitant about adopting language we are concerned
12 with and then amending this entire discussion as to ways of
13 interpreting that language.

14 I agree with Bill that there ought not to be
15 a means test. I am not sure that we have eliminated all
16 interpretations under which we-- there would not be an
17 exquisite means test, but there might be a covert means
18 test and that is what I think we are aiming for, to eliminate
19 the means test.

20 I want to say what I think part of the problem
21 may be. When Charles speaks about the language and his
22 understanding of the language, he speaks as if there are
23 different steps in the decision procedure.

24 First to staff, according to which we decide that
25 this is an excellent humanities project and then an

1 inseparable step in which we decide that this is the sort
2 of thing that the institution ought to be doing or not,
3 whether it has the funds.

4 MR. RITCHESON: (inaudible) right and wrong
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. SILVERS: It sounded to me as if that is the
7 way the discussion comes out.

8 My sense of how panels operate-- and Charles, I
9 think that may well be the way we ought to operate, but
10 panels tend to mix these things up and when I read the
11 reports of panels, we often-- I often find that panels
12 bring these considerations up helter skelter. So--

13 MR. RITCHESON: The panels don't really deal with
14 some of these points that you are raising, Anita.

15 MS. SILVERS: In the Education Division, they do
16 deal with precisely this and this has to apply to all the
17 Divisions. The Education Division discussions often center
18 around whether or not the institution should be doing this
19 any way and whether it can afford to do this.

20 MR. RITCHESON: Well, I am absolutely foreign to
21 general programs. We don't do it that way.

22 MS. SILVERS: Well, we in policy-- the Endowment
23 has a policy and I am wondering whether we must, at this
24 very moment, make a decision about the language or whether
25 we could try and rewrite it.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Frances and then if we can vote on
2 that, the motion before the floor.

3 MS. RHOME: My comment--

4 MR. KINGSTON: All right, I am sorry, I didn't see
5 you.

6 MS. RHOME: My comment came from our Challenge Grant
7 Committee. When we-- we really went into this subject at
8 great length and one of the things that we determined was
9 that the memorandum as presented to us by Tom Kingston, did
10 indeed reflect what we were presently doing.

11 We did indicate that we thought that there should
12 be sensitivity, a continued sensitivity to institutions who
13 may be in need.

14 And what we were thinking about was the fact that
15 the poor institution often does not have the advisory
16 staff who can write the very slick and very good request.

17 In fact, we have in our past sent help to some of
18 our colleges in the south who needed assistance in this
19 regard in order to write a better proposal. So, we were
20 concerned.

21 Our general comment was that the memorandum was
22 written-- was defining what we were presently doing when we
23 were merely requesting that there be a continued sensitivity.

24 MR. KINGSTON: All right. I should stipulate by
25 the way, my name is on it because I sent it out. The way

1 that we wrote it, in fact, was that we pulled together all the
2 Division records as an editorial board to review drafts and
3 senior staff and so on.

4 This is not-- I don't want to take either praise
5 or blame for the language. Phil.

6 MR. SCHAEFER: As one who didn't get a letter from
7 the Congressman, (inaudible), I just wanted to say what I
8 thought was perfectly clear has become perfectly obscure and
9 therefore, we are all engaging-- we are all a little bit
10 anti-semantic.

11 I think that all--

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. SCHAEFER: I think that as Walter indicated,
14 we do not have a means test. Obviously, some of our biggest
15 grants to the New York Public Library for example, it
16 personifies excellence.

17 But what we are trying to say simply and these are
18 not welfare grants, we are not working for the Department of
19 Welfare, but we only have a limited amount of money and the
20 amount of funds with which we have to dispense have really
21 been held in check.

22 And I think, in fact, you have two proposals of
23 equal quality. Hasn't it traditionally been the policy of
24 the Endowment to help where there really is the need?

25 The healthy institution that doesn't have the

1 ability to fund the project-- I don't, I mean the motion
2 that Charles is offering seems to be clear and true about
3 any language, it doesn't preclude or exclude anything.

4 MR. KINGSTON: I am going to call for the question.
5 If there are no objections, let us take a vote on the motion
6 that is before the floor.

7 Charles has asked that-- perhaps it would be best
8 if you would just read the resolution.

9 MR. RITCHESON: The Endowment should not take
10 institutional means into account in the evaluation of
11 applications although this can be a consideration in the
12 determination of the level and type of funding awarded.

13 MR. KINGSTON: All council members in favor of the
14 motion, would you raise a hand.

15 (A show of hands was seen.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed to the motion.

17 (A show of hands was seen.)


18 MR. AGRESTO: Hands up again for the nos.

19 (A show of hands was seen.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: The Board is 10 to 10.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. KENNEDY: And the vote is pretty much by the
23 two sides that you think.

24  MR. KINGSTON: The motion does fail, therefore,
25 for lack of a majority vote. The context of the discussion

1 becomes a matter of record.

2 MR. AGRESTO: This decision, I understand, to have
3 changed no policy on the part of the Endowment nor would it
4 had the vote gone the other way changed policy.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Perfect example of democracy.

7 MR. BERNES: Could I ask you to formulate a motion
8 for the next meeting of Council that, in effect, does what
9 Charles would like you to do, but reflects the concerns of
10 those of us who voted against the motion.

11 I think that really could be done. I started to
12 do it right here but I don't trust myself to do it. I am
13 saying essentially what I need to say.

14 I think most of us who voted against this would
15 like to have voted for Charles' motion, but had some
16 reservations and-- just restate the motion for the next
17 meeting of Council.

18 MR. AGRESTO: If you make a motion, it is necessary.

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: Couldn't we simply endorse--

20 (Simultaneous discussion.)

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: So, why not just endorse the
22 memorandum which to many of us is--

23 MR. BERNES: Well, all right except that Charles
24 made the point the memorandum is somewhat vague. Tom
25 suggested he wanted to accept neither praise nor blame.

1 I think he is trying to get out of the blame actually.

2 (Simultaneous discussion.)

3 MR. SCHAEFER: I make a motion that we endorse
4 Tom Kingston's memorandum and if this doesn't (inaudible)
5 we can come up with a subsequent memorandum next time.

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: I second it.

7 MR. KINGSTON: That has been moved and seconded.

8 Rita.

9 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like to speak
10 against that. I didn't criticize it only as vague, but it
11 is internally inconsistent.

12 MR. KINGSTON: Okay. Are you ready for the question
13 on this? Those in favor of the motion as stated, that is to
14 endorse the memorandum as you see it, would you raise your
15 hand.

16 (A show of hands was seen.)

17 MR. : (Inaudible)

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Please hold the hands up once more.

20 (A show of hands was seen.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed to the motion to
22 endorse the memorandum?

23 (A show of hands was seen.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: We must have some abstentions.

25 MR. : I abstain.

1 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Motion carries.

2 MR. : What was the vote?

3 MR. KINGSTON: Ten to eight to two. Ten for,
4 eight against, and two abstentions. The motion carries.

5 The-- I am sorry.

6 MR. DILLE: The people who voted for that were
7 consisting of two groups, those who thought the vagueness of
8 the language was offset by the certainty of the meaning and
9 those who thought the confusion of the meaning was offset by
10 the decision of the language.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. We have had that
13 discussion.

14 Before we proceed to the Committee reports, George
15 Kennedy would like to address the issue of election of the
16 Vice President of the Council, an action that the Council
17 will have to consider in November.

18 MR. KENNEDY: Tom slipped and called it Vice
19 President of the Council. Walter will correct me if I am
20 wrong in saying that John Nance Garner once described the
21 Vice Presidency of the United States as not worth a bucket
22 of warm spit.

23 MR. BERNS: That is the published. (Laughter.)

24 MR. KENNEDY: That is the published.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. KENNEDY: The Vice Chairmanship of the Council
2 is somewhat less indignity than the Vice Presidency of the
3 United States so that it perhaps defies description in
4 print or out of print.

5 One does get to go to fewer funerals, I would say.
6 What does the Vice Chairman do? He has certain specific
7 functions and I guess some dates early in my two year term,
8 I consulted several times with Chairman Bennett and sought
9 to influence his judgment with probably no more success than
10 the rest of you experienced in that task, but he did consult
11 me too a few times on various matters.

12 The Vice Chairman has been the Chairman of the
13 Budget Committee. There is no legal provision for this
14 office. It was created by the Council and its duties are
15 those determined by the Chairman of the Endowment and by the
16 Council.

17 The most important one has been the Chairmanship
18 of the Budget Committee. That does involve one additional
19 meeting a year, though about half the members of the Council
20 ordinarily attend that anyway.

21 It does not seem to be a reasonable objection that
22 someone might not wish to serve as Vice Chairman on the
23 grounds that it is too time consuming. If anything, I have
24 found it less time consuming than it was to be, for example,
25 a member of the Research Committee.

1 I have also served as Chairman of the Jefferson
2 Committee. I am not sure that that was consistently true
3 in the past of the Vice Chairman. I think that that is a
4 good association of duties in that the Jefferson Committee
5 is also a matter that lies within the jurisdiction of the
6 council.

7 Some previous chairmen-- vice chairmen have been
8 Chairman of the Challenge Grants. That depends, I think,
9 in large part on the kind of background they bring to the
10 appointment.

11 Mr. Kern (?) the nominee for the Chairman of the
12 Endowment owes his fame largely to having recommended his
13 job be abolished. I thought of imitating that, but it does
14 seem to me that at perhaps this point in time in particular,
15 there might conceivably be some need for this position. We
16 don't know what the future is going to bring and some council
17 member with considerable experience on the Council might be a
18 valuable communications link between the Council and the new
19 Chairman.

20 Now, the Vice Chairman has customarily been chosen
21 for a two year term from among those Council members who are
22 moving into the final two years of a six year appointment.

23 That would mean that if I am not ill informed that
24 the following people would, on the basis of precedence, be
25 considered candidates. George Carey, Lawrence Chickering,

1 Gertrude Himmelfarb, Ellis Sandoz, Walter Berns, Rita
2 Ricardo-Campbell, Peter Stanlus (?), Jeffrey Hart and James
3 la Force (?).

4 There is, however, no reason why you---no consti-
5 tutional reason why you have to restrict yourself to that
6 choice if you do not wish to do so.

7 So, one question would be to ask whether the
8 candidates should be limited to the people in that category.
9 The other matter that you would need to consider is the
10 procedure that would befall.

11 What happened last time was that early in the fall,
12 all members of the Council were asked to make a nomination--
13 make nominations for Vice Chairman and they were asked to
14 clear those nominations with the person they were nominating
15 so that-- I suppose that was intended to save the time and
16 effort and conceivably in some circumstances save embarrass-
17 ment.

18 Then, the candidates nominated and who had agreed
19 to accept if elected were voted on by written ballot in the
20 November 1983 Council meeting.

21 I think there are very-- you couldn't agree to
22 adopt to that same procedure again. I think there are
23 various options, perhaps some simplification that might be
24 tried.

25 First of all, could I raise the question then of

1 whether or not you wish to limit the number of candidates to
2 those who will be essentially in their senior two years on
3 the Council?

4 MR. COHN: I would certainly agree with that. It
5 should be limited.

6 MR. KENNEDY: Hearing no opposition to that, I
7 assume then that it is agreed that the candidates, people
8 that are eligible are George Carey, Lawrence Chickering,
9 Gertrude Himmelfarb, Ellis Sandoz, Walter Berns, Rita
10 Ricardo-Campbell, Peter Stanlus (?), Jeffrey Hart and
11 James La Force(?).

12 The second question is, do you wish to proceed in
13 the same method as last time? Each council member could
14 nominate one or conceivably more or I suppose themselves as
15 candidates but would be expected to discuss the matter with
16 the person nominated and have that person's permission.

17 The nominations would go into the Office of the
18 Chairman of the Endowment. They would then be circulated so
19 that you would know in advance of the meeting.

20 I think we ought to set a deadline. We thought of
21 that procedure -- what, October 15, all nominations to be made
22 by October 15th. Do you wish to follow that procedure?

23 (Responses of yes were heard.)

24 MR. KENNEDY: Hearing no opposition, I understand
25 that that is agreed to.

1 Will you, therefore consider various candidates and
2 submit, discuss with them, contact them by telephone or by
3 letter and send by the 15th of October to the Chairman's
4 office the name of any nominees.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, George. We will move into
6 the Committee reports on policy and general matters. Some of
7 these reports we have already had in part.

8 We are going to, in the order of reporting here,
9 switch the State and General programs position, but we will
10 begin with State programs and Mr. Hart.

11 STATE PROGRAMS

12 MR. HART: The meeting open to the public began
13 with the introduction of new staff members and the announce-
14 ment that (inaudible) would be with me in the--- on the
15 one year on arrangement by the Simmons College.

16 One of his principle tasks will be the conduct of an
17 intensive study of the various projects developed by the
18 State councils.

19 New guidelines and preparations of biennial pro-
20 posals were reviewed, discussed and approved. There then
21 ensued the announcement and description of (inaudible)
22 and forthcoming events including the program in connection
23 with the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, June to
24 December 1985, television documentary "Lost in Time, Early
25 Alabama Indians", a conference on southern literature in

1 in New Orleans, October 9-11, 1985; and the (inaudible)
2 projects.

3 All of these are manifestly of high quality and
4 interest. It was noted that the Federation of State Councils
5 will be celebrating the 15th anniversary of state programs
6 on September 12. After that, the meeting was closed to the
7 public.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Are there questions
9 or comments?

10 (No response.)

11 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move to
12 the report from the Education Division. Roland Dille.

13 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

14 MR. DILLE: We began by noting staff changes. I
15 will mention two. John Hale has left to enter a Master of
16 Public Administration Program-- for a great many years with
17 the NEH.

18 And I mention Eugene Garver because he (inaudible)
19 to go to Minnesota.

20 The staff members reported on their site visits
21 during the summer and they reported that they have a high
22 level of satisfaction with the kind of rigorousness that they
23 saw with very few exceptions and with the promise of
24 influence on teachers and students.

25 We asked the staff to consider ways in which

1 successful projects, new approaches, whatever, can be given
2 greater publicity. It wasn't really publicity we were talking
3 about so much as ways in which states, institutions,
4 consortia, school districts, can be encouraged to replicate
5 our successes.

6 We also asked the staff to prepare reports for us
7 on its outreach efforts; that is, those efforts through
8 visits to campuses and conferences to acquaint people with our
9 programs and to help those institutions perhaps less
10 sophisticated in preparing grants and developing-- develop
11 the kind of skills they need to make proposals.

12 The declining number of panelists drawn from the
13 state colleges and universities-- a category not including
14 the large universities was pointed out.

15 A little later at the closed session, but I mention
16 it now to foster coherence, the declining number of awards
17 to such institutions was noted and still the declining
18 number of applications from such colleges was noted. No
19 attempt to trace relationships among these (tape interrupted
20 by mechanical difficulty.)

21 You can be thinking of the way in which the names
22 of panelists are secured. We did ask too that our Division
23 meet with the academic administrators of the insti-
24 tutions. I have since learned that the Research Division
25 has recently done that. And then we entered the closed

1 session.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, Roland. Now are there
3 any comments or questions?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will move to
6 the report from the Fellowship Division. Ms. Himmelfarb.

7 FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

8 MS. HIMMELFARB: (Inaudible) you may remember that
9 at the last Council meeting we were told that the
10 Scholars Program was to be moved from the General Programs
11 to Fellowships. It seemed to be appropriate.

12 We have also then welcomed the present officer of
13 Young Scholars, Lou Branson (?) as well as (inaudible)
14 Colson (?), the new Assistant Director for seminars and
15 Program Officer for the current (inaudible) seminar.

16 We were also informed of staff changes though they
17 are rather less welcome, of the imminent departures of four
18 staff members who had been serving under IPA appointments,
19 Ron Hertzman, Assistant Director for Seminars, Rick
20 Emerson, Program Officer for the College Teachers Seminar
21 Program, Martha Hodiak (?) and Marsha Jacobson(?), both
22 (inaudible) administrators.

23 I very much regret losing these four people who
24 have greatly attributed to the work of the Division over these
25 past years and we wish them very much success as they

1 return to academic life.

2 We then reviewed the scheduled programs that come
3 before us for the next three meetings. We discussed and
4 we endorsed the memorandum from Mr. Kingston explaining NEH
5 policy on institution endowments and application review.

6 We decided that that memorandum did, in fact,
7 reflect the actual practice of the Division and was as
8 adequate as any written statement ever is in describing
9 what it is one does and what it is one should do.

10 I think to expect more precision in an area like
11 the humanities is really quite unrealistic.

12 We also reviewed the general principles guiding
13 the endowments budget submission for fiscal year 1987. We
14 then moved on to some policy issues which we had reserved
15 for this meeting.

16 We approved a future program of bicentennial
17 seminars for law professors to be held in the year 1986 as
18 part of the Endowment's special initiative to commemorate
19 the bicentennial of the Constitution.

20 These seminars would offer law professors the
21 opportunity to read, write, and reflect in the company of
22 other law professors on the historical and philosophical
23 origins and intentions of the American Constitution.

24 We noted that these seminars are particularly
25 appropriate and welcome since so many of the law schools are

1 in fact not dealing with this subject at all so far as we
2 can see.

3 The Committee approved a policy limiting individual
4 applications from Directors of seminars to only one of
5 the summer seminar programs; that is, either the College
6 Teacher Seminar Program or the Secondary School Teachers
7 Program.

8 When the Secondary School Teachers program was
9 instituted a couple of years ago, it was felt that denying
10 the possibility of dual application would be detrimental
11 to the new program --- that to limit the applicants
12 from the potential applicants to that program.

13 But now that the program has become established and
14 successful, we feel that this policy is no longer necessary.
15 The duplication led to problems later when we were faced with
16 the reality that some people had been accepted as Directors
17 in both programs and the process became unnecessarily
18 complicated and it is no longer valid.

19 We also propose to return to the policy of allowing
20 prospective participants to the Secondary School Teacher
21 Program to apply to only one seminar in a given year.

22 For the first two years in our program, this had
23 been the policy. As an experiment this past summer and in
24 response to requests from teachers, applicants were allowed
25 to apply to two seminars.

1 The many applications which were accepted in the
2 two seminars, unduly complicated the selection process for
3 both applicants and directors. The directors urged us to
4 return to the original rule and we are now doing that.

5 We also approved a policy to allow participants in
6 the Secondary School Teachers Program to reapply to the
7 program in three years. Thus, the 225 participants in the
8 original 1983 program would now be eligible to apply again
9 to the '86 program.

10 There are two qualifications to this. One, other
11 things being equal, preference will be given to new applicants
12 and two, as a general rule, no more than a quarter of the
13 members, one quarter of the members of any seminar, should
14 be former participants.

15 We also agreed to review and reconsider this
16 policy in the light of the experience of the program in the
17 next several years. Thank you.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you. Are there any comments
19 or questions about the Fellowship program?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: Then we will move to the report from
22 the Research Division. Walter.

23 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

24 MR. BERNS: For the second consecutive Council
25 meeting, the Research Division actually had some public

- 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

3
4
5
6
7

8
9
10
11

12
13
14
15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 the field, we had comments from outside members of the public,
2 constituents of the Research Division, and he reported that
3 the response of these people was extremely praiseworthy
4 and laudatory.

5 The guidelines were widely praised for being clear,
6 simple, and flexible and the new alignment of programs was
7 praised because it does seem to indicate that the Endowment
8 is more willing to be flexible in responding to ideas.

9 There was, however, we learned from Mr. Ekman
10 consensus on certain points, namely that the emphasis on
11 national impact should be softened since research grants
12 often have an international impact, and that the term
13 significance is ambiguous in its meaning and it should be
14 rephrased throughout the document so as not to give the
15 impression that novice projects of an esoteric nature
16 would no longer receive funding.

17 In addition, the Committee suggested that the
18 draft section on the Publication (inaudible) Program, that is
19 on page 12 of the draft guidelines, which contains the
20 phrase, quote "priority shall be given to grants not
21 previously funded by the Endowment." That should be
22 omitted.

23 Nevertheless, the Division's present practice of
24 weighing previous Endowment support in applications
25 recommended by the panel against the factor of excellence

1 should be continued.

2 The Committee felt that the revised guidelines
3 were extremely well written and that the Division should
4 be encouraged to get the guidelines quickly published out of
5 fiscal year 1985 administrative funds and Mr. Ekman suggested
6 by September 1st he would be ready to send this over to be
7 processed, and that the guidelines will finally be
8 adopted and printed.

9 So much on guidelines. Blanche (?) provided
10 an update on Matching Fund requirements for the Division
11 in fiscal year 1985, described the activities of staff;
12 the questions that would attribute to the success of these
13 programs and the aggression displayed and we had some
14 questions as to what that aggression meant and I guess it
15 means a lot of telephone calls around to various people.

16 At any rate, she reported that the Division has
17 gained control of the over-commitment situation in Federal
18 Matching commitments.

19 The Committee responded favorably to the aggressive
20 approach the Division is taking to managing the call
21 of matching funds and suggested that methods be researched
22 for forecasting matching needs in any given year for projects
23 that are long term.

24 One final word on this subject. This is really an
25 indication of success and is not really a problem and we are

1 assured that the thing is really under control.

2 Finally, the Division received a list of prizes
3 and honors that books resulting from Research Division Grants
4 were awarded in 1984. It is an impressive list, it really
5 is. And may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Endowment
6 could exploit it for publicity and impress various skeptics
7 holding political office, for example, about the value of
8 expenditure of Federal funds on somewhat esoteric projects.

9 At that point, we asked the members of the public
10 to leave and we went on to other business. Actually, we
11 had a cup of coffee.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: You did have members of the
14 public there because you had members of congressional staff.

15 MR. BERNES: There was some question in my mind
16 as to whether they were asked-- should have been, whether
17 they were members of the public. There was no way that they
18 could stay on in the closed session.

19 MR. AGRESTO: They are members of public insofar
20 as they are not staff. They can, in fact, stay on for closed
21 session. There were others there. Someone from the
22 Humanities and Arts (?) was also there as well.

23 MR. BERNES: (Inaudible) to stay (inaudible) be in
24 closed session?

25 MR. KINGSTON: We simply include that in--

1 MR. AGRESTO: Congressional staffers may be present
2 at closed sessions except at those times when we are dis-
3 cussing the President's budget that we would be preparing to
4 send to the Hill.

5 I think, I don't know, maybe there are exceptions.
6 At that time, they may not be present. They cannot be asked
7 to be present.

8 Also, they may not be present for the (inaudible)
9 election discussion or specific things relating to their
10 constituents.

11 Those are the only three exceptions to the rule,
12 but they may be present at other times.

13 MR. KINGSTON: We did say at this time that we
14 would also discuss, in terms of overall policy, so-called
15 long term grants, multi-year grants in the Research
16 Division. Rich, it might be helpful for you at this
17 point to describe the programs in which we do have multi-
18 year funding and what kind of funding that is.

19 MR. EKMAN: Several of the categories-- grant
20 categories in the Research Division typically make multi-
21 year grants which are themselves small fragments and projects
22 whose natural lives can go on 10, 20, and 30 years.

23 For example, in the Addition's category and the
24 Tools category where the papers of famous individuals or
25 where the preparation of dictionaries occur. Those projects

1 naturally might engage a group of scholars for a generation
2 or longer.

3 The problem for the Endowment has been that although
4 the rules of the review process give the Endowment the right
5 to make an independent decision each time a proposal comes
6 along, in fact, once the momentum is going on a project that
7 does have a long natural life, it is complicated to make
8 either recommendations that would lead to changes in the
9 design of a project or decisions that would stop the project
10 in midstream while things are straightened out or stop it
11 all together.

12 And our ambivalence in trying to balance the
13 immediate concerns and criteria of the review process in
14 looking at a particular application in this larger context
15 which is a problem related to particular categories such
16 as tools and additions is a problem we have been wrestling
17 with.

18 MR. KINGSTON: I think that in terms of Rita's
19 question, the general procedure in the Centers for Advanced
20 Study comes under question. Again, we won't discuss this
21 specific application until Closed Session, but the general
22 policy that governs centers, I think, would be helpful for
23 you to delineate.

24 MR. EKMAN: Some other long term projects where
25 there need to be a great deal of lead time in order for the

1 applicant to prepare.

2 We have taken a number of things into account in
3 trying to plan when to consider renewal application. For
4 example, Centers for Advanced Study which applied for a
5 block of fellowships which they then regrant to individuals
6 do need quite a bit of lead time in order to get word first
7 to the Endowment, they have the funds in hand, then launch
8 a publicity proecess to tell the scholars that the grants
9 are available, pursue those applications, consider them and
10 make the selections, announce them in time for those fellows
11 to arrive at the center. So that--

12 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I think that we need to
13 leave this to the Closed Session (inaudible).

14 MR. KINGSTON: As you wish. We will continue the
15 discussion in Closed Session.

16 Are there other comments or questions about the
17 report from the Research Division?

18 (No response.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will have the
20 report from the General Programs now.

21 GENERAL PROGRAMS

see p33

22 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, the General
23 Programs report has been made already.

24 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you.

25 MR. RITCHESON: Did you nod off when I made my

1 report?

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. : The rest of us didn't.

4 MR. KINGSTON: I certainly didn't have (inaudible)

5 MR. RITCHESON: Only the subject.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Only the subject. Thank you.

7 Challenge Grants, Marcus. Anything to add to--

8 MR. COHN: I gave my report too. Do you want me
9 to read it again?

10 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry.

11 MR. COHN: Do you want me to read it again?

12 MR. KINGSTON: No thank you.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. KINGSTON: That was an invitation to add
15 anything.

16 MR. COHN: There is one thing that I would like
17 to add and that is our indebtedness to the staff. They
18 were very, very helpful. They were very cooperative-- no,
19 not normally cooperative, but extraordinarily cooperative and
20 led us through a maze of different things that a great number of
21 us who don't deal with it on a day to day basis would have been
22 completely lost but for their guidance.

23 MR. KINGSTON: Thank you, that was a good group
24 of people working on it.

25 Under Tab H, under the Approval section, there are

1 three emergency grants that were approved funding. Here in
2 Open Session, I invite any questions you may have about the
3 actions. Louise.

4 MS. KERR: I have a question and possibly a policy
5 question also. In the one-- you can't say anything specific,
6 but there was one for fellowships and I wasn't clear on
7 whether or not one was given and one not or two.

8 MR. KINGSTON: That is in disapprovals. I can
9 state generally in that particular instance there was an
10 applicant-- there were-- the same applicant applied for two
11 different kinds of projects and could accept only one.

12 That is a technical--

13 MS. KERR: I think--and I also couldn't tell from the
14 statement-- you might want to clarify the statement because
15 I couldn't tell whether there were two grants given to the
16 same project.

17 MR. KINGSTON: No.

18 MS. KERR: Okay. Okay, the other-- the other
19 question is for-- for your consideration has to do with the
20 first one under education and it is, I think, a policy
21 question.

22 It seems to me, on the face of it, that the reason
23 listed is one which, under-- at the committee level might
24 very well have been responded to with a deferral for getting
25 further information. And I don't know whether or not it--

1 this is very cryptic so it is very difficult to tell--

2 MR. AGRETO: Was it disapproval or--

3 MS. KERR: It was disapproval.

4 MR. KINGSTON: We can't get to the-- we can
5 talk specifically about disapprovals in Closed Session but
6 we are addressing right now the three approved emergency
7 grants.

8 MS. KERR: Oh, well I am not going-- I wasn't going
9 to say anything more than that except that as a matter of
10 policy could we-- could it be discussed as to what are the
11 options at that point.

12 I mean, obviously that is one option and in that
13 case, in the first case--

14 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, okay, well we can come back
15 to that in Closed Session.

16 MS. KERR: Okay.

17 MR. KINGSTON: The disapprovals can be discussed
18 in Closed Session.

19 If there are no other comments about the approved
20 emergency grant requests, then you should look beyond the
21 emergency grants disapproved to the three approved grants
22 that were consequence of the reversal of Council recommenda-
23 tions which have been described before.

24 Any comments there?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, let us adjourn
2 for all of 11 minutes. Report back at 11:00-- I am sorry.
3 Robert Laxalt.

4 MR. LAXALT: The Council recommendations on
5 disapprovals will be discussed in Closed Session?

6 MR. KINGSTON: That is right.

7 MR. LAXALT: All right, fine.

8 MS. KERR: Did you-- I didn't hear you say anything
9 about the 20th anniversary celebration. Could that be said
10 in public?

11 MR. AGRESTO: I mentioned---I am sorry. I guess
12 I didn't mention it because I mentioned it yesterday at the
13 breakfast.

14 There are in the works a number of conferences,
15 meetings and so on. We expect that there will be a celebra-
16 tion held for us at the New York Public Library early in the
17 fall.

18 We expect that the Newbury (?) Library is also
19 going to put together a meeting, celebration, commemoration
20 for us.

21 We are still waiting to hear from the White House
22 on our request for-- we have a double request there. A, for
23 the designation of a week in September to be National
24 Humanities Week and also a request that Council members,
25 members of the Endowment, members of the public be invited

1 to the White House for-- we have left it open, for lunch, for
2 tea, some kind of celebration.

3 I tend (inaudible) to be optimistic about these
4 matters. I think things are moving smoothly along that--
5 along those lines. Obviously the President's illness
6 troubles us somewhat, but that is still--- it is over at the
7 White House. They have letters from us, they have had calls
8 from us. They know what we want and we are just waiting for
9 the answer.

10 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments for Open Session?

11 MS. CRESIMORE: Tom, I wanted to ask just a few
12 minutes ago, but-- could I request that all policy papers
13 that come before various Committees for consideration be
14 automatically be sent to me at least if not us without having
15 to request them.

16 Right now, you send a memo and ask us to request
17 them, but I just feel that maybe this should be sent
18 automatically.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, anyone in fact--

20 MS. CRESIMORE: I don't know if anybody else feels
21 this way or-- but I--

22 MR. KINGSTON: We have already been reporting it
23 as having been so requested. If you don't receive them, let
24 me know.

25 MS. CRESIMORE: I don't know whether the other

1 members felt that way or not.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Certainly anybody who wants to
3 work out that arrangement, it is fine.

4 MS. CRESIMORE: Sometimes there is a time delay
5 and we don't-- you know, it takes a little time to get them.

6 MR. KINGSTON: All right, we will close the meeting
7 to the public at this point. We will still reassemble at
8 11:00 o'clock for Closed Session.

9 (Whereupon a recess was taken.)

10 C L O S E D S E S S I O N

11 MR. KINGSTON: If you will take your seats, we will
12 begin.

13 We are in the agenda at "L". This still entails
14 discussion of the actions that are presented under Tab
15 "H" of the agenda book.

16 We are now open to discussions of applications--
17 emergency grant applications that were disapproved.

18 Anita.

19 MS. SILVERS: I speak in regretful memory of the
20 baroque (?) and I speak for-- to put this in the record.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Okay. Anita is speaking now about
22 reversal of Council recommendations.

23 MS. SILVERS: Right.

24 MR. KINGSTON: This is a--

25 MS. SILVERS: This is the proposal from the

1 University of Oklahoma for a summer institute on music for
2 (inaudible) and (inaudible) at the time of Louis IV, but--
3 I don't take this to be a woman's issue even though it has
4 something to do with music.

5 I want to tell you a little bit about this because
6 I think it brings up a procedural dimension about the time
7 line between Council discussion and the Chairman's decision.

8 This was a proposal that was rated very, very high
9 as I recall, by panelists and subsequently to the panel
10 discussion-- if I understand the Education Division pro-
11 cedures, an outside reviewer's letter was received which
12 raised some points about the impact on education.

13 The Council Committee knew that some question had
14 been raised in the pre-Council meeting about this proposal,
15 but I think the Council Committee was not clearly focused
16 on all of the details of that objection.

17 Now I do also want to point out that this was
18 a summer institute in the area of music history and criticism
19 and that is an area with which we have, perhaps, less
20 experience than with some of the more familiar disciplines
21 like history and literature.

22 John's is convinced he was right in doing this and
23 the reason that is given in the Council book, although it
24 may not be the entire reason, is that the proposal failed
25 to demonstrate how the program-- the Institute would translate

1 directly into more effective classroom teaching. We noted
2 yesterday, having gone through the file, that the proposal
3 failed in that regard no more than other proposals which
4 were not rejected.

5 So, part of the problem may be that we have less
6 experience in how institutes deal with this subject matter
7 and involving performance are translated into classroom
8 activities than we do with institutes dealing with familiar
9 texts.

10 John also, I guess, is convinced that further
11 information-- that is, an attempt to demonstrate that the
12 program at the institute does translate into effective
13 classroom teaching, that further information would not have
14 been relevant and that indicates that there is a (inaudible)
15 decision rather than a matter of demonstration.

16 When I read-- when I read the Council book, I
17 raised the question if the need for more information had
18 occurred during the panel discussion, or had occurred during
19 the staff discussion prior to panel discussion, a typical
20 although not always engaged in practice, would have been to
21 ask the applicant to provide more information.

22 I don't know whether the applicant could have
23 provided satisfactory information or not, but it is not un-
24 heard of that a request for further information go out.

25 In this case, because of the time line, because

1 the Council Committee did not see a need for this, and
2 because we don't typically, I guess, after the Council
3 Committee ask for more information, no such requests for
4 additional information was made.

5 The reason that I am bringing this up is for two
6 reasons. First of all, as it happens, this was a unique
7 proposal. It cannot be done in another year because it has
8 to intercept with the existence of a baroque music workshop
9 at Lake Tahoe which I think may be one of the other problems
10 about this.

11 And the baroque music workshop does different
12 composers in different years and next summer is (inaudible)
13 and that is why they were going to do this.

14 But, in general, I have a little bit of concern
15 where it seems as if further information might make the
16 difference. The criticism is that there is not enough
17 information, they failed to show that-- they failed to
18 demonstrate-- in fact, they didn't address this question very,
19 very thoroughly.

20 I guess I believe they could have addressed it
21 thoroughly and could have been convincing. And, the question
22 comes up so late in the procedures that the Council has
23 already recommended funding; therefore, a deferral presumably
24 cannot occur and therefore, in the absence of information,
25 it appears to be appropriate action, to turn the grant down.

1 Ordinarily, that might not be a problem because
2 a resubmission could be made in this single case. Now,
3 it is true that this group is likely to apply for other
4 composers in other years, but I keep insisting that some of
5 this is a matter of taste and some of us are very devoted
6 to (inaudible).

7 MR. AGRESTO: Thank you. Anita and I have
8 discussed this. Thank you, by the way, that was I think a
9 very clear and fair summary of the-- of your side.

10 MS. SILVERS: I didn't mention Bruce Springsteen.

11 MR. AGRESTO: I wouldn't want the Council to think,
12 however, that these things are simply tossed off at the
13 Chairman's office. It seems to be a matter of his tastes.

14 When-- prior to the previous Council, we had to--
15 we reviewed the proposals before the Education Division and
16 Bruce Kearns was then Head of the Planning and Budget, asked--
17 looked at the file and thought that there were substantial
18 problems with the proposal, asked that it be reviewed by
19 a Council Committee. A Council Committee would in fact read
20 the proposal and give their judgment on it.

21 Independent of Bruce, there were-- at least one
22 letter of one outside review on the file who made what I
23 thought to be an extremely compelling argument as to why this
24 is not an appropriate conference for us to fund.

25 After reading that review, after talking it over,

1 we then called up after we got the Council vote last time,
2 we called up-- oh, and meanwhile, John Andrews is in fact
3 putting together questions for his staff on this that we
4 think need to be answered. Those questions are in the file
5 and the answers are in the file.

6 The questions, I think, you can read them if you
7 want but they are in great detail and seem to be very
8 appropriate and penetrating questions.

9 After Council voted for this the last time, I
10 asked to see this and a number of other grants as you know,
11 and I thought the questions that were raised by the outside
12 reviewer, by Bruce Kearns, by John Andrews were still, still
13 important and at that point, still I thought unanswered
14 questions.

15 Myself, Tom Kingston, and John Andrews spent the
16 whole day reading this file, going through it and finally
17 unanimously deciding that we did not think we could commit
18 \$100,000, \$60,000 some odd thousand dollars to this project
19 which we had so many great doubts about.

20 I have no doubt, however, that it is a project that
21 is on a subject that is both lovely and timely and important,
22 but this project-- we, in other words, we did this in a
23 thorough, in a conscientious manner as possible and I don't
24 think any further outside review would have answered the
25 question-- the questions that we are asking.

1 Nor, we should realize, (inaudible) in the Chair-
2 man's office negative requests-- negative resolutions from
3 Council do I hold them up and say well, let's send them out
4 for more and more review.

5 There comes a time when you just have to make a
6 decision and I thought this was a time when we had to make
7 a decision on this.

8 MS. SILVERS: John, I think what I am trying to
9 focus on, still, having gone through the file and gone
10 through the discussions, the distinction for me is whether
11 the issue was a failure to provide information because what
12 was of concern to me was that I could find no letter in which
13 they were asked to provide information, or whether they had
14 made an argument that was not a good argument.

15 It seemed to me that I could not find in their
16 application or in any of the correspondence any request to
17 him to make extraordinary arguments about the effect and I
18 did not find, therefore, their arguments-- extraordinary
19 arguments for these matters that one could not have been
20 judging that they made bad arguments.

21 The question is, were they required to make these
22 arguments and it is not the case that we require all our
23 successful institute applicants to make these arguments in
24 great detail.

25 That is pretty much what I am focusing on and I do

1 understand that you think that they could not have made a
2 good argument, that they do not have a case.

3 MR. AGRESTO: And also that the questions were
4 different both in magnitude and kind than some of the
5 questions that were made and have been asked of other
6 applicants.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Are there other questions or
8 comments? Bill.

9 MR. ALLEN: I want to make one comment about this.
10 I wasn't here in May. Of course, I was uninformed about
11 this proposal, but I was in town at the time of the Budget
12 Meeting and talked with Anita and John about it and dis-
13 covered there was something to look at.

14 So, I merely request to review the proposal as
15 well, go through it very clearly and --- and I was --
16 I must say, Anita, rather impressed with the fact that I
17 found the 20 teachers almost (inaudible) to what was a
18 beautiful research purpose that had been designed.

19 To that extent, I suppose I was persuaded at least
20 that there was a material defect not in the conception of the
21 activity, but in the conception of how it was to be
22 qualified within one of the agencies, divisions of the
23 Endowment.

24 That raises an interesting question from the point
25 of view of timeliness that you raised because it means, of

1 course, that if this were a research conference rather than
2 an institute under the Division of Education, giving the
3 time factors they in fact would still qualify for some kind
4 of consideration even after that last decision.

5 MS. SILVERS: I think we can pursue this more a
6 minute.

7 It couldn't have been a research conference because
8 it needed too much money, because they had to have those
9 people there for a longer period-- hang on-- but I -- in my
10 former life, I was a person who helped organize these kinds
11 of conferences for philosophers and they were (inaudible)
12 back to improved teaching.

13 But the persons who were writing them, never thought
14 when they were inexperienced in writing these applications,
15 that anyone could doubt that introducing teachers to the
16 newest research could fail to improve teaching. Experienced
17 persons know that one must demonstrate that.

18 I would have been happy had I found correspondence
19 in the file that mentioned this to the applicant.

20 MR. ALLEN: Let me explain that that is not what
21 I am speaking to.

22 MS. SILVERS: Yes.

23 MR. ALLEN: I am speaking to what I think is, at
24 least, an extraordinarily high density or ratio of staff
25 involvement as to the number of teachers involved which I

1 don't deny for a moment that research conferences can have
2 impact on teaching.

3 But, this one was so extraordinarily rich, that it
4 seems to me inappropriate-- it seems to me the level of
5 research and the point in time of their research was such
6 that they needed to focus among themselves.

7 And I know that-- in looking at the budget that
8 perhaps as much as half of it, and perhaps more, is accounted
9 for by the attempts to include the 20 teachers rather than
10 just to bring these people together for the research purpose.

11 So, the budget needs to be substantially lower if
12 they come as a research conference, not necessarily fitting
13 all the guidelines but very close to it and giving them
14 participation from Stanford and Oklahoma, they perhaps
15 could have pulled it off as a research conference.

16 I don't know-- it appeared to me that that was the
17 real problem.

18 MS. SILVERS: See, this is part of what always
19 worries me a little bit about how we slice up the Endowment
20 and whether it might not be more cost effective. Forget that
21 we think that research and education are two different
22 divisions and do a single application of funds rather than
23 think that we must in education do one thing and we must
24 do the research first or pay for it essentially if not twice
25 one and a quarter times.

1 But, the budget was too high. Who gets the
2 busses?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. KINGSTON: Are there other comments about
5 other actions departing from Council recommendation or about
6 the emergency grants that were disapproved? Bob Laxalt.

7 MR. LAXALT: I would like to say,--- not to
8 be antisemetic--

9 MR. KINGSTON: Excuse me, could you use-- Richard,
10 could you use your mike? That is the recording one.

11 MR. LAXALT: I would like to raise a question on
12 the rejection by the Chairman on the Nazi antisemetic films.
13 I am curious as to the-- what was lacking in procedures
14 and use, it would seem to me, the students of propaganda
15 a very valuable archives. Was that anti-semantic, I didn't
16 know that?

17 MR. SCHAEFER: No, it created a furor.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. AGRESTO: This proposal caused somewhat less
20 of a difficulty at the Chairman's level when we reviewed it.
21 It did not receive the kinds of grades that the one we just
22 discussed received which really did have much higher ratings.

23 This had substantially mixed reviews, as I remember.
24 The problem was that it-- not that it created the archives
25 but that it took the archives, took the films from the

1 archives interspersed into that film, film of Nazi propaganda
2 films, interspersed for classroom use to counter weight
3 arguments.

4 (Inaudible) was something like this. Look at this
5 film. Look what they are doing in this film. Isn't this
6 terrible what is going on in this film?

7 Here is the technique they are using for propagating
8 antisemitism in Germany. Look at this film. It went on--
9 it was not, it was not what it seemed to be when you were
10 reading it here last time.

11 We are talking about-- it was not a collection,
12 an archives of Nazi propaganda films, but rather was an
13 attempt to -- I hate to use the word doctor-- but an attempt
14 to splice, cut and add commentary to film and then use that
15 for classroom use.

16 There were other-- there were other problems with
17 it as well, but that is what I remember now. I haven't gone
18 back over the file now in three months. Yes, I would be
19 more--

20 MR. LAXALT: Had there been any examiners or
21 reviewers who viewed the film?

22 MR. AGRESTO: Oh yes, there were. I am sure there
23 were a panelists, reviewers on that board who had some
24 background in films.

25 MR. LAXALT: And their reaction was the same?

1 MR. AGRESTO: I would have to look again and see.

2 MR. SCHAEFER: ----the procedure by which the
3 material is prepared for the classroom, some questions
4 were raised about how exactly the film be made available.
5 so that really doesn't address what you just said.

6 MR. AGRESTO: The first part does. What I was
7 speaking to or mentally speaking to was the first part, how
8 they were adapting or changing material for classroom use.

9 There was a question as to whether these things
10 were just going to be produced and kept in house or would
11 others have access to it which was another question that we
12 raised.

13 But the first one was the one that I remember
14 now as being--

15 MR. : (Inaudible)

16 MR. AGRESTO: They could certainly resubmit this.
17 This is unlike the (inaudible) proposal, this is not time
18 bound. This archive exists and they in fact can come in
19 with a revised proposal and they will get consideration
20 from us.

21 MR. KINGSTON: Other questions or comments about
22 the disapprovals?

23 (No response.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: All right, we-- Louise (?).

25 MS. HIMMELFARB: (Inaudible) that is the one I was

1 (inaudible). I am not clear on how-- what is our procedure
2 (inaudible) something like salary? (inaudible) may not be
3 (inaudible) in the future may (inaudible)

4 MR. CHERRINGTON: There---there was no governing
5 policy. You remember that the (inaudible) moved from research
6 into fellowships.

7 At the time, there was no policy that precluded
8 an individual from submitting two applications to two
9 different projects. We would not give that individual two
10 travel grants, but there was nothing to preclude application
11 for two.

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: I am just--I am just curious as
13 to whether or not in some respect even though I wouldn't
14 approve of -- that she is being victimized by our mistake.

15 That is to say, that if she in fact-- if she had
16 been given two from two different divisions --

17 MR. CHERRINGTON: She was being offered support for
18 both projects. She could only take support for one. She had
19 to choose which grant she wanted to take. This is a technical--

20 MS. HIMMELFARB: I know that, but does that-- did
21 she know that ahead of time?

22 MR. CHERRINGTON: You are asking did she know
23 ahead of time that she would choose one over the other?

24 MS. HIMMELFARB: That she had-- she could only take
25 one? What is the policy about them both?

1 MR. CHERRINGTON: Oh, no.

2 (Inaudible)

3 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Does that mean that that
4 is accepted?

5 MR. AGRESTO: That means that you have advised
6 the Chairman that you want to consider the suggestion.

7 MS. HIMMELFARB: Where does it talk about that?
8 Because, the rating is, after all, only one factor in the
9 overall panel recommendation so that in order to complete
10 that you would also have the report of staff and also the
11 report of the Committee.

12 MR. AGRESTO: And also the outside reviewers.

13 MS. HIMMELFARB: And the outside reviews. So, in
14 other words you would have to recapitulate the whole process.

15 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: That may be so, but
16 we are dependent on those panel members which I think could
17 be beefed up and one of the things I asked at yesterday's
18 meeting and I don't know whether it will be raised again,
19 but I asked it be raised was that it be asked if every
20 Council member could make recommendations to the panels that
21 do the reviewing.

22 I did know that we might be sought for such
23 things. I have a lot of people that I can recommend and
24 have already named one.

25 It seems to me the quality of the panels may be a

1 question to some degree and that maybe people such as
2 yourselves could make recommendations and beef up those
3 panels.

4 Now, admittedly, they are only one point of view--
5 review of the panelists, but that is really basically a
6 shorthand, I hate to say, description of how at least six
7 people or five people look at it.

8 And it (interruption in tape) turned over by the
9 Chariman, then we might have a little bit of curiosity
10 about it and that is the way-- I flagged some that I thought
11 I had curiosity--

12 MS. HIMMELFARB: But the point is that it is
13 the panels recommendation. If the panel-- it was the entire
14 process of review.

15 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Then what is the-- we are
16 doing here. (Inaudible)

17 MS. HIMMELFARB: Including staff review and
18 Committee review.

19 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I agree, but it is
20 essentially a rubber stamp. If we can't depend on the panels
21 to some degree to flag (noise on tape), to flag (inaudible),
22 how are we to tell (inaudible) who are (noise on tape).

23 MR. AGRESTO: Let me see if I can resolve it in
24 the following way. There was a time in the past when a
25 Chairman's overturn was simply-- there was a time when

1 they were written down. Then after they became written
2 down, no explanation was given.

3 Then about --- around that time, we started
4 writing explanations as to why the Chairman would in fact
5 overturn.

6 I have no objection to having an explanation;
7 if the Chairman overturns something, why. I would object
8 just to hinging it on the panel vote, but I will certainly
9 see to it that these write-ups will say such things as
10 questions were raised at pre-Council, the panel was
11 unanimous in the praise of the project; Council members
12 raised issues about this; reviewers had questions about it;
13 the Chairman overturned.

14 I have no problem-- so long as I think it is
15 perfectly appropriate for me to give you full information.
16 I have always wanted to give full information, but I think
17 in this case if you want more information, I will give you
18 all the information rather than selective information.

19 MS. : (Inaudible)

20 MR. AGRESTO: Excuse me?

21 MS. : Not partial.

22 MR. AGRESTO: Partial information would be worse
23 than none in this.

24 MR. KINSTON: All right. We will proceed to the
25 discussion in Closed Session of the fiscal year 1987 budget

1 planning. Mr. Kennedy.

2 FY 1987 BUDGET PLANNING

3 MR. KENNEDY: We will take up again the document
4 dated August 1st, the budget.

5 After the considerable number of pages, some of
6 which are numbered and after a while the numbers give out,
7 in the appendix, you will come to the first page of statistical
8 information. It looks like this.

9 It is the summary budget giving, for each Division,
10 the 1984 final and the '85 estimate, '86 request and then
11 the three requested: the proposed funding levels for the
12 1987 budget.

13 The first of those proposed levels totals at the
14 bottom of the page, \$126 million, I might-- my impression is
15 a (inaudible) figure. We don't know that at present.

16 If any of you are not familiar with the term
17 Humanities Studies in the budget, that refers to contracts
18 and grants as they are known to us.

19 The Budget Committee went over these figures and
20 recommends them to you and if you agree to the Chairman as
21 the basis for budgetary planning.

22 If there are any questions, we will try to
23 (interruption in tape).

24 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions about the
25 financial details?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will proceed
3 to the reports from the specific committees noting that there
4 are some issues that we have deferred to discussion until
5 this time.

6 First of all, the report of the General Programs
7 Committee on the review of applications.

8 GENERAL PROGRAMS

9 MR. RITCHESON: Mr. Chairman, as the (inaudible)
10 approved the proposed budget for fiscal year 1987.

11 Applications occupy most of our attention in an
12 extraordinarily long and exhausting though very rewarding day.

13 I think that it was one of the best days I have
14 had on this Council in terms of (inaudible) and exchange
15 of ideas.

16 The Committee reviewed, at the start, 169 media
17 applications requesting a really staggering \$49 million.
18 On page one of the book, I refer you to the applica-
19 tion from (inaudible) projects, a one hour documentary on
20 the construction of a pyramid in ancient Egypt.

21 Pyramids are (inaudible) so that the staff
22 (inaudible) evaluation of the two previous programs in the
23 series, one called Castle and the other Cathedral.

24 Both were based, as is pyramid, on books by
25 David McCauley (?).

1 The evaluation was undertaken at 11 sites around
2 the country by a research communications (inaudible) in
3 Boston.

4 The Committee was pleased with the highly profes-
5 sional and detailed assessment which was also quite favorable.
6 Consequently, (inaudible) production of pyramid. We believe,
7 however, that the Endowment has demonstrated substantial
8 support in an important series and that the applicant should
9 not seek other sources of funding.

10 Thus, we recommend support--- outright support
11 and an increase in matching funds.

12 The Committee was not convinced that GN22527,
13 Visions of Social Order, page four, should be denied support.
14 The applicant requested funds to write 15 (?) scripts. The
15 proposal received a mixed rating from the panel and outside
16 reviewers and the staff recommended no support.

17 Bill Allen read the whole proposal. We had an
18 extensive discussion and then voted unanimously to provide
19 the funds to write scripts for two 30 minute programs.

20 We found the idea compelling and we want to see how
21 well they execute it.

22 On page seven, application GN22586, I note a recom-
23 mendation-- the panel recommendation to support scripting
24 only, but we engaged in extensive discussion due to
25 favorable reviews and a request for the script production

1 funds. The vote to accept the scripting recommendation was
2 three in favor with one abstention.

3 Also, application GN22594, Rights of Passage,
4 is really-- is a departure from normal practice. The
5 applicant, Learning in Focus, seeks support for a series
6 of literary adaptation for television of short stories
7 designed for teenage audiences.

8 We recommend support sufficient to provide full
9 support for production of one short story or matching funds
10 for up to four programs.

11 On page 24, you will find GN22579, Stillwell in
12 China, a request for funds to produce a documentary on
13 General Joseph Stillwell's experiences in China.

14 The staff proposed a scripting grant, but the
15 Committee by a vote of three to one, recommends no support.
16 The proposal was endorsed by the panel, but after lengthy
17 discussion, the Committee concluded that the Endowment
18 should not support a script that varied very little from
19 previous submissions.

20 Now, GN22580, on page 24, the Divine Comedy-- three
21 Committee members voted to support the staff recommendation
22 not to fund this request for scripting funds and there was
23 one abstention.

24 There was some rather facetious remark that at
25 least one Committee member thought the words had already been

1 supplied.

2 We also, at the request of a Council colleague,
3 paid special attention to GN22557. On page 22 of the motion,
4 which is found on page 22 of the motion, we debated the
5 merits of the proposal and voted to accept the staff
6 recommendation that no support be given.

7 Our consideration of these applications encouraged
8 considerable discussion of procedures and practices. We
9 urge the staff to seek aggressively-- a favorite word
10 today, apparently-- means to distribute television and radio
11 programs broadly, especially to schools and libraries.

12 We were encouraged to learn that the Division
13 is updating its catalogue of film, television, and radio
14 projects.

15 The media log lists each entry by discipline and
16 topic, thereby helping teachers, librarians and others to
17 organize programs by theme.

18 The staff undertook to explore other ways to
19 encourage secondary distribution. The Committee also
20 instructed the staff to re-examine phased funding of media
21 projects.

22 We turn now to humanities projects for adults.
23 Starting on page 28 of the motion are the applications in
24 humanities projects for adults.

25 The Committee approved the staff's recommendations

1 with one exception.

2 In the case of a planning grant application from
3 the Indianapolis Museum of Art, GP21270, page 29 of the
4 motion, the Committee noted the relatively favorable panel
5 vote and concluded that the criticisms raised could be
6 remedied in the course of planning.

7 Thus, we altered the recommendation from reject
8 to support for this project. We agreed further that the
9 applicant should be asked to address criticisms and any future
10 implementation requests.

11 We turn to humanities projects and libraries. In
12 the libraries program, starting on page 33 of the motion,
13 the Committee paid particular attention to applications from
14 Fisk University, GL20629, page 34, Ohio University, GL20643,
15 page 35, and Southwestern College, GL20651, page 36.

16 In this last case, a small college in Winfield,
17 Kansas, with a rare collection of material on Robert
18 Browning will present programs for citizens in that part
19 of northern Oklahoma.

20 The Committee was impressed and encouraged.

21 The Committee also discussed an application from
22 the Orange County Public Library, GL20642, page 40, which
23 was not recommended for support.

24 Although the Committee members accepted the staff
25 recommendation, they instructed the staff to work closely

1 with the applicant and encourage resubmission.

2 We turn now to the bicentennial applications which
3 are included in the separate draft motion in front of you.
4 Two applications drew our special attention and extensive
5 discussion.

6 I call your attention to GB20085, page 2 of the
7 motion, and GB20086, page 3. The Center for the Study of
8 Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California,
9 GB20085, proposed a three year program of research and public
10 activities on the bicentennial.

11 It received a mixed review from the panel with
12 ratings from excellent to poor, but the principle criticisms
13 focused upon the lack of specific plans for the second and
14 third years.

15 The Committee saw considerable merit in the pro-
16 posal and elected to recommend support for the first year at
17 an appropriately reduced level of funding.

18 All members of the Committee read the full pro-
19 posal from the American Federation of Teachers, GB20086
20 to conduct a research project and a conference on the status
21 and future of American Civic Education.

22 This engendered extensive and fascinating dis-
23 cussion. We questioned the practicality and appropriateness
24 of the proposal and whether democracy is a subject which can
25 be taught as mathematics or history can be taught.

1 Some members doubted further that a Government
2 agency should be funding this type of project arguing that
3 NEH should not impose or inculcate political principles.

4 The Committee voted three to one not to recommend
5 the proposal. All of the staff recommendations were
6 sustained.

7 Mr. Chairman, that is the end of my motion.

8 MR. KINGSTON: The motion has been received and
9 to act in accord with the printout here, is there a second
10 to the motion?

11 MR. GIBSON: Second.

12 MR. KINGSTON: All right, so seconded, comments,
13 questions. Walter.

14 MR. BERNES: I am moved to say something because
15 of the sums involved here, so-- all right, what happens after
16 you make a film of the early life of Catherine M. Porter(?).
17 Do we give it an outright \$312,000. What happens to that
18 film?

19 MR. GIBSON: What do you mean, what happens? What
20 is done to that film to distribute it?

21 MR. BERNES: Yes.

22 MR. GIBSON: All-- everybody in east Texas sees
23 it or what?

24 MR. BERNES: Pardon?

25 MR. GIBSON: Who sees that film? All television

1 programs produced by funds from NEH which must be
2 offered to Public Broadcasting within one year after the
3 project is completed.

4 Almost all of our films are aired, with very few
5 exceptions, on public television. In addition, a number of
6 them will be--- some of these are on cable television, some
7 public, which is rare but has occurred, others we will
8 use in schools-- in elementary and secondary schools and
9 finally (inaudible).

10 MR. BERNES: Okay. How many stations are likely
11 to show the finished film?

12 MR. GIBSON: I don't know that I can give you any
13 estimate of the number of stations, though as a general
14 practice as I stated earlier most are accepted by public
15 television and most stations-- the majority of stations will
16 pick up most of the offerings they make.

17 MR. COHN: There is a whole procedure for the
18 public television stations where they vote on and agree to
19 carry certain programs.

20 Normally anything which is funded by the NEH is
21 carried. That is not always true, but generally it is true.

22 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

23 MS. KERR: And most of them are carried by the
24 major markets so that the-- it is not like we are talking
25 about--

1 MR. COHN: Oh, yes.

2 MS. KERR: But I wanted to find out on the first--
3 page one, GN22447, the Post Office project. Is that the
4 Post Office?

5 MR. GIBSON: This Post Office or what?

6 MS. KERR: The U.S.-- United States Post Office?

7 MR. GIBSON: No, no, no, no, no. That is the name
8 that the film makers have adopted for their own group.

9 MS. KERR: (Inaudible)

10 MR. GIBSON: Yes.

11 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments and questions? Leon.

12 MR. KASS: Yes, could I ask for just a little more
13 comment on that proposal that you said was discussed on the
14 film Roosevelt and Churchill.

15 MR. GIBSON: The-- that-- excuse me, that project
16 was reviewed thoroughly by a panel in addition to our outside
17 reviewers. It is an exciting topic of the relationship
18 between Roosevelt and Churchill. They are doing the correct
19 one.

20 We would eagerly like to see something like that
21 produced. It is true we also have some funds in another
22 project on Churchill in the early war years, but that is not
23 relevant but I thought I would point that out to you.

24 In general, the panel and the outside reviewers
25 praised the scholarly research and scholarly content for that

1 film.

2 However, the professional film makers and other
3 media professionals whom we consulted were sharply critical
4 of the dramatic qualities and the ability of the script which
5 they have submitted to sustain the interest of an audience
6 for more than a few minutes.

7 It is in the area of improving the script or im-
8 proving dramatic qualities that the application would need
9 to be improved in order to get a favorable recommendation.

10 MR. RITCHESON: Talking heads.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MR. AGRESTO: I wouldn't (inaudible) in public
13 discussion. Could you clarify or elaborate on the
14 question Charles. I am not sure what you meant, speaking
15 of the AFP proposal that you couldn't teach democracy.

16 Surely you could teach the spirit of democracy,
17 principles of a democratic society, basic foundation of
18 democratic theory--

19 MR. RITCHESON: We are getting-- you are giving
20 inundations, John. You are getting footnote explanations
21 to go along, principles of. You have to find something
22 different.

23 We found the proposal vague for precisely the
24 reasons that you are now , perhaps unintentionally.

25 MR. AGRESTO: I just wouldn't want to have left the

1 discussion that you could not teach things related to
2 democracy.

3 MR. RITCHESON: What was that?

4 MR. AGRESTO: I wouldn't want to have left the
5 discussion that things related to democracy were unteachable.

6 MR. : All those in favor of democracy.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. AGRESTO: The Council should-- no, this project
9 which is here for rejection, didn't receive any money. It
10 had an emergency grant ahead of this and the Chairman of this
11 was-- is the former chair, I think Sidney Hook is the
12 Chairman of this project.

13 MR. RITCHESON: I don't know that he is the Chair-
14 man. Is that vital to you?

15 MR. AGRESTO: Chairman of the conference, I thought.

16 MR. RITCHESON: I don't recall that he is called
17 the Chairman of this project and it certainly was not-- the
18 proposal was not in his name.

19 MR. AGRESTO: Chairman of the conference, Chairman
20 of the (inaudible) it was to be called. I thought that the
21 Council should know that as they voted.

22 MR. : That is---

23 MR. AGRESTO: Yes.

24 MR. KINGSTON: All right, no other comments, we will
25 vote on the motion.

1 MR. RITCHESON: I don't think we did. Like-- my
2 memory at this point begins to fail. I don't think we
3 did.

4 MR. ALLEN: (Inaudible) the title (inaudible) the
5 Conference is set for the spring of 1986.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Those in favor of the motion,
7 signify by saying aye.

8 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

9 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed? Charles and Walter, the
10 motion carries.

11 Charles and Walter, it would be appropriate at
12 this time to introduce your comments about the congressional
13 interaction. We have deferred that discussion until now.

14 MR. RITCHESON: I don't know if they are my comments
15 solely. I am interested, in the first place, to know how
16 many of us-- members of this Council or staff, received a
17 letter on the letterhead of the Congress of the United
18 States, House of Representatives signed by Claudine Schneider
19 and James Schoyer, and dealing particularly with a grant
20 application, Humans in Nature.

21 MR. KINGSTON: How many Council members did receive
22 this letter?

23 (A show of hands was seen.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Eleven of the Council members.

25 MR. RITCHESON: What is the matter with the others?

1 (Laughter)

2 MS. SILVERS: Well, what-- when did you receive it?
3 Remember, some of us have--

4 MR. RITCHESON: The letter is dated August 2nd,
5 1985, and I assume from George Kennedy's copy-- I am comparing
6 it with my original, that it is precisely the same language.

7 It does deal with the application, Humans in Nature,
8 directed by Joseph Meeker (?), which application has actually
9 been turned down.

10 Mr. Chairman, many of us feel, other colleagues
11 with whom I have touched base about this feel, that this is
12 a highly inappropriate intrusion by members of the Congress,
13 by these two specific members of Congress, in the workings
14 of this Council.

15 And I think we are morally obliged to take some
16 position which should be conveyed in rather strong terms, to
17 these two members of the House of Representatives.

18 MR. LAXALT: (Inaudible) diplomatic. I think from
19 the brief-- I just read the letter now. Obviously, a
20 constituent placed a letter previously written right in front
21 of the Congressman and he signed it automatically.

22 MR. COHN: I intend to--

23 MR. LAXALT: I can't see a public reprimand-- I
24 think that would be out of place.

25 MR. COHN: I intend to write in my own personal

1 capacity. I find it highly, highly offensive and indeed if
2 this kind of a letter were written to a judge either on the
3 appellate level or on trial basis, the writer of the letter
4 would be cited for contempt of court.

5 And, in one sense we are a court. We hear different
6 points of views, we make decisions. This contamination
7 of the entire process-- and I don't-- I intend to write, as
8 I say, in my own individual capacity.

9 I hope I will temper somewhat-- my opening sentence
10 which I scribbled as we were talking yesterday and this is
11 just a draft of an opening sentence. This will acknowledge
12 receipt of your letter of August 2, urging me to vote on
13 August 7th, for the application of the College of the Atlantic
14 which letter I consider highly improper and indeed bordering
15 on criminality.

16 Because the whole idea of attempting to contaminate
17 a judicial process is one of the most repulsive things I
18 can possibly imagine.

19 Now it is quite possible, of course, this was done
20 on behalf of a constituent, but even so, on behalf of a
21 constituent doesn't give extraordinary sanctity to this
22 kind of letter.

23 So, I do intend to write on my own behalf.

24 MR. LAXALT: If I could interpret what I just read,
25 right now I would say it would be ignorance on procedure on

1 the part of the Congressman.

2 MR. COHN: I will add a footnote.

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. COHN: And the footnote, which I scribbled this
5 morning, if a staff member wrote it for you and you just
6 automatically signed it without giving too much thought to
7 what you were doing, I can understand parenthesis (and
8 perhaps be forgiving).

9 (Simultaneous discussion.)

10 MR. AGRESTO: I had not seen the letter until a
11 few minutes ago when it was handed to me.

12 My office receives letters like this 50 times a
13 week. They come from Congressmen, they come from Senators.
14 They do not come from the other two branches. We never
15 get letters from the Executive Office or the Judiciary.
16 (Inaudible).

17 We get letters from governors. We get letters from
18 honorary societies, from academic societies; we get letters
19 from, you know, ACLS. Letters from all kinds of people asking
20 us to take into account these matters.

21 It may be, although I am not sure I could put my
22 finger on it-- it may be a difference in kind if it goes to
23 you rather than it goes to me.

24 But I would not write a letter back to a Congress-
25 man on my behalf that carried any of the tone or--

1 MR. COHN: John, I agree with you 100 percent and
2 (inaudible) in the anger with which I am replying or anywhere
3 near that.

4 MR. AGRESTO: This is, to my office, an absolute
5 formal letter for which we have a courtesy reply that we give
6 all--

7 MR. COHN: I understand.

8 MR. AGRESTO: We have gotten-- we have gotten
9 letters from Congressmen that have been considerably stronger
10 which we give considerably stronger replies. But, at least
11 at my level, this is not-- this is not, I don't think either
12 these Congressmen-- neither of them wrote this. It clearly
13 was written by one of their staff members or--

14 MR. COHN: (Inaudible) where it also said to members
15 of the Council.

16 MR. AGRESTO: Perhaps not, I don't know--

17 MR. COHN: As far as I know, this is the first
18 time I have ever received a letter like this, after some five
19 years here.

20 MR. LAXALT: I think it might have been a clerical
21 error; they probably had some extra copies and started
22 filling in the Council.

23 MR. AGRESTO: I don't-- (inaudible)

24 MR. COHN: Did I understand you to say that among
25 these 50 letters you get every week, that you get letters

1 from members of Congress?

2 MR. AGRESTO: I told you.

3 MR. COHN: Yes. See, I think that is inappropriate.
4 I don't think Congressmen should write you letters.

5 MR. AGRESTO: Well, I think it would be difficult
6 to break them of the habit.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. AGRESTO: And I don't mean to be facetious
9 about that. Congressmen, when asked by their constituents
10 will you please intercede for me, will write a letter saying
11 you know, so and so has a grant before you, please make sure
12 it is given all due consideration.

13 That is the spirit in which the letters are
14 generally written. That is always the spirit in which they
15 are taken and of course we give due consideration and
16 therefore, I write-- you know, thank you for having sent
17 me a letter. We will inform you of the results when they
18 are done.

19 I take no offense at these kinds of letters
20 directed at me. I would not use my situation to bind the
21 Council on its feelings.

22 MR. LAXALT: If these discussions are (inaudible)
23 to the center of (inaudible), I suggest we think about it
24 a little bit.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: I think that---

2 MR. KENNEDY: I think that is true. I have
3 never heard of either of these Congressman before. They
4 had not the slightest influence on my sentiment one way or
5 the other.

6 I took the letter as a courtesy done for their
7 constituents. I sometimes ask Congressmen to intervene in
8 matters that I am interested in and I don't really see very
9 much difference.

10 It hasn't affected our judgment in any way. I
11 think the proper way to react to the letter is to ignore it,
12 not even to-- I would urge you not even to make personal
13 responses, but of course you will do what you see-- feel you
14 should in that respect.

15 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

16 MS. KERR: I am not sure that I didn't pay any
17 attention at all and I would caution or urge that you
18 separate your reactions.

19 First of all, it seems to me that if there is a
20 reaction, there is a potential negative for the applicant
21 and if you are to respond in any way, personally or from the
22 Council-- both of which I would not endorse-- that you would
23 caution them that they may in this instance have jeopardized
24 their constituent rather than supporting them.

25 Furthermore, I too have never received anything of

1 this, on a particular application from any Congressman and
2 it seems to me that to respond-- if you are going to respond,
3 respond to those Congressmen, not to the Congress.

4 It seems to me that you are raising an issue
5 where there is no issue to be raised with the whole of the
6 United States Congress.

7 MR. KINGSTON: Marty (?).

8 MR. CHICKERING: John, it occurred to me that if
9 you wanted to issue a short denunciation to Congress,
10 Congress might retaliate by reducing the endowments and
11 appropriations.

12 On the other hand, if they felt really punitive,
13 they might increase what they issue.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments on this issue?

16 Yes.

17 MS. CRESIMORE: What makes this a little more
18 sensitive, I think, and of course if I had received one from
19 a Senator, I would have been very unnerved because some of
20 us are still pending confirmation and it makes it a little
21 special situation, I think, now.

22 For Congress, under ordinary circumstances, I think,
23 we just handle it the best way we feel we should individually.
24 But, it is a little special right now in that we are pending
25 confirmation.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Harold.

2 MR. CANNON: I would just like to complete the
3 circle on this because I think it is informative to the
4 Council.

5 John has told you that he gets 50 letters a week.
6 I would guess that probably Division Directors get some three
7 or four letters of this sort a week.

8 By completing the circle, this is what I mean-- when
9 a grant is awarded in such instances and this of course
10 happens in some occasions, I have actually seen in the intro-
11 duction to the resulting book which is the product of a
12 research grant, thanks to Senator blank and Congressman
13 whozit, I received a grant from the National Endowment for
14 the Humanities.

15 It is that that is prompting applicants to write
16 to their Congressman so there is a kind of circularity here
17 that is going on.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments?

19 (No response.)

20 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, we will--

21 MR. DOUGHERTY: Yes there is.

22 MR. KINGSTON: I am sorry, Jim.

23 MR. DOUGHERTY: If I could expand the circle and
24 complete it. It isn't unusual from time to time for an
25 assistant director or a program officer to receive a letter

1 from a Congressman or a Senator in support of a project.

2 MR. KINGSTON: I should also note that when we do
3 have any kind of congressional interest, we immediately send
4 that letter or a copy of it to our Congressional Liaison
5 Office and they keep track of expressions of interest on the
6 part of Congressman.

7 MR. ALLEN: I was trying to stay out of this because
8 I wanted to wait until I got home, but I have been away since
9 July 31st, I don't know if I have heard from them or not.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. ALLEN: I must say that I think it is entirely
12 appropriate for Congressmen to address themselves to the
13 substance of applications to the Endowment.

14 They should do so the way when others recommending
15 certain references do, that is by appending letters to the
16 applications when they submit it.

17 I see nothing wrong with that. And I see on the
18 other hand, this particular letter is entirely inappropriate.
19 I would ask you all to make the distinctions.

20 Sometimes Council members are contacted by the
21 office's staff, which I also consider in the circumstance
22 inappropriate.

23 The difference between the office and Congressman
24 is we are able to say to the office, look, don't talk to me
25 about that or whatever you find appropriate in the case to

1 dismiss them because we have no fears of reprisal.

2 The situation with Congress is, of course, that
3 there are kinds of implications which Mr. Chickering humorously
4 referred to, and further considerations that we have no
5 recourse.

6 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments?

7 MR. BERNES: John, I am sorry, but I think there is
8 something more that has to be said here.

9 If, for example, these letters were to come from
10 members of the Committee that-- dealing with appropriations
11 and so forth, there would be the implication that unless you
12 make this grant, we will something, something, something and
13 therefore, I think it inappropriate for Congressman to do
14 this sort of thing.

15 Now, I am persuaded by some of the things that have
16 been said here, that I will not do-- you know, submit a
17 telegram, go to hell, strong letters follows sort of thing.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. BERNES: But, if there is-- I think there is
20 something inappropriate about this and it ought to be
21 recorded. That is my view, at least, my view and I think
22 Charles' view.

23 MR. LAXALT: I must say that anybody who had been
24 close to a Governor's office or a Senator's office, that that
25 is so routine that it would be paid any attention to at all.

1 I would totally disregard it. Anyway, we lobby
2 Congress so can't they lobby us for a change?

3 (Laughter.)

4 MR. AGRESTO: I must say that I have not seen in the
5 three years I have been here, a letter from anybody with
6 any direct authority over us, Senator Yates, or whoever
7 is writing--- if they would write letters they would be
8 at least the kind of courtesy letters for the constituents.

9 We have never gotten from anybody in authority over
10 us in Congress any kind of letter that I would have ever
11 taken to be even any kind of strong arm tactics against
12 us at all.

13 If we did, we would respond to that in kind and
14 if pressed, then these-- we are a public agency and such
15 things would be public.

16 Everyone knows this on both sides and nobody
17 pushes.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Anita.

19 MS. SILVERS: I just wanted to agree with Bob.
20 This is a-- I cannot get excited about it because it is
21 totally--~~the~~ the people who wrote it know that it is totally
22 ineffective. They are doing it as courtesy and we are
23 behaving, I think, a little bit as if it could possibly be
24 effective, but it is inconceivable that it could.

25 We should send the letter to a panel and have them

1 rate it not recommended.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Yes, Jim.

3 MR. SCHALL: I think it would be quite dangerous
4 for a Congressman or a Senator to write a letter like this.
5 I mean all you have to do is give it to the appropriate
6 journalist who would say Congressman X is trying to lobby
7 an agency.

8 I mean I would think from his political viewpoint
9 or even-- I mean there is a kind of a free speech question
10 in here in some sense.

11 Somebody mentioned, I think, that Congressmen have--
12 do, they are citizens too and if they want to write you a
13 letter, it is perfectly all right as far as I can see.

14 But, if it tends to be, shall we say, threatening,
15 that is a very dangerous position. Maybe what you should
16 write to your Congressman or Senator-- your Congressman back
17 and say that don't you know you are compromising yourself to
18 write this kind of a thing. I mean, it gets dangerous from
19 their viewpoint, perhaps more so than the threat to influence
20 some poor member of the board.

21 MR. LAXALT: Well, again, if I were a newspaper
22 man and had been-- had been contacted by both very closely,
23 that I would not consider it a story at all.

24 MR. KINGSTON: I gather we have exhausted the
25 discussion on this topic. Should we move to the report from

1 the Education Division?

2 EDUCATION PROGRAMS

3 MS. KERR: Chairman Dille had to leave so I will
4 give the report instead.

5 During its closed session, the Committee discussed
6 the policy paper which we have already discussed, I suppose,
7 so to speak.

8 We had a very brief report on the budget and
9 considered staff recommendations and all of the programs.
10 There were two, actually three applications in specific that
11 we gave some time too, one of which Anita has already talked
12 about.

13 The Education Programs, by the way, are in green.
14 The first proposal-- the first application that we gave any
15 time to was ES21260 on page three and it was relatively speaking
16 a minor matter.

17 Central Michigan University called for university
18 support for a program leading to a Master's degree and we
19 noted and note for you that this is an exception to normal
20 division policy but it was justified by what were considered
21 to be-- by everyone, staff, Council, Committee and Panel,
22 exceptional circumstances in that the program-- the
23 university's program had been developed at the express
24 request of the teachers from the region.

25 We also discovered-- discussed in specific application

1 EG20027 from Mercer University.

2 MR. BERNES: What page is that?

3 MS. KERR: That is on page eight; which called for
4 a humanities project and humanities education for prisoners.

5 The Committee reviewed and had position papers from
6 several of the staff members and Steve McCleary (?) was there
7 to guide us in our discussion of the matter.

8 We were-- it was a discussion designed to determine
9 whether or not we should evolve a policy or state a policy,
10 enunciate a policy.

11 It was decided that up to this point, we had not
12 had very many applications from prisoners, although indeed
13 there have been two in the last six months.

14 They-- we decided that there are various kinds of
15 prisons which might require different kinds of responses,
16 and we have asked the staff to monitor the number of applica-
17 tions and the kind of applications.

18 At this point, we do not want to preclude prisons
19 from applying to our nontraditional program, but it may be
20 necessary in the future so that we recommended funding of that
21 proposal without-- at the same time recommending any particular
22 further policy.

23 There was, as Roland Dille suggested this morning,
24 some discussion which covered the whole of our application
25 process. There was some discussion about the panels and the

1 process. We have asked the staff to follow that and to
2 provide some strategies for correcting any imbalances that
3 may have occurred.

4 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is before you. Is there
5 a second?

6 MR. : Second.

7 MR. KINGSTON: It has been seconded. Any comments
8 or questions?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, may I hear a
11 voice vote for approving the motions?

12 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: The motion is carried.

16 With your permission, we will proceed on to the
17 report from the Fellowships Division.

18 FELLOWSHIPS DIVISION

19 MS. HIMMELFARB: There was discussion and
20 approval of the new budget. The budget was similar to the
21 '86, (inaudible), with the suggestion that the (inaudible)
22 awards will be raised \$500 to \$750 to offset the higher costs
23 of travel ^{to collections} and so the stipend awards will increase from
24 \$3,000 to \$3,500 ^{Summer Stip, College, Seven day increased} to help offset higher costs. ^{Read slowly}

25 These stipends were not raised last year when

1 Fellowships were increased.

2 The proposed increase in stipends for participants
3 in the Seminar Programs: \$3,500 for the eight week college
4 teacher seminars and proportionate increases for the
5 secondary school teachers-- teacher seminars; \$2,750 for
6 six weeks, \$2,375 for five weeks and \$2,000 for four weeks.

7 The Committee reviewed and passed upon applications
8 for the four programs. Summer seminars for secondary school
9 teachers, summer seminars for college teachers-- (inaudible)
10 student programs and the bicentennial law professor seminars.

11 We also discussed the seminars for undergraduate
12 fellows. The (inaudible) now includes the other scholars
13 program, the Committee recommends that the Division discontinue
14 these seminars and concentrate its efforts for students on the
15 (inaudible) Scholars Program.

16 I therefore submit our motion which includes the
17 following items: the bicentennial law professor seminars
18 and some seminars for college teachers which, for some
19 computer reason, have been included in the same batch. The
20 law professors seminars are the last three items on page 12.

21 Summer seminars for secondary school teachers-- I
22 should say that we include -- the law professors seminars,
23 we have approved three of the three submitted; of the summer
24 seminars, we approved 60 applications; of the summer seminars
25 for secondary school applications, we approved 52 applications,

1 and of the Faculty Graduate Study Program, we approved 10
2 applications.

3 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Any questions or comments
4 of the seminars programs, graduate programs and so forth.
5 Rita?

6 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I don't think it is about
7 the seminars. I had a question that I might as well ask it
8 now.

9 I notice two of the fellowship grants which I
10 presume is part of this page eight (inaudible) examples on
11 Humanities and Medicine. Now I understand the difference
12 between fellowships and research divisions but I was under
13 the impression that that was the science--- humanities and
14 science and technology programs.

15 That is, I would have anticipated that application
16 as strictly a matter of procedure would have fallen under
17 the research area.

18 MS. HIMMELFARB: What item exactly are you --

19 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: It is on page 10.

20 MS. HIMMELFARB: Oh, ten.

21 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: SF21553. There are some
22 others scattered (?). I just wanted a point of clarification.

23 MS. HIMMELFARB: This one-- this is not a fellowship.
24 This is a summer seminar.

25 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: They are all seminars, but

1 that is--

2 MS. HIMMELFARB: The only-- did summer seminars.

3 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: So, the humanities, science
4 and technology doesn't encompass the whole group of that area,
5 subject area?

6 MS. HIMMELFARB: No.

7 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Thank you.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments, questions?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. KINGSTON: Those in favor of the motion signify
11 by saying aye.

12 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

13 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed.

14 (No response.)

15 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

16 A report from the Division of Research Programs--

17 RESEARCH PROGRAMS

18 MR. BERNES: Our motion is in the-- the Research
19 Division ought to be the envy of all other Divisions, the
20 envy of staff members and Council members.

21 I say you ought to all envy us because as is
22 usual we finished our matters with the dispatch that should
23 be envied. We were finished by 1:00 o'clock yesterday.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MS. HIMMELFARB: Well, in that case we should get

1 a medal, because we were done by five (?).

2 MR. BERNES: The Committee considered applications
3 in two categories and had their regular cycles of reviews
4 scheduled for this meeting, conferences and publications and
5 also considered a few applications in other categories.

6 On pages one and nine of the motions, some 55
7 conference applications are listed, of which 14 are
8 recommended for approval.

9 Council members' attention is called particularly
10 to the item on page one, RD20679, Spellman College. This
11 proposal received high ratings from the panel, but the
12 same panelists made substantitive comments about the proposal
13 that were really quite critical.

14 This sort of mismatch between panelists comments
15 and their use of the summary ratings happens from time to
16 time and we on the Council will be grateful to the staff
17 for their reference to sort out these matters and to advise
18 us.

19 In this Spellman College case, the Committee felt
20 that the deficiencies of the proposal could be handled in the
21 form of a few conditions to be added to the grant award and
22 saw little to be gained by rejecting the proposal and
23 considering it in a revised form at a later date.

24 So, this is one item that-- where we differed from
25 the staff advice given to us.

1 On pages 10 to 14, the motion--

2 MS. : Where is this?

3 MR. BERNES: That was on page one, Spellman College
4 Conference, \$10,000 and we granted that.

5 On pages 10 to 14 of the motion, 27 applications
6 in the HST program are listed; only one recommended for
7 support, 20 of 26 recommended for rejection, originated in
8 the joint NEH, NSF EVAS(?) program and that program was
9 not slated to be discontinued.

10 Pages 15 to 27, applications in the Publications
11 Program are listed: 34 are recommended for approval, 30 for
12 rejection and four deferrals.

13 I should mention here that the members of the
14 Council saw, particularly to appraise the report of the staff
15 here and also for the way in which this was handled.

16 Pages 28-- on page 28 are four Tools applications,
17 stragglers left behind from the main group. Tools applica-
18 tions were considered at the May meeting.

19 Pages 29 to 30 listed six additions applications
20 that are recommended for approval. Three of these were
21 deferred at the May meeting for normal substantive reasons
22 pending the completion of staff work.

23 The remaining three, RE20425, 20531, 20535 were
24 judged in May to be excellent programs and were deferred
25 pending the availability of additional funds.

1 The added clarity of being three months further
2 along in the fiscal year, additional funds do appear to be
3 available. We are pleased to recommend these proposals
4 today in the motion.

5 Page 31, two applications in an International
6 Culture Program are listed and on page 32, three applications
7 for renewed support of the ACLS regrant program.

8 The Committee discussed these particular grants
9 as a group, expressed concern about the appearance of large
10 administrative costs in these programs, praised the NEH
11 staff for their efforts to make these grantees more
12 accountable to the Endowment's usual renewal procedures than
13 had been the case in the past.

14 One year ago, the Fellowships Division began the
15 practice of formal review of these applications and the
16 Research Division has followed in a similar vein.

17 In discussing RI20265 listed on page 31, the
18 Committee noted that the-- the Committee on Scholarly
19 Communication with the People's Republic of China's
20 Humanities Program with China, abbreviation CSCPRC-- anyway,
21 page 31, 20265.

22 The Committee noted that this-- our Committee, us
23 in other words, we, noted that this Committee is a conduit
24 for funds from such Federal agencies as NEH, NSF, and USIA
25 as well as from private foundations such as Ford, Star and

1 Luce (?) and is a responsible and ideologic endowments
2 organization. We discussed this matter at some length.

3 Finally, Mrs. Ricardo-Campbell asked to be reported
4 as having abstained from voting on this particular applica-
5 tion and Professor Kass asked to be reported abstaining on
6 the ACLS grant proposals which are 201--2001, 2, and 3.

7 I move adoption of the motion.

8 MR. KINGSTON: Are there comments or questions
9 about the Research Division's motion? Rita.

10 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I am just assuming that
11 my affiliation with the university which is heavily or
12 somewhat represented and also I (inaudible) universities,
13 Santa Clara University of the Pacific, but it is true that
14 I am a director of the (inaudible) college of northern
15 California and I hope that continued good work-- and keep
16 track of all 12 universities affiliated with it. But that
17 I be recorded as abstaining otherwise.

18 MR. KINGSTON: It will be so noted.

19 Other comments or questions about the motion?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: There being none, those favoring
22 the motion?

23 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

24 MR. KINGSTON: Those opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 MR. KINGSTON: Motion carried.

2 It is appropriate at this time to bring forward
3 the issues that we have deferred. That is, the points made
4 in Rita Ricardo-Campbell's letter and the question of long
5 term grants within the division. Rita, why don't you begin.

6 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I don't have the letter in
7 hand, but I think I have a good memory.

8 I am concerned that the grant-- in fact three
9 grants were made to three different centers in May of 1985
10 when I unexpectedly could not attend the meeting, that start
11 in September 1, 1986 which is almost a year-and-a-half
12 lead time and go all the way to August, the end of August
13 and the beginning of September in 1989. That is four-and-a
14 half years advanced.

15 Now, I will understand and understand Dick
16 Edman's arguments that you need advanced time for
17 screening fellowship grants and things of that nature.

18 In all three instances, the only one I know
19 anything about individually is the Center for Advanced
20 Behavioral-- Study of Advanced Behavioral Sciences or
21 whatever. We call it the (inaudible) and here is the term.

22 Because, what you are doing is guessing that one
23 and a half years hence or three and four years hence this
24 is going to be rated good or just as good as when you
25 gave the grant for one thing.

1 Another thing is you are tying up funds which might
2 be weighed against other alternatives, and for making
3 better applications.

4 These are established grants, there is no need for
5 a great deal of lead time for advertising, they were all well
6 known. One was in (inaudible), the other is in the Folger
7 Library of Shakespeare-- certainly you can't say their
8 programs aren't known in the academic community and they need
9 lead time for advertising.

10 And I would like to say that we didn't as a
11 general policy matter-- also I-- let me finish all I felt
12 because I resented very much the (leaving out of the dates
13 and therefore my reason in the minutes and the--
14 the telegram was read at the last meeting because it seems
15 to center on the subject of whether there were women or no
16 women at the Think Tank.

17 The Think Tank is well known to have a lot of
18 women invited and in fact there are some unkind Stanford
19 professors who say that is the screening for the declining
20 quality of the males that are there.

21 I am not a feminist and yet I have been approached
22 by two people at this meeting in casual conversation saying
23 oh good, a feminist. When the discussion that occurred,
24 whatever it was, it made me the-- I am a feminist in an
25 old fashioned sense. I believe in equal pay for equal work

1 and I don't mean work-- it is like a letter I had from the
2 Attorney General recently where he -- well, I guess he
3 didn't notice when some secretary transformed work to word
4 in it.

5 But let me go on. I am just saying that I don't
6 think money should be granted that far ahead whether it is
7 this particular group or some other group.

8 I think three-and-a-half years is plenty of time
9 for a lead into these programs, especially when there were
10 existing programs.

11 I would like to hear other peoples points of view
12 and maybe they can persuade me on this way.

13 MR. AGRESTO: If I may for a second. I do not wish
14 to speak right now to the issue that seems to be presently
15 on the floor, namely the lead time or the length of the grant.
16 But, when the telegram was read, I thought I had read the
17 telegram in full.

18 It is correct, however, that when it was printed
19 in the minutes that date along with the heading and a few
20 other things were not printed.

21 I do not think this Council was wrong in thinking
22 that the substance of the telegram was as it thought it was.
23 I will read the telegram now.

24 Regret cannot attend meeting. Why rush on FC20029-
25 82 renewal 9-1-86 dash 8-31-89 for \$720,000 as deferral.

1 No complaints against the Center's method of selecting
2 fellows. Please read to whole Council this telegram before
3 Council's vote on renewal FC20029-82. I have no conflict
4 of interest. Rita Ricardo-Campbell, Hoover Institution,
5 Stanford University.

6 That was the telegram that was read and the dis-
7 cussion that followed did not in fact, I think, impute to
8 Mrs. Campbell any feminist or anti-feminist bias.

9 What-- since the telegram raised that as an issue,
10 we wanted to know what in fact was said about the Center
11 regarding its recruitment procedures and that is how we got
12 into that discussion.

13 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I would like the minutes--
14 to look at the minutes.

15 MR. AGRESTO: The telegram will be reprinted as
16 a telegram totally in the minutes.

17 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The selection process was
18 discussed and there is, may I say, informally, a great deal
19 of conversation on the Stanford campus about the method of
20 selection fellows at the Think Tank.

21 I think if you would talk to somebody who are
22 unhappy about it-- I didn't want to protest this, but
23 Mr. Ekman noted that panelists and site reviewers had all
24 commented on the selection process and agreed that the pro-
25 posal was excellent despite its unusual procedure.

1 And if this--- whether this process led to the
2 selection of women, minority, and other--- of scholars--and
3 I can understand why she asked because she doesn't know.

4 Mr. (inaudible) said that large numbers of women
5 and minorities have been invited to the Center. Anita
6 Sillers stated that there were many women scholars at the
7 Center. Mr. Ritcheson-- he wanted to know what my objections
8 are which obviously were tied up with the date that was
9 omitted.

10 Basically, Ms. Griest talked about the grant
11 from the Center in the past because of concern about the
12 procedures. She stated that the Center has been very candid
13 and so forth.

14 You feel when you read the minutes that the major
15 objection was that there were not women invited and this
16 that this was being corrected, very correctly by comments made
17 by Anita Silvers and others.

18 It is just the way it was read to the Council
19 members when somebody said to me-- I won't mention who-- I
20 was waiting in line to go get some coffee and somebody
21 said, oh yes, you go ahead but not because you are a feminist
22 and wouldn't want to do that or something.

23 I am perfectly happy to take both the advantage of
24 being a woman and I hope a qualified, competent woman. I
25 am just telling you the way I feel about it.

1 That is-- and this aside from the policy issue
2 involved and the policy issue is how far ahead should the
3 funds be committed under all sorts of grants and whether into
4 the year, well into the year 1989 should monies be committed
5 so that future Councils on which probably very few people
6 present will even be involved will have their hands tied by
7 these grants that already existed.

8 It is for this reason that I have asked for a
9 compilation of all outstanding grants much as companies keep
10 backlogs and other ways of orders, that you have all your
11 grants laid out for you into the year 1986, '87, '88, and '89.

12 What are-- I guess in Congress, for example, there
13 are not funds that you can play with because you have
14 (inaudible) assumed to be constant that you-- not constant
15 but tied up. You have entitlement programs. What are the
16 funds that you can play with?

17 There are no funds here which can be played with
18 if you gradually increase the percentage of far off grants.
19 That is what I am asking about.

20 MR. KINGSTON: If I may, I would like to separate
21 the policy issue from the mechanical issue of submission of
22 the letter, the telegram into the record if there are no
23 objections. We would submit a copy of the letter-- a copy
24 of the telegram as appended to the minutes.

25 That being the case, I would like to call the

1 question on approval of the minutes as corrected and amended
2 at this point.

3 All those who approve the correction and amendment
4 of the minutes, please signify by saying aye.

5 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

6 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. KINGSTON: All right, now we will come-- and
9 one abstention. Okay.

10 We are coming back to the issue, the policy issue
11 of long term funding. Louise.

12 MS. KERR: On the issue of long term funding, I
13 would-- I would like to separate that as well, specifically
14 with the matter of centers for-- which is what we are talking
15 about now.

16 I did have a reason for asking about the selection
17 process because in fact before, when it was under Fellowships
18 and I was on the Fellowships Committee, there were questions
19 raised about it. Those questions have obviously been
20 addressed.

21 But, besides the-- because of those questions and
22 the difficulty, I would, in this instance, for Advanced
23 Centers, I would think that long range funding is very, very
24 important for purposes of having a good selection procedure
25 and for notifying people-- there may be modifications to

1 of whatever the grant procedure or purposes may be even, for
2 example, at a place like the Newbury (?) which is one of the
3 major recipients. There are sometimes slight alterations
4 and they need the lead time.

5 So, in this instance, I would applaud long range
6 funding and I would think it would continue.

7 MR. KINGSTON: I should note (inaudible) answer to
8 the question about conditions on long term funding, we
9 operate under an annual appropriation, the majority of
10 funding that we are talking about here is Gifts and Matching
11 Funding and those offers are always made contingent upon
12 appropriation.

13 There are also conditions and requirements for
14 interim reporting and review of those reports. Anita.

15 MS. SILVERS: Yes, I just wanted to ask some
16 technical questions about the funding.

17 There was a time when the Endowment used to
18 engage in funding multi-year projects, but the entire amount
19 was committed out of the current fiscal year's budget. There
20 was a time once.

21 And, in that case, of course, it was not an issue
22 of tying up future funds. I understand that can't really be
23 done with Treasury funds.

24 On the other hand, wherever we use Treasury funds,
25 we put, presumably, an outer limit on the date at which the

1 date at which the matching can occur. We can't really, I
2 suppose, tell when during the time period the claims will
3 be made on those funds, whether folks will raise the money
4 the next day or not.

5 So that-- there is a problem inherent in that
6 alternative fund motion that specific to centers.

7 The question that I want to raise though in respect
8 to long term funding now is that while I understand there is
9 a defect of tying up funds, what are you noticing in the
10 Education Division in that we are not funding ordinarily
11 multi-year projects.

12 What we are doing is saying, do the first year and
13 then produce an evaluation. That doesn't always happen, but
14 that is-- is becoming somewhat more typical.

15 The problem then becomes the time line and we
16 happen to produce an evaluation at the time that you are back
17 in the middle of-- engaging the year's activities in order
18 to support the next year's application.

19 So, I think what I am suggesting, Rita, is that
20 in discussing long range funding, we need to find a happy
21 medium between the issue of the matter of tying up funds in
22 the future and the matter of not requiring a cycle in which
23 evaluation for the next application must occur before a
24 reasonable period has been completed.

25 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Let me ask you a question.

1 I can understand-- possibly, this is why my reaction was
2 so strong-- that when you have open competition for a
3 fellowship, it takes quite a long while to go through the
4 applications, get the references and consider them.

5 We do it every year for one year applications, and
6 we do it within two years. That is, we do give 10 to 15
7 (inaudible) the actual grants in the \$30,000 up range which
8 people might be interested in hearing.

9 And we do do it in two years. This case doesn't
10 even have the excuse as the Think Tank of having applica-
11 tions.

12 It is an invitation only so that it is true that
13 the permanent staff members sit around and discuss who knows
14 whom and whom should we invite this year and do we want a
15 particular subject covered in some depth so that we have
16 more people concerned.

17 It is very much an in house thing, not concerned
18 with a great deal of review time of applications. And I
19 guess that bothered me, too.

20 MR. KINGSTON: Trudy?

21 MS. HIMMELFARB: The invitations, as you point out,
22 often include prospective years. That is, sometimes the
23 invitation will be for two, three years hence and they are
24 open ended invitations so that the other applicant is
25 permitted to say I am not availalbe next year nor the year

1 after, but I will be available in that third year.

2 So, there is a great deal of lead time that is
3 required ---

4 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: The third year is probably
5 the end of the lead time. Four-and-a-half years, I think,
6 is a bit much.

7 MR. AGRESTO: I don't mean to cut off a healthy
8 discussion, (about) this proposal in particular, but just for
9 one minute.

10 Clearly having a three year funding cycle or three
11 year grant is not strange, not only in this program,
12 Challenge Grants as well. We know for a fact that the
13 Hoover Institution recently had a three year Challenge Grant
14 from us.

15 Three year grants are not unheard of in this
16 agency. This proposal received, in that program at that
17 time, the highest rating of all the proposals that have come
18 in. Not only received the highest rating, but we in fact
19 sent out a team of site visitors to look at it.

20 That site visiting team was headed by Tom Kingston,
21 came back with fine reports on this project and on the Center.
22 I stood by my word and I said, however, that I would look at
23 the project, look at the proposal, myself after Council meeting
24 last time. I did. I found nothing amiss in this project and
25 only things to praise.

1 I do not mean to put off a discussion that we should
2 have long term grants or not, but if we are going to talk
3 about this particular project, I certainly-- for my money--
4 have nothing out of the ordinary or remiss in it.

5 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

6 MS. RHOME: I (inaudible) you said all-- there
7 was one reject on page 173 (inaudible). There was a great
8 deal of discussion in terms of the panelists about method
9 of selection.

10 Another-- let's see, however, we took a strong
11 stand against the Center's method of selecting fellows,
12 in the process of deciding which.

13 Of the nearly 1400 currently eligible scholars to
14 invite in any given year, involved too much power on the
15 Director of the Center.

16 But for this principle objection, the panelists
17 would have rated the application E so there were several,
18 I guess six E's and one R.

19 MR. KINGSTON: Technically there were six E's and
20 one E over R. The dissenting panelist agreed to a split
21 rating. When we report a split rating, we always report the
22 lower one.

23 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I am still interested,
24 however, in the policy issue of three funding years,
25 which is what this was.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Frances.

2 MS. RHOME: Mine was a question of information. I
3 think they relate to what we are talking about and that is,
4 when we are funding additions, quite often they are numerous
5 volumes that are going to be involved.

6 How is the time devised there for the length of--
7 period of the award?

8 MR. KINGSTON: I will defer that question to
9 Rich (?) Ekman.

10 MR. EKMAN: Yes, both in the case of the Center's
11 applications and in those other potentially mutli-year
12 applications that are submitted, the judgment as to which
13 ones are awarded in the form for multi-year grant and which
14 in the form of the one year grant depends very heavily on the
15 review process and upon recommendations of the panelists.

16 MS. RHOME: My question is, how do you determine
17 the years, for example, of a-- for a project that I think is
18 in its now eighth year receiving funds from the NEH.

19 And, it is a 20 volume edition (inaudible) of
20 additional process, I think it would undermine the entire
21 project, but I don't know how that decision is made by NEH.

22 MR. EKMAN: Let me try and sort this out. Most
23 additions applications that are submitted are for two, three,
24 four, even five year periods, but the normal way in which the
25 Endowment proceeds is to make a grant, of course, something

1 for a period that is shorter than the time period requested
2 in most cases.

3 Following the panels recommendations, however, some
4 proposals are recommended so enthusiastically, that the
5 Endowment response is to make a grant for a long period, say
6 three years.

7 Now, when proposals come back as renewal applica-
8 tions for these long term projects, the same questions are
9 asked again, but there is an added ingredient of the track
10 record of the first grant.

11 And, as the panelists then rank the proposals and
12 judge relative quality and have the additional information
13 available to them about the what the productivity was in the
14 previous grant, it then becomes an ad hoc ranking process
15 for that particular group of applications where some projects
16 that are first timers may be ranked higher than some that
17 are renewal applications, but not all.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Isn't it fair to say that there are
19 different mechanisms which you just described than we do
20 for centers.

21 MR. EKMAN: Absolutely. The case in question in
22 which the Stanford application was considered, the panel was
23 clear in recognizing that some proposals were significantly
24 better than some of the other proposals under consideration.

25 So, in Stanford's case, which was very, very highly

1 regarded, it was -- pardon me, Rita.

2 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Tom incorrectly called it
3 Stanford, but the Center for Advanced Behavioral Studies--
4 it has no connection with Stanford University.

5 MR. EKMAN: I stand corrected. I think I will use
6 your term. The Think Tank's proposal impressed the panel
7 of reviewers to a great degree, and therefore their recom-
8 mendation was that the longest possible grant period be
9 awarded.

10 MS. RHOME: I wondered for how many years we
11 supported it and got through the B's and C's or something
12 of that nature. I see in addition's where we just simply
13 have to have long term considerations.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments, questions you wish
15 to raise. John.

16 MR. ANDREWS: Just a point of clarification, Tom.
17 I would like to point out that it is not that we do not fund
18 multi-year projects. In fact, I have just counted 22 projects
19 that are recommended at this Council are two years or longer.

20 It is just that in certain categories such as
21 some of the Summer Institutes for Elementary and Secondary
22 Schools, we feel that it is necessary to make a special case
23 for funding for more than one year, or a year-and-a-half
24 counting that time.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Any other question or comment?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. KINGSTON: Hearing no motion of any kind.

3 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: May I make a request that
4 I have already made to the Committee and I think Richard Ekman
5 does very fine work and I am looking forward to seeing him--
6 I think we should have an overall look of funding going out.

7 That is, what are our commitments already made for
8 the year 1985, well '86, '87, '88.

9 MR. KINGSTON: Steve, perhaps you can answer
10 that question.

11 MR. CHERRINGTON: We have a report that ~~report that~~
12 would answer some of those questions prepared by the Grants
13 office that would have every commitment that is currently
14 outstanding and the end date for that offer.

15 As far as (inaudible) funds, most divisions don't
16 really have commitments that project into many years.

17 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: I am only-- the only
18 Division of my research with all those additions, one started
19 in 1968.

20 You see, once you have given the grant, there seems
21 to be the feeling that you keep on renewing and renewing.

22 MR. EKMAN: It does happen-- you will occasionally
23 have a series of grants, but generally restricted to research.

24 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Does all the research
25 (inaudible). I would still like then just to see that--

1 particularly the Divisions outstanding grant commitments.

2 MR. KINGSTON: Richard.

3 MR. EKMAN: The longer we talk, it is beginning to
4 dawn on me that there are really two policies that are
5 twisted together here.

6 One is the issue of how long a grant period a
7 particular project ought to have and the second issue is how
8 much in advance of the proposed starting date of a project it
9 is appropriate for the Endowment to consider the application.

10 In the case of this Think Tank's proposal, there
11 were good arguments consistent with the two policies in the
12 different areas which had the effect of increasing the period
13 of time involved.

14 So that, Rita, as you look at the proposal and the
15 way it has been handled, the dates you see-- 1989 and the last
16 thing that will happen related to this project, does seem
17 further into the future than we usually see.

18 MR. KINGSTON: Although I did notice that the
19 (inaudible) 1990. I felt you should be aware of that.

20 MS. SILVERS: There may be two-and-a-half because the
21 issue, I guess, is not that grant period which can be
22 extended, it is whether extending the grant period increases
23 that money. Does that help with this issue? If you give
24 \$50,000 to an institution to do something in one year or two
25 years is still \$50,000.

1 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: But it still competes with
2 new grants and applications that may come in say '87 for that--
3 I thank you for finding out-- you see I thought it was a
4 very innocuous request to ask for a deferral on something
5 that would start in 1986, you know. That was May of '85, so--

6 But it is true, it starts much after when they--
7 there was no rush and that was my telegram. What was the
8 rush? Instead of having it out then on those particular
9 set of grants; they started in '86, the meeting was in May
10 '85 and then it goes into '89 all the way.

11 MR. KINGSTON: I think there are two partial
12 explanations to that. One is the fact that the Center's
13 program there is an annual deadline, one deadline. And
14 secondly, the actual designation of NEH fellows at that
15 Think Tank would begin next spring, before our next deadline
16 action.

17 The funding period itself indicates when the money
18 is going to be released.

19 MR. ALLEN: Are you saying, Tom, that it has--
20 Rita's request to defer consideration to this Council meeting,
21 for example--(you mean) that there was no difficulty in
22 treating that application?

23 MR. KINGSTON: No.

24 MR. ALLEN: That is what I thought.

25 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions?

1 MR. CHERRINGTON: I would like to make one comment.
2 There is a difference between commitment and expectation.

3 As far as official commitment, we have that with
4 (inaudible). As far as expectation, there is probably more
5 of that.

6 If you sat down and projected our commitments,
7 that would be much less than the expectations in the field.

8 MRS. RICARDO-CAMPBELL: Why don't you do both
9 problems. That would be helpful. Thank you.

10 MR. KINGSTON: If there are no other comments, I
11 will ask for the report of the State Programs Division.
12 Frances is sitting in for Jeff, I believe.

13 STATE PROGRAMS

14 MS. RHOME: Yes, Jeffrey Hart had to leave but
15 he has left his report and asked me to read it to you and I
16 do that on his behalf.

17 In the Closed Session, there was a discussion of
18 the 1987 agency request budget which remains the same as
19 year with general satisfaction with the proportion allocated
20 to the Division.

21 A new formula exists for the allocation of Treasury
22 funds within the Division. The principle discussion of the
23 Closed Session concerned the 27 states which had submitted
24 two year proposals and the nine outstanding State councils
25 that were recommended for Merit Awards. This provided the

1 the meeting with an opportunity to hear in some depth from
2 program officers about the strengths and weaknesses of the
3 various state programs.

4 There are soft spots here and there, but continuing
5 improvement with the point made several times that our
6 expectation of quality has risen considerably.

7 Our report is on the white sheet that is before you
8 and the South Carolina recommendation carries a condition
9 that appears on page 11. That is on the very last page of
10 the report. You will see at the bottom of the page the
11 recommendation by the staff which is an award of up to
12 \$263,000 in definite funds and a matching authorization of
13 \$51,000 subject to the following conditions: of the above
14 amount, \$126,400 will be released immediately.

15 Program funds will be released upon condition that
16 the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities submits for
17 Endowment review a description of the rationale and implementa-
18 tional plans for program development including the new
19 initiatives.

20 This is done occasionally within the state council,
21 I might add, because of various concerns as to whether or not
22 the projects which sound good in their proposals are really
23 definitive enough for their implementation.

24 Those states that were recommended for Merit Awards
25 for excellence were: Arkansas, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine,

1 Minnesota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wyoming, and
2 as an aside, I will tell you that we were highly impressed at
3 some of the things that the states were doing there and
4 the use of their funding.

5 The Council members voted a special commendation
6 for the new Council in the Virgin Islands which has developed
7 exceptionally in about one year.

8 They have had one year with a full time staff
9 individual and the projects and programs that have been
10 initiated there we found were superior and exciting.

11 Finally, the meeting discussed the states
12 submitting progress reports with the funding requested. The
13 recommendation for the biennial proposals and the progress
14 reports is before you.

15 And, Jeffrey Hart also says he would like to make
16 mention of the footnote to all pages to the effect that
17 amounts recommended are based on fiscal year '86 requests
18 level. That concludes his report.

19 MR. KINGSTON: All right. Any questions or comments
20 about the State Councils? Anita.

21 MS. SILVERS: I would like to ask a question about
22 (inaudible) for programs which as I understand it was going
23 to be evaluated because I am a little bit curious when it was
24 initiated originally.

25 I took it to be-- I think it was-- it was

1 in part as a way of simply excellence among the State
2 Councils and I am a little bit curious with that, the
3 percentage of State Councils which applied for this award
4 hasn't remained the same year after year.

5 And I am also a little bit curious about the
6 (inaudible) issue, that is, are we finding that certain State
7 Councils are getting the award more than once. Is there
8 any Council, for instance, which had the award at least more
9 than once? The answer is yes.

10 MS. RHOME: I can answer your question in part
11 because I have been through as a Council member, to a couple
12 of the regional meetings when the states were there and I
13 can tell you that their interest in the Merit Award is high.

14 They see it as a competitive thing. They wish it
15 from a pride standpoint plus the fact that it does, indeed,
16 carry with it a \$50,000 additional award which they can use
17 for other projects.

18 As to the actual date it started and to the per-
19 centage of those who are applying which appeared to me most--
20 this appeared to be---

21 MS. MERLINCOURT: I think we should make a distinction
22 when talking today about Merit Awards which are based on the
23 biennial proposals.

24 The exemplary projects are a special competition
25 (inaudible). And, the evaluation will be going on next year.

1 MR. KINGSTON: Louise.

2 MS. KERR: I am hearing the amount listed here
3 for the Virgin Islands and for the state of California which
4 I gather is still our largest state.

5 \$200,000---\$206,000 for the Virgin Islands,
6 \$627,000 for the state of California. How many people are
7 there in the Virgin Islands?

8 MR. : 100,000.

9 MS. KERR: 100,000? Now, this is by formula, is
10 that correct?

11 MS. BERLIN COURT: Yes.

12 MS. KERR: This is the minimum amount that can be
13 awarded to a state?

14 MS. BERLIN COURT: \$200,000 is the minimum amount.

15 MS. KERR: And, is \$607,000---

16 MS. BERLIN COURT: That is based on the formula.

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MR. KINGSTON: Other comments or questions? Those
19 in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

20 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 MR. KINGSTON: The motion carries.

24 The last report is from the Challenge Committee.
25 We have one item for review.

CHALLENGE GRANTS

MR. COHN: The 1987 budget request, the staff reported that the proposed budget request for the year 1987 will enable the Challenge Grant program to meet all of its continuing commitments under prior year awards and to offer, in addition, \$14,500,000 to new awards.

It will also provide \$2 million to support our Challenge Grant offer that we made to the New York Public Library.

These funding levels are the same as those in the Endowments fiscal year 1986 budget request and the amount budgeted for new awards is nearly the same as the amount offered for new awards in-- for the year 1985 which was \$14,884,000.

While this level of funding is lower than that of former years, it will be sufficient to support all of the excellent rated applications for first time awards and almost all of the excellent rated applications for second time awards.

Increasing the numbers of applications and rising average grant amounts in recent years make it seem likely that the success rate of applications will decline.

Experience with this year's application cycle will make clear the extent of that particular problem. We had one application before us. It is in your tab X, Y, Z

1 or the sheet, the white sheet that has just been handed out.

2 It is an amount requested of \$210,000 from North
3 Texas State University. This is a peculiar quote "conjoined
4 application" which requests support from both the Challenge
5 Grants program and also the Division of the Education
6 (inaudible) Disciplines Program.

7 The Challenge Grant support is requested to help
8 provide an endowment to sustain and strengthen the activities
9 initiated with the project funding requested from the
10 Education Division.

11 Funding for the project component is not being
12 recommended in accordance with established policy; we also
13 recommend against the award of a Challenge Grant.

14 MR. KINGSTON: Any comments or questions?

15 (No response.)

16 MR. KINGSTON: Those in favor of the motion
17 signify by saying aye.

18 (A chorus of ayes was heard.)

19 MR. KINGSTON: Opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 MR. KINGSTON: That carries for the reports of the
22 Divisions. Is there any other item of business to be
23 addressed in Closed Session?

24 MS. KERR: Could I just reiterate-- or iterate
25 Walter's request on behalf of his bloody hands for all

1 Division Directors to send us-- when they send us the things
2 for November, that they give us appendable packets.

3 MR. KINGSTON: We relate that message to the
4 Director of Administration who will do her best.

5 Lunch is being served in the back room. The
6 meeting is formally adjourned.

7 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25