

Signa Dodge and Lea Oliver  
cc: Mr. Edgerton and Mr. Kingston

6/22/71

John Barcroft

(June 10)  
Friday's Meeting with Mr. Edgerton and Mr. Kingston

*well, I tried!*  
JB

I think it is important that we have a quick and concise summary of the results of Friday's meeting. This is my recollection of the meeting. I am sending a copy to Mr. Edgerton and to Mr. Kingston. If either you or they have any additions or modifications, please let me know. I am going to try to keep to the same format of the eight general areas that were our "agenda" for the Friday meeting.

1) In discussing significant policy and procedural changes, we agreed that a) groups should be encouraged in their full proposal to elaborate enough on the meaning of the theme for us to be sure not only that the theme is workable, but also to have some sense of how they would interpret it to those within their state who might be interested in the program; b) it was agreed that we would proceed as quickly as possible to discuss with all state groups the possible use of the NEH "Gifts and Matching" provision for increasing their program and administrative funds. It was also agreed that we would routinely have as part of the recommendation of each grant, a Council resolution authorizing the matching of up to \_\_\_\_\_ in Treasury funds; c) it was suggested that we ought to talk to organizations like the Great Books Foundation not only to find out what they are doing and how they operate, but also to find out whether their various thematic approaches are---or could be---useful to us.

*insist on theme*

2) In terms of procedure in awarding second year grants, it was agreed that we would ask second year applicants to indicate what kinds of groups they did not hit in their regrant program as well as what groups they did, and that we would ask them to submit an adequate enough list of their regrants so that we could come to some judgment as to the overall quality. It was also agreed that we would take a somewhat "conservative" approach to our control of their regrants. That is, if they had made a few regrants that we thought were questionable, we would tend to simply note those and express concern rather than come on like gang busters and insist that they never do anything like that again, or deny them a second year grant because they did pull a few boners.

3) In talking about the additional twenty states and additional modes, it was suggested that for tactical purposes we try to think of five "basic" modes rather than just three. Thus, our "committee of academic humanists" and our "committee of academic administrators" could be seen as two more basic modes rather than as "one shot" experiments. It was further agreed that the problem of splitting a state into two groups (e.g., northern California and southern California; New York City and New York state) should be worked out on an ad hoc basis over the next few months, but that before any firm decisions were made, we would invite Wally and Bob to think the matter through with us in a very concrete instance. It was also agreed that we would not be mesmerized by arts and humanities councils. That is, we would make our judgments as best we could and not worry too much about whether we had a confrontation with an arts and humanities council. The suggestion, in short, was that we might not necessarily---even in a state with an arts and humanities council---invite them to the meeting.

4) In discussing the regional projects program, concern was expressed that we develop guidelines which encouraged applications rather than discouraged them; that we aggressively seek good applications; that no matter how precise the guidelines are about concentration on the humanities and relating to current conditions of national life, that a "saving clause" be in the guidelines which would permit us to fund projects of good quality no matter what their focus is. It seems fair to me to say that the collective opinion was that we should be careful not to over-control the regional projects program/

5) The discussion of a "formula" for the State-Based Program led to the conclusion that the application of such a formula would be premature in the next year or two. A further hope---which was generally expressed---was that we not be defeatists about this program over time in the sense that we not assume that it would become mechanistic and that we would lose control over the quality of activities supported. There were some specific suggestions in addition: a) we need not think in terms of specific legislative language for reauthorization in Fiscal 1974; instead, we should be thinking about having a good and imaginative program going by then; b) we should talk about "methods of financing" the state-based program (to illustrate the variety possible), rather than worrying about specific formula devices at this point--thus, gifts and matching is possibly a way of operating in lieu of a formula;

c

c) the only mistake that we must avoid in the next two years is that we must not "overfund" a state---that is, we must avoid a situation where, should we go to a formula, it would require dramatic reductions in any state's existing program; d) that, above all, we stay loose about the overall policy implications that are suggested by a "formula."

6) In discussing possible levels of funding for Fiscal 1973 there seemed to be general agreement that we would have to hold the grant size at no more than \$150,000 per state, even though this meant that some states would be on a plateau for a couple of years. There was some discussion of what should happen in Fiscal 1974 and it was agreed that that depended very largely on what level we were authorized for then, and also what kinds of conclusions we had come to about formulas together with what kind of track record we had achieved in use of gifts and matching for increase in program funds in particular states, all of which is to say that no real decisions could be made about Fiscal 1974 at our meeting and none were. With regard to the funding of regional projects, there was considerable discussion as to what the long-term purpose of the program was and how it fit with the existing state-based program. There seemed to be consensus that, funds permitting, a significant increase of funding to the level of \$1,600,000 would be desirable in Fiscal 1973 but that it was not at all clear that the program should grow dramatically beyond that and that decisions about funding beyond Fiscal 1973 would have to await both the experience of the regional projects program in the next year or so and also developments in the state-based program.

7) On the matter of relating to State Arts Councils when they are not involved in the State-Based Program, it was agreed that the only realistic time to let a state arts council director know of our existence in his state was at the time a program design grant has been awarded---unless there are very persuasive reasons for a deferral. It was agreed that it was desirable to get the maximum amount of information about the Humanities Endowment out to the state arts councils directors probably through sending them general Endowment press releases. There was the agreement that we should be very careful about how we implemented this procedurally in order to avoid implying that they are a "natural" constituency; but also avoiding the problem of giving persons unassociated with the Humanities Endowment the control of dissemination of this information. The state-based program staff was asked to consider this and make some specific propositions. It was agreed that it would be useful to have

grantees in the state-based program involved with the Endowment as panelists---both in Fellowships, Research, and Education in so far as possible, and also in the Public Program. The caveat was that we should not overuse them in terms of evaluating new projects.

8) With regard to the workload situation of the state-based program staff, the following agreements(contingent upon our FY 1972 administrative appropriation) were made: a) the existing secretarial slot for FY 1972 would be used to hire a fourth full-time professional staff member; b) consultant funds would be provided at a level which would permit the use throughout Fiscal 1972 of one consultant or a series of consultants to provide the equivalent of a fifth full-time staff member; c) in lieu of a secretarial position, using up one of our permanent positions, we would seek a part-time person who worked up to 39 hours a week instead. This would mean that we had just short of two and a half secretaries during Fiscal 1972. I was asked to notify Mr. Berman immediately of the needs for space on the eighth floor which this kind of addition of staff will require, and I have done so.

If there is anything I have missed, or misstated, could you please all let me know?