

CONSULTATIVE GROUP
NEH-STATE COUNCILS PARTNERSHIP

HENLEY PARK HOTEL
926 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

APRIL 9, 1994

9:14 a.m.

EBERLIN REPORTING SERVICE
14208 Piccadilly Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906
(301) 460-8369

C O N T E N T S

	Page
INTRODUCTIONS-----	3
RELATIONSHIP OF STATE COUNCILS TO THE NEH AND ITS DIVISIONS-----	4
ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE REVIEW PROCESS-----	55
REPORT OF THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE, PARTNERSHIP, AND THE NATIONAL CONVERSATION-----	115

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. MYERS: All right, let's get started. I would like--I would like you all to meet Margaret Crowley, who is our reporter today. And Margaret would like to meet you. It will help her in her work. So, let's start on Margaret's right with Liz Young, and please introduce yourselves.

MS. E. YOUNG: Elizabeth Young. I was at one time the chair of the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities, and on the Council.

MR. WILSON: Bill Wilson, the former chair from Vermont.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MS. WATSON: Carole Watson, Director of the Division of State Programs.

MS. WILLIAMS: I am Pat Williams. I am deputy executive director for programs and policy of the American Association of Museums. Sondra, I think it might be a good idea if we could get the music turned off.

MS. MYERS: Yes.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MS. WILLIAMS: I was just thinking that would be on the recording.

(Simultaneous discussion.)

MR. HERBERT: I am Jim Herbert. I work for NEH.

MR. ZAINALDIN: I am Jamil Zainaldin, and I am

1 with the Federation of State Humanities Councils.

2 MR. R. YOUNG: I am Bob Young. I am the director
3 in Wyoming.

4 MR. ROBERTS: And I am Tom Roberts. I am the
5 director in Rhode Island.

6 MS. SEMMEL: I am Marsha Semmel. I am the
7 Director of Public Programs at NEH.

8 MR. GIBSON: Don Gibson, NEH.

9 MS. MAY: Anita May, Oklahoma Foundation for the
10 Humanities.

11 MR. CHEATHAM: Robert Cheatham, Tennessee
12 Humanities Council, and the Federation of State Humanities
13 Councils.

14 MS. JONES: Arnita Jones, Organization of American
15 Historians.

16 MR. HAMMER: John Hammer, National Humanities
17 Alliance.

18 MR. GLADISH: Ken Gladish, Indianapolis
19 Foundation.

20 MS. MYERS: Sondra Myers, NEH.

21 MS. A. YOUNG: Ann Young, Director of
22 Congressional Affairs, NEH.

23 MS. MYERS: Thank you. Well--

24 (Laughter.)

25 Anyway, thank you for coming back and huddling in

1 again with us on another beautiful day. We could pretend it
2 is raining, but there are too many windows in the room to do
3 that.

4 It has been suggested that we build on yesterday's
5 conversation in the following way, in the context of Liz
6 Young's suggestion that we do some blue-skying, and really
7 think about where we want this partnership and the councils
8 and the NEH to go. We return to Robert's charts and
9 presentation, and look at the approach, or deduce, or even
10 better, have Robert say, given this information, what kind
11 of funding policy would he see--would--to the states, and
12 you know, through the NEH, throughout the NEH, I would say.
13 And so, I have the pleasure of putting Robert on the spot.
14 I know he likes to be on the spot, so why don't we start
15 with that?

16 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I don't have the solution.
17 It seems to me that I don't want to get into the issue of
18 the funding formula for the state councils, because I don't
19 think--I think what we have learned about the funding
20 formula for the state councils is you can't change it until
21 there is a lot more money to give away. Because nobody is
22 going to take a big hit. And nobody wants anybody to take a
23 big hit. So, you are really stuck with the current funding
24 formula, and the only money you have got to play with in the
25 Division of State Councils is the discretionary money.

1 My concern would be the other divisions serving
2 the local needs of the country. And I would like to see a
3 study of Public, Education, Challenge, Preservation, all of
4 those that have some sense of public mission, and see what
5 they do. This is not available to me, that is why this is
6 all pieced together. I don't have the data to do that. And
7 I don't know that the data exists right now, the way it is
8 tracked, because the NEH does not track, for example, if a
9 project goes out of Public, the NEH does not say, "Is this a
10 national program, or is this a state program?". It is just
11 a program, funded by NEH. So that they make no distinction
12 between a grant that would, say, go to a library program in
13 Tennessee, exclusively Tennessee, only serving Tennessee,
14 and a grant that goes to the ALA, which would serve several
15 states, and seemingly, the nation.

16 Those sorts of distinctions have to be made.
17 There are a lot of projects being served in Washington,
18 funded in Washington, that really should be funded, it seems
19 to me, by the states, because they are in-state programs.
20 And that is what I would like to see done.

21 MR. GLADISH: So, Robert, the presumption of such
22 an examination is not that you just want to see the
23 statistics, but you have--The assumption lying behind it is
24 that if there is significant money flowing to however we
25 define local projects, your conviction would be that--

1 MR. CHEATHAM: My conviction would be the states
2 can do a better job of local projects than the national
3 government can.

4 MR. GLADISH: Well then, then how--Let's say you
5 come with an answer, and you have these statistics. Then
6 how would you determine the distribution of those Endowment
7 resources that are being used for those purposes, in another
8 way than they are currently being distributed?

9 MR. CHEATHAM: What do you mean? I am not getting
10 the point.

11 MR. GLADISH: Let's say you come to the conclusion
12 that another \$40 million of the Endowment's money qualifies,
13 by whatever definition you are using, as local funding,
14 okay? So there is that \$40 million that has been engaged in
15 local funding. Where does that \$40 million go?

16 MR. CHEATHAM: It is dispersed by formula to the
17 state.

18 MR. GLADISH: Okay, that is what I wanted to--That
19 is the end of the argument.

20 MS. MYERS: Again, it would mean then that there
21 would be a revision of the criteria and the guidelines in
22 the divisions. Is that right? For example, if something
23 that seems to be local, or exclusive to a state, is
24 applying, there would be some provision that says that if
25 that is in Public Programs, that--You know, that if you are

1 in Public Programs, you must have a non-local agenda. Is
2 that right? So it would mean a shift in the guidelines.

3 MR. CHEATHAM: That is right.

4 MS. SEMMEL: Robert, can I ask you a question?

5 MR. CHEATHAM: Sure.

6 MS. SEMMEL: When you put your charts out
7 yesterday, I assumed as I--I made an assumption, so I want
8 to say it, that an ideal for you would be equity, an
9 equitable distribution of NEH funds, and I am talking big
10 NEH, not necessarily State Programs funds, on the basis of
11 per capita distribution or geography.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: No.

13 MS. SEMMEL: That is not what you mean.

14 MR. CHEATHAM: No. I would say there should be
15 some rationale for not doing that. You need to be able to
16 defend to the American people your reason for not doing
17 that. No, I wouldn't think that appropriate.

18 MS. SEMMEL: And one of the things you see lacking
19 is that rationale.

20 MR. CHEATHAM: That is right. There is no defense
21 right now.

22 No, I mean I think, for example, clearly this X
23 amount of dollars required to run a state humanities
24 council, whether you are serving 500,000 people or 5 million
25 people, there is a basic amount that you need to run--to

1 have a program. Scholarship is not going to be distributed
2 per capita, I hope. Research money is not. There will
3 definitely be, as Tom mentioned yesterday, there are going
4 to be TV media projects that go to certain places more than
5 others. I think there could be some adjustments to that,
6 but there is still going to be an imbalance. I mean, even
7 if you adjust it by region, there will be an imbalance
8 within the regions. So there are going to be certain
9 imbalances. You know that. But you need to be--If a
10 congressman, if our congress, congressional delegation,
11 looked at this and said, "Why is this?", we have no answer.

12 MS. SEMMEL: Well, you know, one of--I don't know
13 that we have the complete and final answer, but one of the
14 things that--one of the reasons that I think this meeting is
15 very useful, is that we really are, as Don said yesterday,
16 examining lots of our assumptions, and lots of our
17 processes, and I think we as an agency, like most agencies,
18 will be looking more closely, especially over the upcoming
19 years, at how well our processes work, how well our
20 evaluation works, how well we are serving all the various--

21 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, some--

22 (Simultaneous discussion.)

23 MS. SEMMEL: Well, I was just going to say,
24 though, that I find--You know, when I think of national, I
25 always attach the word "national significance", rather than

1 national in a kind of purely geographical framework, and I
2 think one of the things that might be interesting as we go
3 through the day is to talk a little about--Because when I,
4 then when I think in my head "national significance", even
5 if the project happens in Bisbee, Arizona, does this
6 project, according to our peer review system, arrive at some
7 sort of--meet some sort of standard based on national
8 significance. And so, I guess at some point today, I think
9 that is--In addition to the equity standard, the excellence
10 standard--

11 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I think when you talk about
12 national significance, you run into some of the built-in
13 biases of our culture. One of the built-in biases of our
14 culture is that, all else being equal, if you are studying
15 the 17th and 18th centuries, you are more involved in the
16 humanities than you are if you are studying the 19th and
17 20th centuries. Ergo, if you look at these charts, the
18 local history of the Massachusetts Bay Colony is conceived
19 to be national history. The local history of Nashville is
20 conceived to be local history.

21 MS. SEMMEL: Do you see that reflected in the
22 awards that we give out?

23 MR. CHEATHAM: Excuse me?

24 MS. SEMMEL: Do you see that reflected in looking
25 at our annual report?

1 MR. CHEATHAM: I see that reflected in these
2 charts.

3 MR. GIBSON: No, how do you get it out of these
4 charts?

5 MR. CHEATHAM: You look at it.

6 (Simultaneous discussion.)

7 MR. GIBSON: --topics there.

8 MR. ROBERTS: In Massachusetts. I mean, that
9 doesn't mean they are studying 17th century Massachusetts
10 history. I mean, I think that the states that have the
11 bigger blips, at least on some of the earlier charts, are
12 those that have institutions that a) are good at getting
13 grants, but b) have some of what Martha is suggesting is
14 national reputation--

15 MR. CHEATHAM: Right, right--

16 MR. ROBERTS: --significance.

17 MR. CHEATHAM: That is true. Then once you have
18 got--then you have got a problem. How do you deal with the
19 states like Florida and Texas, Florida being the extreme
20 example. Here is a state that is booming. They haven't
21 developed all these institutions that can compete
22 nationally. How do we solve that?

23 I mean, you can argue that we should be sending
24 more money into there, just to solve that problem, like we
25 did with hurricane relief, and that sort of thing. You can

1 argue that, that really what we are doing is, we are
2 continuing an imbalance, because if the institutions of the
3 East, are better than the institutions of the trans-
4 Appalachian South, say, they are going to continue to be, if
5 they continue to get more money, and there is no infusion of
6 money to build institutions in our states.

7 MS. MYERS: Anita.

8 MS. MAY: Yes. I think that one, maybe a fruitful
9 line of proceeding, might be to go back to what we were
10 talking about yesterday, in terms of what we think we do
11 really well in the states, that in terms--

12 (Simultaneous discussion.)

13 MS. MAY: It is really well today. As opposed to
14 looking at it in terms of equity, maybe we can look at in
15 terms of what we do, that the Endowment needs to accomplish.
16 And I think that what we do, that the Endowment needs to
17 accomplish, is something that you are talking about, which
18 is to get into every state for sure. And what ways can we
19 build on that capability, given our limited resources? And
20 make sure, for instance, that there is an Education Program
21 in every state, that there is a Public Program in every
22 state. It would be a nice thing, if at the end of the year,
23 when you close your annual report, you could actually say
24 that, just the way I would like to have a program in every
25 county in Oklahoma, just--You know, not--

1 MR. GLADISH: And are encouraged to do so.

2 MS. MAY: That is right. Not just because I want
3 to cover that map, but really because I believe the people
4 in every county deserve a humanities program. And so, I
5 think if we are envisioning the future, we might do it more
6 positively if we forgot about equity in some senses, and
7 looked at this thing in another way, in terms of what we
8 actually can help each other to do.

9 And I think that at the state level, what we
10 manage to do very economically, is to take programs that are
11 duplicateable, and spread them all over. And it is always
12 amazing to me, when I look at all the little towns that get
13 a humanities program because of our traveling exhibits. And
14 when they take an exhibit, they do six months of programming
15 with it. They start programming in September for an exhibit
16 that is going to arrive in December. We are really having
17 an impact on that small community. I mean, and it gives me
18 goose bumps to see these reports, because I think, you know,
19 the town of New--(Technical difficulties.)--one thousand of
20 whom see a traveling exhibit that goes there. Now can you
21 tell me that anything that came to Washington, D.C. had
22 anything like that relationship to the population of
23 Washington, D.C.? You couldn't, you know.

24 MR. HAMMER: Actually they could, but they
25 wouldn't be right.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MS. MAY: It would bring visitors to Washington,
3 D.C., actually. But I think that--I am not saying that is
4 better than, but I am saying what a significant thing, that
5 1000 people out of 20,000--And I am trying to think of ways
6 that we can just make sure that that happens for the
7 Endowment as well as for the state humanities councils. And
8 I think if we can invent strategies to implement that, out
9 of this partnership, that would be--I think we would all
10 feel more positive than taking the money and dividing it up
11 equitably. Because even in Oklahoma, I don't think we want
12 to send--I know we get \$500,000., and divide that into, say
13 there are 50 counties, (I think there are fewer), so we will
14 send \$1000. out to every county in the state--

15 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, that is a little bit
16 different. If you had an institution in every county in the
17 state, would you apportion the funds to those institutions
18 by some formula?

19 MS. MAY: No, I wouldn't, because I would still
20 want to make sure of the quality of the program, and maybe I
21 can spend \$100,000. to fund one project that would go to
22 every county.

23 MS. MYERS: Bill, and then Arnita.

24 MR. WILSON: I would not resist an equitable
25 partnership, but one of the things that, it seems to me,

1 state councils do well is with the equity question. And
2 because we have NEH funding, what we do is, we seek out the
3 entire state, and having been on a couple of panels, I have
4 been impressed about the extent to which councils, the
5 Virginia council and others, have sought to avoid the
6 temptation of just serving the metropolitan area, but to
7 push out into the state. It is a different kind of equity,
8 but it is crucial. Absent that funding, I know what would
9 happen, and that is, executive directors will go for the
10 money, and in Vermont that would mean 90% of our programs
11 would probably be in the metropolitan Burlington area,
12 because that is where we would raise the funds to do our
13 work, and essentially, the far reaches would become charity
14 cases. So that the equity question is central for me, in
15 terms of what states can do, as an organizational base.
16 They can deal with how to get things out.

17 I worry a little bit when we talk about the
18 conversation. Part of it is, numbers of people that may
19 participate in the conversation. But there is also the
20 qualitative question, making sure all the various people get
21 in. States are great at doing that, because they know
22 states, and states are different. So that may be a real
23 strength that states can bring, is to get everybody in that
24 state participating.

25 MS. MYERS: Arnita.

1 MS. JONES: Well, let me go at it from a little
2 bit of a different way, because I think this is something
3 that concerns people in state councils, and it is something
4 I have observed, being involved with the national
5 organization, but also more than one state council in one
6 way or another. That is the disparity between the size of
7 the grants that come out of the divisions, and the size of
8 the grants that can be made by the state councils.

9 It just seems to me that by the very allocation of
10 the monies at the state level, you can never do a \$200,000.
11 project in the schools. And yet, I see these things being
12 funded, say, in Indiana. I have a colleague, Ken knows him,
13 who said to me a few months ago, "I am not going to be able
14 to participate in any state council projects anymore,
15 because the university is telling me now, I can't donate my
16 time. I can only be involved in projects where my time can
17 be bought out.". And this is somebody who is a very
18 important resource to history education reform nationally.
19 Can't participate in any more state council projects,
20 because they can't afford him. That trend within
21 universities is going to accelerate. That is not a
22 momentary blip in Indiana.

23 I think also, you know, you look at projects that
24 do have the \$200,000. price tag, and they might seem pretty
25 good, but have been funded by the national for something

1 that is going on at the state level, but they don't seem to
2 be giving \$200,000. more impact than something that got
3 funded for 10 or 15 by a state council. Maybe they are
4 having more impact; they are more national. But is it that
5 kind of factor, in terms of comparison? And that can--I
6 mean, you know, state councils don't provide funding for
7 overhead. In a \$200,000. project, you see a lot of that
8 money just going back to institutions for overhead. I mean,
9 there--It is not just the arm of geography that is being
10 reached in the equity of what goes to how many different
11 kinds of states.

12 Is there a way that there could be--? I mean,
13 there are some projects that ought to be funded at \$200,000.
14 I am not saying there aren't ever. But is there a way that
15 there could be a partnership in the grant making process,
16 between divisions and state councils? So that if, for
17 instance, there is a big blockbuster library program in
18 Indianapolis, maybe the Indiana council could sort of buy
19 into the process somehow. I mean, maybe that gets to be an
20 unwieldy kind of procedure. I have no idea, but I toss it
21 out, you know, because I think that is part of--I think
22 state council people say, you know, watch this. And I watch
23 it as a national organization, but being out there in
24 Indiana, saying, "Gee, I don't know, you know--". I could
25 see--

1 MS. MYERS: Let's push that further.

2 MR. GLADISH: Isn't there a tension in that?
3 Maybe my impression is incorrect, but I think one of the
4 tensions internal at the Endowment, (and representatives of
5 the agency here can comment on this), is, I am not so sure
6 that the professionals in charge of the peer review process,
7 and grantmaking in the other divisions, have all that much
8 confidence in what we are doing in the states.

9 MS. JONES: Well, that ought to be out on the
10 table, too.

11 MR. GLADISH: I hear that message informally, and
12 sometimes formally, over the ten years, depending on who is
13 speaking. And so if one opines that perhaps there could be
14 a closer relationship, and internal to some of the other
15 divisions there is a suspicion of the quality, if you will,
16 of what the state councils are doing, its intellectual
17 integrity and quality, which I think is present--

18 MS. JONES: And vice versa, though.

19 MR. GLADISH: I understand, because you just
20 expressed the versa, or the vice--

21 MS. JONES: I think you are right. I think you
22 are right about the other.

23 MR. GLADISH: Well, I think that is clearly, that
24 is clearly present. That is, that there is some perception
25 from time to time, that really what the state councils are

1 doing, (because we are not doing original research or
2 whatever the case may be), is kind of, it is nice, it is
3 civic, it is public, but it is not really the heart of the
4 real work of the agency. And so if one suggests that we
5 ought to engage in a partnership more on the grantmaking
6 side, I wonder if we are prepared to do so.

7 MS. MYERS: Well, I wonder--Yes, Anita.

8 MS. MAY: One of the things I was going to say is
9 that, when I first heard you, Arnita, I kept on thinking,
10 "We are busy.". If you had made a \$200,000. grant in
11 Oklahoma, thank you very much. I don't know that I want to
12 be a full participant in that, because I have got 70 million
13 other things to do, and a very small staff. But the thing
14 that--

15 MS. JONES: Be a participant in the grant, or a
16 participant in the process to award the grant?

17 MS. MAY: Well, a participant in the grant.

18 MS. JONES: That is what I was talking about.

19 MS. MAY: Oh, I see. A participant in the process
20 to award the grant.

21 MS. JONES: I wasn't talking about being involved
22 in grants.

23 MS. MAY: I see. Well, the other thing though, I
24 was thinking of, is that in terms of efficiency in what you
25 were saying, we see that a lot. I think everybody in the

1 state councils has commented on it. Somehow or other, the
2 Endowment seems to have to pay \$150,000. for a project that
3 we could do for less money. But what we can't do in
4 Oklahoma anymore, and what I was just talking to him about,
5 is we can't make a grant that is in between 20 and 50,000.,
6 which seems to be an appropriate level even for a state
7 humanities council to make, but our ceiling now is 20, and
8 if we were going to make those, we couldn't make more than
9 ten. I mean, if everybody came in for 20,000, we couldn't
10 make more than ten of those.

11 MS. JONES: That would be all you could do.

12 MS. MAY: That would be all that we could do. So
13 we can't do 20,000 consistently. And we used to do, with a
14 very good product, a \$40,000. grant. A product I believe
15 better, than you can get at the national level for 100,000.

16 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, that is getting something
17 else on the table.

18 MS. MAY: Yes, and I just would like to get that
19 out there, because I think it is an efficiency--

20 MR. R. YOUNG: Can you say why you can't do it
21 anymore?

22 MS. MAY: Oh yes, because I just don't have the
23 grant funds. I don't have--

24 MR. R. YOUNG: How does that come to be? How is
25 that?

1 MS. MAY: Well, it is because the level of funding
2 from the national has pretty much stabilized, and what we
3 can't do is raise, very well, is raise regrant funds for--
4 from the private sector. A private sector person always
5 wants you to do a project. So if you go out, you can raise
6 money for a project, rather than for your regrant project.
7 You can't raise money to give it away.

8 So we have gotten into the challenge grant game,
9 where we will make up to 20,000, and the grantee is supposed
10 to go out and raise 20 more. But we used to be able to give
11 40, and the grantee went out and raised 40 more, and had
12 some really wonderful small, curated exhibits, for example,
13 in Oklahoma, that don't come there anymore, because we get
14 skipped. We are not a big population center.

15 MR. GLADISH: But Anita, there is less money in
16 real terms from NEH, but there is also another thing that
17 has happened, which is that all of us, generally, in the
18 states, are taking more of the money we are getting, for
19 operating purposes.

20 MS. MAY: Right, but--

21 MR. GLADISH: There are both of those trends.

22 MS. MAY: --operating now includes doing our own
23 programming--

24 MR. GLADISH: Sure, I understand. I am not saying
25 it is pure overhead, I am just saying that that is--that

1 both trends are present. For instance, if you had one staff
2 member and one secretary, or we did in Indiana, we might
3 have been able to sustain the grantmaking at the same level
4 it was X number of years ago. Even so, that amount wouldn't
5 compensate, because inflation has undercut the capacity of
6 \$20,000. to do something in Indiana.

7 MS. MAY: That is true. And also, in our case
8 anyway, we get out more programs by doing things like the
9 travelling exhibits and stuff like that ourselves. And we
10 talk about this all the time, but we miss being able to make
11 those grants in the 40 to \$50,000. range, which I think were
12 terribly efficient projects, and did a lot for that much
13 money, which I believe when the Endowment will fund in
14 Oklahoma, it will pay probably 110 to 150, for maybe that
15 same project that we could have bought for 40, partly
16 because you require--the Endowment requires states, just if,
17 you know, they had to have matched with in-kind, if nothing
18 else, whereas the Endowment itself doesn't have that
19 requirement for its grantees.

20 MS. MYERS: Yes, Bill.

21 MR. WILSON: Just a question, because I don't
22 have--I am in ignorance on this. If someone applies to
23 another division for a grant, to what extent does the review
24 process, is the review process, sensitive to the impact on
25 the humanities within that state in general? That is

1 probably not a consideration, is it? And the question is
2 then, should it be? Or--

3 MS. SEMMEL: You know, we had an interesting
4 conversation in the bar last night about this. Not with
5 you, but I did.

6 MR. GLADISH: With somebody at the bar? Or--

7 (Laughter.)

8 (Simultaneous discussion.)

9 MS. SEMMEL: It really was in response to Carole's
10 comment about taking need into account. I know that in our
11 programs, increasingly, not only our guidelines, but the
12 panelists, talk about impact, talk about audiences served,
13 talk about the appropriateness of a particular project, the
14 format of the project, the ideas of the project, the
15 outreach of the project, in conjunction with the place the
16 project is going to happen, and the people then who are
17 going to have access to the project.

18 Now that means that we can, and we do, and we have
19 funded projects at the Harvard Art Museum, when we feel that
20 they, the Harvard Art Museum, is making a good faith effort
21 to reach out beyond the museum's university community. But
22 it may mean that the themes associated with that project are
23 slightly different than a project that we funded in New
24 York, say, on identity and community, that is going to ten
25 local historical societies, each of which have an annual

1 operating budget of less than \$400,000. a year.

2 But in fact, we feel that the panelists themselves
3 are raising these issues, time and time again, about the
4 appropriateness of the fit, the appropriateness of the
5 message of the project, and where the project fits into not
6 only the role and mission of the institution, but the other
7 activities within the area. Now, I can't say that that is
8 always state-bounded. I mean, that doesn't always come out,
9 the issue of the state. But certainly the area, the city,
10 those kinds of issues are addressed more and more.

11 And just to continue a little bit from my
12 conversation last night, I think that--and also to respond
13 to something that you are saying, Robert, I think that we
14 have to be vigilant in how--in the kind of care that we take
15 in looking at our own language for describing things, to not
16 use language that might be seen by a certain constituency,
17 or a certain group of people, as off-putting. I think we
18 always have to keep the ultimate goal in sight, which is--
19 which is exactly what Anita said. I mean, reaching people
20 everywhere, from the national and from the state level. So
21 we have work to do on that, but I see that, in our review
22 process, happening more and more and more. It is not some
23 project that--

24 MR. WILSON: If we say that states, state
25 councils, know the humanities in their state the best, that

1 suggests that they might be able to contribute to the
2 question of context, if not to the question of substance. I
3 am thinking of things like an environmental impact
4 statement. But some kind of contribution that can speak
5 with some authority to the geographic context, so much as
6 that is a consideration.

7 (Simultaneous discussion.)

8 MS. MYERS: Anita.

9 MS. MAY: Well, one additional thing is, if you
10 put a question in your grant application forms, which asks
11 them what impact this has on the other work that is being
12 done by your humanities council, for example, in the state,
13 or how is this project, you know--How will this project be--
14 I know you always ask, don't you, how is this project going
15 to be continued? And often, I mean, at least a couple of
16 people who put in applications will tie that to the ones
17 that we already work with, but I think that it is possible
18 that you get grant applications from other states where no
19 one is really thinking about that answer. But one very
20 simple thing would be to put the question on there, and say,
21 "How does this fit with--?"

22 MS. SEMMEL: The only problem with that is that
23 the state councils are so different and unique, and so if a
24 particular state council has no interest in museum
25 exhibitions, or film or media projects, you are just saying

1 that the applicant should say that, "Well, my state council
2 isn't interested in this project."?

3 MS. MAY: Right. Yes. That is just a question,
4 and it would give you the answer that Bill is looking for,
5 and it is just a question. And maybe it is impossible to
6 tie in, or maybe it is something that actually they never
7 thought of, but if they called on the council in their
8 state, they might start a new partnership.

9 (Simultaneous discussion.)

10 MR. WILSON: --I say that never prejudices the
11 question, so it is not a matter that you have to; it is
12 simply a part of the decision-making process that you
13 consider the implication.

14 MS. MAY: Right. And oftentimes the project can
15 have a longer life, like Ann was talking about, if you do
16 plug into your local council.

17 MS. MYERS: Which is certainly indicated. Jim,
18 and then Bob, and then Liz.

19 MR. HERBERT: It seems to me we are going in a
20 very productive direction here. We are beginning to circle
21 around the definition of an area where the strengths of the
22 two kinds of agencies will be joined to address the problem
23 which, after all, overwhelms us all. And I don't want to
24 back away from that, but I did want to ask a clarifying
25 question, that has surfaced between Robert's analysis and

1 Anita's discussion of what the state councils do well.

2 About a little more than half the work of the
3 Division of Education has to do with higher education,
4 faculty development, and curriculum reform in institutions
5 of higher education. Some of that is site-specific. It is
6 a given campus. We are particularly concerned that we don't
7 have the clout to reach the very large institutions where
8 more than half the students go. There are about 300
9 institutions with enrollments over 15,000 which we barely
10 touch. So I wanted to ask, the state councils define
11 intrastate projects as involving institutions of higher
12 education, as well as the schools?

13 MR. CHEATHAM: I didn't mean that. I was just--

14 MS. MAY: I am sorry, I don't really understand
15 the question.

16 MR. HERBERT: Well, about half the staff effort to
17 outreach, and time and money, that we are responsible for
18 goes to higher education, institutions of higher education,
19 and I guess I am asking is that an area where the state
20 councils feel there is a possibility of partnership, that
21 that is something that they do well?

22 MS. MAY: I think the different states are
23 different. We have heard that. But we--I think we have a
24 pretty close relationship with both OU and OSU, and Tulsa
25 University. We do a lot of programming at university sites,

1 about as much programming at university sites as we do at
2 museum or library sites.

3 MR. HERBERT: So this would be programs directed
4 at improving the quality of undergraduate and graduate
5 education?

6 MS. MAY: But it is--Not necessarily. Although if
7 you funded a project at a university, a lot of it is for
8 that. I mean, we force them to get a public audience, but
9 you can see in the very structure of the program, and the
10 way that the scholars who come into the program are being
11 used, that they are spending a great deal of time doing that
12 as well. But we have the kind of connections in Oklahoma
13 that could help you, because we do have strong ties with--
14 And so many of our scholars, and former and current board,
15 come from those universities and are officials at those
16 universities, so--

17 MS. MYERS: Bob, did you still want to--

18 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes, I wanted to pick up on the
19 idea of partnership that Arnita was hinting at, and I don't
20 want--I realize that I come from a unique place, a state
21 that has 97 incorporated towns, that is all. Thirty-four of
22 which can field an eleven man football team. That is--

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. R. YOUNG: Over the last three years, our
25 humanities programs reached 97 towns, not all of which were

1 incorporated. Some were even too small to be incorporated.
2 Eighty-five percent of our community-initiated projects in
3 Wyoming, came from towns under 8,000 people. These are our
4 grants.

5 What I am saying is, there is a network there that
6 we have, and a recognition that we have. Forty-eight
7 percent of the people in the state know who we are. They
8 probably haven't heard of the NEH. But there is a network
9 there that I think could result in a very productive
10 partnership, with us playing the role of honest broker, or
11 whatever it might be, that would, I think, speak to one of
12 the missions which is public involvement in the humanities.
13 And I think that while we may be an extreme case, that that
14 is the case with humanities councils. And it is a
15 frustration to me that somehow we can't parlay that into a
16 partner--I am not saying we can't, but I think if we could
17 discover a mechanism whereby we could, I think the ultimate
18 benefit is going to be to the people of the United States.

19 MS. A. YOUNG: Bob, (Inaudible.) that, because one
20 thing that I am very struck by is--Jamil and I had a
21 conversation when I first came on board, about how the
22 councils were separate from NEH, and their missions were
23 individually driven, and that was a very important part of
24 the construct of state humanities councils versus NEH. I
25 guess the sense being that the mission of the state councils

1 should not be federally driven, they should not be
2 Washington driven, and ultimately should not be politically
3 driven, depending on the vagrancies (sic) of the political
4 whims.

5 But to my mind, it seems to me that we are
6 beginning to move away from that a little bit, is that there
7 may be a growing sense, or interest, or willingness, to open
8 up the doors a little bit on both ends, and to have a
9 stronger sense of mission, leadership, whatever, that comes
10 out of Washington, not to be as in terms of a mandate, but
11 as a way of ensuring that there is sort of some coordinated
12 mission that you have a sense is happening in every state,
13 so that you do have a sense not only of the state impact,
14 which is just such a--so impressive as 97% or 98%, but to
15 also translate that somehow nationwide, if there is a way of
16 doing that. And maybe the answer is, it shouldn't come from
17 NEH itself; it should come from the Federation of
18 coordinating state councils working together, but that there
19 is this interlocking mission, which I think is so--is so
20 critical.

21 I, in particular, am very concerned about this
22 notion that perhaps NEH is not fully aware of what the
23 states are doing, or doesn't have profound understanding of
24 the importance of what the states are doing. I think you
25 can kick that up one level above that, and from what I see,

1 is the federal government, the Congress, the nation, does
2 not have an appreciation for what we are doing. And I think
3 that is partly because of the sense of magnitude of effort
4 and of reach, because it doesn't seem sort of to translate
5 nationwide, what we are doing.

6 And I wonder if we can--I think one of the best
7 things that could happen in these two days would be if we
8 could begin to work in that direction, and develop a
9 construct that would get us there, because the job that we
10 all have is really to make people aware of the fact a) that
11 they are participating in humanities projects without even
12 knowing it, and b) that there is a very, very important role
13 that the humanities play in daily life. And I really hope
14 that we can work together on that, because it is a larger
15 question, perhaps, from what we are talking about today, but
16 I think it is the most central. Obviously, the great
17 frustration at this table is because of diminished resources
18 from the federal government, and little willingness to move
19 beyond that. We need to work on basically--

20 MS. MYERS: Could we just follow through for a
21 moment on the particular example that Jim Herbert mentioned
22 yesterday about the schools, you know, and the fact that in
23 the science and math communities, and in the arts community,
24 a great deal of energy, and in some case investment, has
25 been made in making certain that the arts and math and

1 science are going to be included in the curriculum, and that
2 there will be standards and goals set and met. Is there
3 among--Among the state councils, is there, would there be,
4 any who would be willing, or would there be some who would
5 be unwilling, to take on, you know, as part of their
6 responsibility, the inclusion of the humanities in schools?
7 Is it--Is it--How willing--

8 MR. HAMMER: Fighting in the state legislatures.

9 MS. MYERS: Pardon me?

10 MR. HAMMER: Fighting in the state legislatures.

11 MS. WATSON: This has been going on now for a
12 decade, over a decade.

13 MS. MYERS: Among many, or all councils?

14 MS. WATSON: Half of the new awards given this
15 year, I think about half were given for education
16 programming. I think what you are asking, and tying both of
17 your comments together, is, is there a way for the councils,
18 the NEH, the Federation, to agree on two or three things
19 that will drive our national passion, banners that we can
20 fly under, and that we can say, "This program is disparate
21 and individualistic, but these are the things that it stands
22 for.", because we all are aware of the many wonderful things
23 that are going on across the country, and the reach of the
24 program is astonishing. But how do we talk about it in such
25 a way that we get adherence to it in a coherent, clear way,

1 that is compelling?

2 MR. CHEATHAM: How can you do that with the NEH
3 grants that have nothing to do with the state councils,
4 clearly? Is that possible there?

5 MS. WATSON: If you want to talk about that, we
6 can talk about that.

7 MR. CHEATHAM: No, I am just saying you are
8 asking, see, what--

9 MS. WATSON: It is a question--

10 MR. CHEATHAM: --what seems to be, (or I feel it
11 is missing in part from this discussion. We keep dropping
12 it.), is that, why are the grants going down? The grants
13 are going down because our operating costs are eating up the
14 grant program. How is that distinct from what is going on
15 in Washington, at the NEH?

16 MS. JONES: It is not.

17 MR. CHEATHAM: It is not really distinct. It is
18 not really distinct, it is just that--

19 MS. JONES: Except it is a bigger pie.

20 MR. CHEATHAM: That is right. It is a bigger pie,
21 and when the appropriation comes in, you say, "We need to
22 increase operations, administration, because we need more
23 money in administration.". So it is just happening faster
24 with us, because we are not even getting that "We are going
25 to increase operations.". See, we are not even getting--

1 MS. MYERS: But you are spending a lot of money
2 initiating projects because you think it is more cost-
3 effective, and people--

4 MR. CHEATHAM: What I am saying is that we are not
5 getting the cost of living increases for operations,
6 although we are institutions that function just the same as
7 NEH does. But also, we are also, when we talk about
8 commonalities--

9 MR. GIBSON: I don't see the distinction there
10 either. I mean, your operating expenses go up, our
11 operating expenses go up, the amount of monies we have
12 available are less--

13 (Simultaneous discussion.)

14 MR. CHEATHAM: When you make a request in your '95
15 budget to increase administration, and reduce oper--and
16 reduce all grants, you are reducing--You are increasing your
17 administration, and reducing our administration.

18 MR. GIBSON: No, we are reducing your overall
19 grant. You determine your--the level of your
20 administration.

21 MR. CHEATHAM: Well--

22 MS. WATSON: What I was trying to say is that the
23 reality is there for all of us. How do we make a case? How
24 do we make a case that goes beyond--or that goes to Congress
25 and goes beyond it, that is compelling? What do we stand

1 for?

2 You know, the old days are gone when we got our
3 moral passion from public policy issues, and to think that
4 the humanities could contribute to doing something in the
5 country about that. We are doing so many things right now,
6 and many of them are wonderful, but it is very difficult to
7 say, "Give us money. We are doing a lot of different,
8 wonderful things.", in the humanities, which most people
9 don't even understand.

10 MR. CHEATHAM: Have you read the--I mean, I know
11 you have--the booklets that have been put out the last two
12 years, and we are working on the third one, where the
13 Federation is trying to give that kind of unity to our
14 projects? I mean, there is some attempt going on to do
15 this, already. I dare say, very few people at NEH have read
16 those. I am sure--

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MS. MYERS: Yes, Liz.

19 MS. E. YOUNG: Let me try to tie a couple of
20 themes back together here, especially this one that has just
21 come up. Coming out of a background of broadcasting and
22 communications, I certainly understand the need to raise the
23 visibility of all the good things we do. Oddly enough, I
24 don't see that as a central problem. I think it can be
25 done. It can be done with goodwill. It can be done with a

1 lot of smarts. There are many, many people in the United
2 States who know how to do that, and do it rather cleverly
3 for their own--for their own activities. I want to get back
4 to that.

5 But I am intrigued with the notion that I think
6 Robert has initially raised, that in some way, and Anita
7 followed on with that, those state councils need to have
8 greater participation in both the granting of, and perhaps
9 the use of, the dollars that come from the divisions other
10 than the State Program. And I am going to suggest something
11 fairly radical here, which is different than simply
12 apportioning, because I think even there (which I am not
13 against, necessarily), that begs the question of what
14 percentage of those funds do you apportion? How do you--Is
15 it for--Is it Ken's 40 million? Is it half? I don't know.

16 Suppose we said that every single grantee,
17 potential grantee, to the NEH for whatever, whether it is in
18 Education, Public Programs, Research, Scholarship, must
19 coordinate, must, in effect, pass the application first
20 through his or her state council. And that the state
21 councils will have a choice of what next steps they take.
22 For example, (and this is not meant to be definitive but to
23 be a thought starter), they can look at the application and
24 say, in the case of a very huge media project, the Civil
25 War, say, "God, that is great. We don't even see a role.

1 It is too big. It is truly national. God bless.". They
2 endorse it. They say, "Come back. We would love to do some
3 programs around it, you know, in certain communities, when
4 you get there.". They could look at it and say, in the
5 private confines of the room, "This is the worst thing we
6 have ever seen.". It goes to Washington, no endorsement,
7 the state has no part in it at all, as opposed to a positive
8 endorsement.

9 The one I hope would result in most cases would
10 endorse and participate. In other words, saying, "And here
11 is the role the state council will play. It will aid in the
12 publicity, it will aid in getting participants, it will aid
13 the scholar in making sure he or she shares the research,
14 whatever." And then it could endorse, but suggest a
15 different type of participation, as one of several state
16 councils, if this is truly a regional, or truly a national
17 program.

18 That would force several things, it seems to me.
19 First of all, for the potential grantee to be aware of what,
20 in fact, is being done in humanities in the states. And I
21 certainly recognize there are differences, but I think we
22 have to make a judgement, at some point, that all the state
23 councils are, if they are not doing the best of all possible
24 jobs now, they want to be. And the only way to help people
25 grow is to challenge them.

1 Secondly, it may, in fact, get around some of the
2 inevitable overlap that we do see occurring, where a project
3 that probably could have been done with less money, and
4 totally by the state council, gets more money because there
5 has been no coordination, to be blunt about it.

6 But the third thing, and this gets back to the
7 point that I think we just were talking about, there is
8 absolutely no doubt in my mind that the best publicity is
9 generated starting at, not ending at, the local level. When
10 you have the local whatever-it-is tied in, whether it is the
11 Chamber of Commerce, the PTA, I don't care, plus the people
12 at the state level, plus the people at the national level--

13 Let's face it. It is very difficult for the NEH,
14 with its limited administrative budget to take a particular
15 scholarly project and put it on the front page of the New
16 York Times. But if you have the grassroots support of the
17 community where it arose, the state that is behind it, and
18 some national recognition, you would be amazed what can be
19 done. You would be amazed what can be done. And I think
20 that publicity, that awareness can be there, if it is first
21 of all a goal, and secondly, it is a goal that is
22 participated in by more than one or two individuals, and
23 maybe one or two grant administrators at the federal level.

24 So I throw that out, Sondra, as a thought starter,
25 to try to get at some of the problems we have been talking

1 about.

2 MS. A. YOUNG: Can I respond to that, Liz?
3 Because I think it is really a great idea. And I think it
4 is something that would increase the impact of what it is
5 that we are doing in piecemeal fashion. But I wonder if
6 there is a way of changing the administrative mechanism a
7 little bit, because of--Rather than having the grantee go
8 through the state council, which creates an additional
9 hurdle for them as they are trying to get their project
10 developed, et cetera, would be to have us do a better job of
11 giving the information to the state councils after every
12 grant cycle, so that you then have immediately (and by
13 immediately I mean in two or three weeks, depending on our
14 ability to compile this information), is that you would have
15 the information four times a year, of the grants that were
16 being made by NEH, and then you could use that information
17 to determine which grants you see as being important in your
18 agenda, to help with the publicity, et cetera, et cetera.

19 I think that may work a little bit better. It is
20 probably a little easier, but would still accomplish--

21 MS. E. YOUNG: No, it wouldn't. No, I really want
22 the state councils in the role of the gatekeeper, and again,
23 I will only do this one more time. I am harking back to the
24 public broadcasting example, where this battle was fought
25 early and bitterly and at some length, and in the end it

1 was--it was state and local versus federal, and the state
2 and local concept won.

3 That is not to say that there isn't today, and
4 there is, money from CPB flowing directly to producers and
5 directors. But even there, it has got to have some tie to
6 some station or network, and 99% of the money flows back to
7 the stations. They in turn pool it, and many of it--a lot
8 that is pooled, as you know, they in turn decide what the
9 programming is going to be. PBS, as I think all of you
10 know, doesn't even produce programming. That is always done
11 at the local, or the non-national level. A little different
12 with NPR. That is really the model I have in mind. Your
13 model may work, too, Ann, but it is a different--

14 (Simultaneous discussion.)

15 MS. MYERS: Tom Roberts.

16 MR. ROBERTS: What Ann suggested already happens.
17 I mean, we do get information about projects that have been
18 awarded, but by that point it is too late for the state
19 council to have any influence, either on the process of
20 deciding on the grant, or on the structure of what is
21 happening in our individual state.

22 MS. MAY: You can't fix a project after it has
23 been planned.

24 MR. ROBERTS: Right, and--

25 (Simultaneous discussion.)

1 MS. MAY: --program, but if in the planning stage,
2 they ask the question that we were talking about before,
3 "How does this tie in with local humanities programs?", even
4 if you just ask that question, they in the state humanities
5 councils, they wouldn't even have to see the whole proposal
6 or anything, but you would answer that question with them.
7 You would--I think it would be an interesting question to
8 work out.

9 I am not sure--I was thinking about the states
10 with the high blips. You see, in Oklahoma that would in any
11 given year be two, maybe, if it was a good year. But in
12 other--So it doesn't really solve a big fundamental problem
13 here, but in other states where they had the high blips,
14 like Massachusetts, I don't know what this means, but I
15 think that Massachusetts doesn't have a very large staff
16 either. He or--It is he, isn't it, that is the executive
17 director?--would have to assign a staff person to deal with
18 everybody with an NEH application. It sounds to me like it
19 might be an insurmountable difficulty.

20 MS. MYERS: John Hammer, and then Arnita.

21 MR. HAMMER: I wonder--I think that is a pretty
22 interesting idea. I wonder if one of the things that we
23 might consider recommending is an experiment of doing that
24 kind of thing in one set of programs at the NEH over a
25 couple of years period of time, because while is pretty

1 interesting, if you think of the state councils who are
2 already overburdened, getting you know, 300, 400 extra
3 proposals to read through, and prepare recommendations on,
4 that is a fair piece of extra work for them.

5 MS. E. YOUNG: John, the chairs would do all the
6 work.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. HAMMER: Anyway, I do think that could be a
9 useful way to get some information on how--

10 MS. MYERS: Also, there could be something less
11 than a requirement, but more than--

12 (Simultaneous discussion.)

13 MS. JONES: That was why--I like the idea of the
14 environmental impact statement. I mean, if rather than the
15 gatekeeper role, there was a sort of assessment of what
16 would be the impact of this in Indiana. It could still be
17 passed forward, it could still be funded, because you might
18 say, "This isn't going to do much for Indiana.", but at the
19 national level there could be a judgement that this is so
20 important nationally that it doesn't matter that much
21 whether there is a particular impact in Indiana. But I
22 think that set of information would force a different kind
23 of discussion in the panel.

24 MR. HAMMER: I think of the thing--

25 (Simultaneous discussion.)

1 MR. HAMMER: --the state really can't recommend
2 it.

3 MS. MYERS: Bill, then Pat, then Robert. Bill?

4 MR. WILSON: Well, one of the things that I hear
5 and wonder about a little bit, and that is, how much do we
6 actually have to look at? Going back to the chair's--
7 Chairman Hackney's three ideas. Creation, you know,
8 translation in the curriculum, participation of citizens.
9 It seems to me that the legitimacy with which state councils
10 can speak is in that third area. Not to exclude the others,
11 but primarily in the third.

12 The concern to me is--Dear to my heart is the idea
13 of boards of volunteers and the like, and it seems to me to
14 the extent that we start to think of state councils as mini-
15 NEHs, we probably move further away from the idea of a
16 volunteer board. And things change over time, but it seems
17 to me there is a certain erosion that takes place there, if
18 staff time is going to be more and more devoted to reviewing
19 something dealing with the creation of new knowledge, and
20 that is going to be more and more removed from the attention
21 and consideration of a volunteer board. That may be a cost,
22 but not something that would preclude it.

23 MS. JONES: I am struck by the fact that we really
24 don't know the proportion of projects funded, say, by the
25 Education Division of Public Programs, that purport to

1 relate to state constituencies issues, et cetera. I mean,
2 there is the whole sound, the creation of new knowledge,
3 not, as I made the point yesterday, I don't think that state
4 programs never do that. I think they do it a lot. But
5 nonetheless, if it is a basic research project that is going
6 to happen in a higher education institution, the impact on
7 the state is not the point of that project. But we don't
8 seem to have good, ready information about the mix of that
9 in any given division. I think that is pretty basic
10 information that the Endowment ought to have.

11 MS. SEMMEL: Actually, we do track that. I don't
12 happen to have--

13 MS. JONES: We didn't seem to have it yesterday
14 when we were talking about--

15 MS. SEMMEL: No, we don't. I haven't done any
16 kind of, you know, over several years tracking of it that I
17 could have for this meeting, but certainly when we do our
18 recommendations for the chairman, each round, and during the
19 whole review process, when applicants have had state council
20 support for a project, they always mention it (or we hope
21 that they mention it), and we mention it as we move forward
22 with our recommendation. Again, it is not a guarantee, but
23 it is something that is very much taken into consideration.
24 So we do track when there is a linkage between a state
25 council's participation in a project--

1 MS. JONES: That is not what I meant. That is not
2 what I meant. Of the projects that are funded, which of
3 those have advertised themselves as having primarily local
4 significance, versus primarily national significance, or a
5 mix of the two?

6 MR. GIBSON: That question isn't asked of the
7 applicant. Pardon?

8 MS. SEMMEL: Well, it is addressed in most--in
9 almost all applications.

10 MS. JONES: Oh, I think it is addressed in the
11 applications, but I mean, do you not have some sort of
12 aggregate data? I mean, we have been concerned in our
13 conversations these two days about overlap, I think has been
14 one of our concerns, and who can do what best. But we
15 don't, it seems to me, know the degree of the overlap, at
16 least I don't feel like I know it from the conversations
17 that we have had. And I suspect, I mean, I only assume you
18 would tell us if you knew, so I--

19 MR. GIBSON: One of the good things that I hope
20 comes out of these two days of conversations, are questions
21 that we can pursue further in terms of--and questions
22 dealing with research--

23 MS. JONES: And let me--

24 MR. GIBSON: --evaluation of our programs, and I
25 think that this is one of those areas where it would be very

1 fruitful for us, and you, I mean that--

2 MS. JONES: You said a magic word, which is
3 "evaluation", too, and I think, you know that we don't--I
4 mean, my experience with NEH is that there isn't that much
5 follow-up. There is always a question about how are you
6 going to evaluate the project, and we are asked to do this,
7 and then to provide that information in the final report.

8 Two things strike me about that. I don't know
9 what happens to those final reports and the evaluation
10 component of them. I don't know how they are used at NEH,
11 and I suspect they are not used that much. I have never had
12 for a project, anyone come to me, say, six months or 18
13 months later, and say, "Okay, we are evaluating a random
14 sample of projects from, you know, the Indiana State
15 Humanities Council of the Division of Education, and we have
16 pulled you out of the hat. Now, you can have a little time
17 to think about this. What difference did this project
18 really make, and what would you do differently if you were
19 doing it over again?". I don't see that happening, and
20 obviously you can't do that in depth with all the projects
21 the agency funds, but you can do a few.

22 MR. GIBSON: True, as you and I were discussing in
23 the bar last night, we do intend to do much more in
24 evaluation--

25 MS. JONES: I am just trying to strengthen that

1 resolve. It is important.

2 MR. GIBSON: I also--Areas of research such as
3 this I think are important, also I think a number of ideas
4 that are on the table are quite interesting, about the
5 involvement of state councils at some point in the grant
6 process, but we need to do some thinking there as well, and
7 research about the implications of all of that. Some of
8 that has come out. I mean, the expertise of boards and so
9 forth, but that also, I think, comes out of this meeting.

10 MS. MYERS: Pat?

11 MS. WILLIAMS: Following this line of thought, I
12 was thinking about some of the projects that Public Programs
13 has funded in the museum community that, while they are
14 examining an issue that has a local nature to it, the
15 methodologies they use, the outcomes they have experienced,
16 have national significance for how to go about doing that
17 kind of program. I am particularly thinking about things
18 that we have done with the Valentine Museum's program. Much
19 of what they are examining as they reexamine the history of
20 the City of Richmond, is very, very local, in terms of the
21 focus, but how they went about it, the way they prepared
22 their staff, the kind of development processes they went
23 through for their institution, the kinds of community ties
24 that they made, and how they made them, and the length of
25 time it took them to make those ties, very important for the

1 national museum community to experience and understand. So
2 in that case, while the content was very much locally based,
3 the process that they went through was extremely important.
4 And I don't know how you would evaluate that under Liz's
5 model. I am not throwing the model out, by any means--

6 MS. E. YOUNG: Well, that is a good example,
7 because in fact, in Virginia we have funded the Valentine
8 many times for different things, and I think it would be
9 rare that they wouldn't coordinate, just on a voluntary
10 basis. I mean, I think the Valentine is a perfect example
11 of where this model works already, because there is a
12 dialogue there, and Rob does know what they are doing at the
13 national level, as well as the things they come to us for.
14 So that is actually a good example.

15 MS. MAY: But there are a number of projects, too,
16 that are funded at the state level, which turn out to be
17 models--

18 MS. E. YOUNG: Sure.

19 MS. MAY: --of methodology, and a variety of
20 different things. One that we worked on a couple of years
21 ago, got an American Association of State and Local History
22 award just for that reason, and another one got an American
23 Association of Archivists award, also for that reason. So,
24 you know, I think that we are doing things on a state level
25 that have national import as well.

1 MS. A. YOUNG: Can I throw out another model on
2 the table, Pat, which is totally appropo, but I don't want
3 to cut you off. So--

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I was going to do another model
5 myself, but go ahead.

6 MS. A. YOUNG: Well, the National Diffusion
7 Network is--I don't know if anybody is familiar with that--

8 (Simultaneous discussion.)

9 MS. A. YOUNG: But again, it--What it does is it
10 takes--Tom is laughing because this was my old boss's
11 creation.

12 MR. ROBERTS: And because we had a grant funded,
13 too.

14 MS. A. YOUNG: Well, you can speak more directly
15 to--

16 MR. GLADISH: People who have money can laugh
17 about these things, is that what you are saying, Tom?

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. A. YOUNG: The network identifies the models
20 of excellence, and--This is the theory; whether it actually
21 functions this way or not is a different story, but it is
22 supposed to take the evaluative data of that particular
23 model, and make it available in a way that could be adapted
24 through technical assistance to other areas. In fact, this
25 particular program provides technical assistance in the form

1 of personnel to go around the country and help people adopt
2 these models in their states, and it is--I think it is an
3 interesting notion.

4 MS. MYERS: Pat, did you have a model that you
5 wanted to put forth?

6 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, and I don't want Liz's to
7 disappear, but I just want to throw this one in because it
8 is one I have been working with recently that has been quite
9 interesting for me.

10 We have formed a new organization called the
11 National Coalition for Heritage Areas, and this is something
12 that has risen up from the regions and the states, which is
13 this notion of identifying large-scale cultural resources
14 that speak to major historical themes, be it transportation,
15 or industrial heritage, that no one entity or jurisdiction
16 can deal with very well, and the interpretive research
17 strategies have to be, you know, cross-disciplinarian. Many
18 times they are managed multi-jurisdictionally.

19 And these are coming up, you know, to this
20 national level. And at the national level, they are asking
21 now, for recognition of they are nationally significant, and
22 the request for that recognition is coming from this
23 direction, not this direction. It is not the National
24 Register, now you are nationally important. It is coming
25 right up from the community, and what is working there, that

1 the crit--What we have done is develop a statement of
2 principles of national significance, that everybody in the
3 coalition has signed, that allows the process to keep--
4 Certain projects are regional, some are state, and others
5 are national. And the national significance statement of
6 principles is broad. It allows a lot to come up.

7 And the other piece that it keeps in place is a
8 local management entity, so that money flows through a local
9 entity, it is not going to come--We are not going to
10 undermine this local entity. That is who is managing this
11 process. And I think that might be worth looking at in the
12 discussion about the role of the state councils vis a vis
13 these network grants.

14 I am a little worried about the burden of routing
15 all the applications, whereas if you had this kind of filter
16 in place, then you knew which ones would just jump right on
17 up, because they met your criteria at the state level to
18 jump up. It is just something that--

19 MS. MYERS: Don, did you--

20 (Simultaneous discussion.)

21 MS. MYERS: Pardon me?

22 MR. GIBSON: I just think it is time for a break.

23 MS. MYERS: A last one?

24 MR. R. YOUNG: Just one quick--I want to get back
25 to this, to finding some means of a partnership that might

1 work and ultimately redound to the benefit of the people out
2 there. And I mean, that is what we are all about. And
3 however we can best do that, but again, for example, we have
4 an incredible language rejuvenation project going on in the
5 Wind River reservation. Those people will never approach
6 NEH. They will never approach NEH. It has taken them 15
7 years to approach us. But we have built up a level of
8 trust. Now is there some--Is there--We don't have the funds
9 to keep something like that going. Is there some way that
10 there can be some sort of partnership where, not necessarily
11 passing on an application, but we could funnel other funds
12 into that? That is the kind of structure that--

13 MS. MYERS: I think that this growth is extremely
14 interesting.

15 Robert. Then that will be the break after Robert.

16 MR. CHEATHAM: I want to add something about
17 Elizabeth's model, which, a lot of which, I like. I agree
18 with Bill that, please, if the Vanderbilt people are
19 applying for scholarly research, don't send it to us. I
20 don't want to deal with them. I will let Don handle them.
21 That is fine.

22 MS. E. YOUNG: Maybe it would be good for you,
23 Robert.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. CHEATHAM: But there is something we have. I

1 mean, I can see this would put me in a delicate position
2 sometimes. If we are solely a gatekeeper, then what do I do
3 when proposals come in that I know are not what they say
4 they are? And we know that in Tennessee, because we know
5 these organizations, and we work with them routinely. Do I
6 send it up and say, "Let them decide. I am not going to
7 tell NEH, I am not going to make these people angry."? If
8 that is a problem we are facing, I am in a bind, because I
9 hate to lose the money coming into the state. If however,
10 we lose that money coming into the state, but we gain it
11 because I can work with these good institutions, and help
12 those go up, then it works in my favor, because I don't want
13 to overspend your money, if we have some way to bring it
14 back. So there has got to be that kind--

15 MR. ROBERTS: There are a number of times that we
16 get the quarterly announcement of grants, that we--It
17 doesn't happen every time, but we say, "Boy, I hope NEH has
18 better luck with them than we did.". And that comes too
19 late.

20 (Simultaneous discussion.)

21 MR. ROBERTS: And conversely, we don't know the
22 ones that got turned down, and we might have said, "Boy,
23 this is a--They don't look like much, but they are really--"

24 (Simultaneous discussion.)

25 MR. GLADISH: Tom, doesn't the corollary apply as

1 well? I mean, I would imagine (in fact I have experienced
2 some of this), that some of my colleagues on the university
3 museum committee will say, "Well, gee, the Indiana
4 Humanities Council is getting \$600,000. a year. We could
5 spend that money a lot more effectively than the Indiana
6 Humanities Council does.". I mean, I think the shoe is on
7 the other foot sometimes, too.

8 MS. MYERS: Well--

9 MR. GLADISH: Scholars and others saying exactly
10 the same thing as we are starting to say about these other
11 people.

12 MS. MYERS: Let's pursue this after the break,
13 because we haven't found the perfect model, and we won't
14 today, but discussing these models of deeper and broader
15 collaboration, and more longterm collaboration, and
16 cooperation, is really important.

17 So, 15 minutes.

18 (Whereupon, at 10:25 a.m. a brief recess was
19 taken, after which the meeting continued as follows.)

20 MS. MYERS: Okay, let's continue the conversation.
21 We have had during the break, a suggestion that I would like
22 to propose to you. Jamil suggested that during lunch, for
23 those who--a few people might be willing to sacrifice a more
24 leisurely lunch--that three people get together and attempt
25 a summary, or some of the hot points, or cool points, or

1 promising points, that have come up in the course of last
2 night and this morning, to begin our afternoon discussion.
3 And if that is agreeable to you, and it is to us, then I
4 would ask that Jamil, having offered the suggestion, we take
5 that as a volunteer--a volunteer commitment, and I would
6 also like to have Ken and Marsha volunteer to join with
7 Jamil in that, if they are willing.

8 MR. GLADISH: "I would also like to have Ken and
9 Marsha volunteer"?

10 MS. MYERS: That is the way I put it. I thought
11 that would be--I haven't been in the military, but I know
12 that they use that word loosely, too. Would that be all
13 right with you? Marsha, would that be all right?

14 MS. SEMMEL: Does this mean we get a free lunch?

15 MS. MYERS: Yes.

16 MR. CHEATHAM: There is no free lunch.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MS. MYERS: If you call that a free lunch, having
19 to work like that, yes.

20 MR. : Paid in kind.

21 MS. MYERS: Okay, well shall we pick up, because I
22 think we were in the midst of talking about models, of more
23 connectedness between the state councils and the divisions,
24 and we can pick up on that. Tom, and then Anita.

25 MR. ROBERTS: Just one potential problem that I

1 think we need to keep in the back of our minds, at least,
2 that in other circumstances, we are discussing, the state
3 councils are collectively discussing, the possibility of
4 being able to apply to other divisions. I think if we took
5 Liz's model, and became gatekeepers for other applicants to
6 other divisions, it would present very potential--
7 potentially very real problems of conflicts of interest for
8 us to be saying this one is good, this one isn't, while we
9 ourselves were competing for the same--some of the same
10 money. So I think there are ways that we can get around
11 that, but I think we need to put that on the table, too, and
12 make it one of the considerations for whatever model we come
13 up with.

14 MS. MYERS: Right. And that has certainly been an
15 issue that has come up frequently.

16 Anita, and then Ken.

17 MS. MAY: Well, I would like to say if we just had
18 that one question in the application, asking for the
19 linkages, then without us being review, it would do some of
20 the same things that we are interested in, at the same time
21 as allow us to be out of the process. Just the question,
22 "How does this link with the rest of the humanities
23 activities in the state?", or maybe it shouldn't, you know.

24 But one of the things that I thought about a long
25 time ago, when Jamil and I talked about state humanities

1 councils and the NEH, and I just want to throw it out here,
2 because I do need to leave at noon and won't be here this
3 afternoon, and this is--

4 MR. CHEATHAM: Is this why you are throwing it
5 out? Because you won't be here?

6 (Laughter.)

7 (Simultaneous discussion.)

8 MS. MAY: --sort of a pie in the sky kind of idea,
9 but I work a lot with people with the state arts council,
10 and I know that they have several kinds of programs in the
11 National Endowment for the Arts, where they make money
12 available for local initiatives to reach hard-to-reach
13 groups, et cetera, and usually it is the state arts council
14 that works with a variety of different organizations to
15 apply for that grant. I see this--At least, we do this in a
16 variety of different ways in Oklahoma, but almost every
17 exemplary award that we have applied for in the past three
18 years, has been with several organizations that wouldn't
19 come to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

20 One year we went in with nine museums, and did
21 what was called the Oklahoma Museum Education Project.
22 There were three large museums, only one of which had ever
23 applied to the National Endowment, and six small museums,
24 and we went in with the project that won the AESLH award,
25 which linked the education programs of the museums to the

1 schools in their area, and developed a model program for
2 duplication in a lot of other museums.

3 But I was thinking, at the Endowment, if every
4 division, with the possible--well, with the exception of
5 Research and Fellowships, but every other division, had a
6 certain sum of money that it held in a kind of a local
7 partnership type of program, then it would answer a need of
8 the Endowment, which would get into those hard-to-reach
9 areas, and possibly create new partnerships at state and
10 regional levels that have never been possible before.

11 As I was telling Marsha yesterday, I dream a lot.
12 I mean, that is why I am in this program. But what if (and
13 I am a native New York State person), what if in order to
14 get money, the Metropolitan Museum had to worry about how to
15 reach Utica, New York, with a program. (That is where I grew
16 up.) And it had to also collaborate with the New York
17 humanities council (and I don't know if they even speak to
18 each other), to do that. Wouldn't that be interesting?
19 Because I think that it might create some fruitful new
20 partnerships, just as the question on the application, "How
21 does this link in with the rest of the humanities programs
22 in your state?".

23 Some of these larger institutions, I think, don't
24 really think about the humanities council. I have always
25 thought it is difficult to be the humanities council in

1 Oklahoma, but it would be hard to be the humanities council
2 in New York, because there is too much going on. And so, a
3 local--some kind of a local initiative, or local outreach,
4 hard-to-reach program in Public, and in Education, might be
5 an interesting vehicle, and I just want to throw it out
6 there, in a vision of the future.

7 MS. MYERS: And I think there are programs, too,
8 at the state arts council level, too. I know that there is
9 a program in New York, where, you know, I can recall being
10 at an exhibit in the museum in Binghamton, where there were
11 loans from the Metropolitan, and there are programs that do
12 get some of their permanent collections out on the road.

13 MS. MAY: But that kind of partnership in the
14 humanities might be stimulated by such--

15 MS. MYERS: Some incentives.

16 MS. MAY: Some incentives, right.

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MS. MYERS: Who is next? Yes, Ken.

19 MR. GLADISH: I think this discussion, which has
20 focused on models of relationship between the various
21 divisions and the agency itself and state councils, is
22 constructive, but it in some ways avoids the key question,
23 which is, what is our current notion of an appropriate model
24 for the state humanities council itself, and what is our
25 definition, and how can the Endowment and the councils work

1 together to create what would be called an adequate program
2 at the state level?

3 In some ways we are kind of on the margins of that
4 discussion in this conversation about the relationship, but
5 what I think Jim ought to do with his relationship to the
6 state councils, or what Marsha ought to do with her
7 relationship to the state councils, where--I think that is
8 important, but I think that is the second question, or
9 connected to this larger issue of, what is in 1994, an
10 adequate program for the state councils?

11 Now, if that adequacy includes a collaborative
12 relationship, or some more significant partnership with the
13 other divisions, fine. But I wonder whether we have a
14 contemporary image of the mission and character of the
15 councils, and how the Division of State Programs, and the
16 Endowment working through that division, and the councils
17 working back to the division and the Endowment, are crafting
18 adequate programs in the states.

19 I mean, part of the issue that was raised in
20 Robert's charts, while he didn't explicitly focus on it, was
21 the adequacy of the program over all. And in some ways our
22 discussions have been focussing again on the radical
23 dependence of the state humanities councils on the simple
24 funding formulas and mechanisms of the endowment. Which
25 raises the question: Does the Endowment, and do the

1 councils, have an obligation in the movement toward adequate
2 programs to reach all the people with public decree
3 mechanisms to allow that to happen within the current
4 resource environment? We know that there is not going to be
5 a whole hell of a lot more money coming into the agency
6 itself. Our focus has for a little while this morning been
7 on how we can carve up the money that is there to more
8 favorably treat what we define inside the councils as our
9 interests.

10 There is a larger question. How can we both work
11 together to expand those interests? Maybe we don't have the
12 right models to work on the councils themselves. The
13 historical document reminded me of these three experiments
14 going back a quarter of a century. You know, the
15 relationship to the land grant universities' cooperative
16 extension agencies, and the relationship to the arts, and
17 the independent one. Well, we chose the independent one.
18 Maybe we ought to be asking the question, is that still the
19 right one? And if it is, are we doing the right things to
20 make it as capable as it can be for the future?

21 That, for me, in my work over the last ten years
22 in Indiana, that is the key question. Certainly I would
23 very much like to have access in Indiana to all the other
24 divisions, to Challenge Grant and everything else. We would
25 take advantage of it, and I think we would be competitive.

1 But that still begs the larger question, which is, what is
2 the obligation of the citizen committee, and the
3 professional staff in Indiana, and what is the obligation of
4 the division and the Endowment to institutionalize, to
5 stabilize, to further support, and to extend the work of
6 these state councils?

7 And I am afraid that we have been kind of around
8 the edges of that question, which for me is the key
9 question. And yes, you know, I do want to address this
10 question in relationship to divisions and the rest, because
11 once you have the model and the notion of what you want the
12 future to be for the councils, then you can go on. I know
13 people are sensitive about that, because we always talk
14 about our idiosyncrasy and our exceptionalism. You know, I
15 mean everybody in every field of work that I know thinks of
16 themselves as exceptional. It is kind of an American trait.
17 We are not like other not-for-profits, we are not like other
18 cultural--

19 MR. CHEATHAM: Where everybody is above average.

20 MR. GLADISH: That is right.

21 (Simultaneous discussion.)

22 MR. GLADISH: And we are not even in Minnesota.

23 So my concern is, with the limited time that we have at the
24 beginning of this conversation, I think these questions are
25 important, but more important to me is the model of the

1 state council, and how we work together to make it as an
2 entity more adequate. The way we have been talking, we have
3 been talking as if our idea is that the state council is
4 simply, and ought to be, an adjunct of the Endowment, and
5 radically dependent on the Endowment for the next 25 years,
6 as it has been for the last 25. I don't think that that is
7 being responsible, in terms of our obligations to our
8 citizens, ourselves, to your obligation as an agency, to the
9 Congress, and the vision of these enterprises.

10 Or maybe we need to come to the conclusion that
11 the councils will forever be radically dependent on the
12 Endowment, that 78 to 85% of their income will always come
13 from there, and we work within that box. I just don't want
14 to necessarily conclude at the beginning of the
15 conversation, that we have to work within the same box.

16 And maybe that is too difficult a question to ask
17 at this point. But I really think that ought to be the
18 question that is on the table, and in some measure was in
19 the agenda that you set out. It certainly is the question
20 that Carole raised in the document she created in draft
21 form, about the role and mission of the agency which
22 occasioned some controversy in our own circle, and some
23 conversations at the directors meeting in the East, and I am
24 sure it will be at the West, a colloquy that occurred
25 between Jamil and Carole on that question, in correspondence

1 between them on the issue. You know, we had a little fax
2 war going on for a while in among the directors and council
3 members and board members. And what was at the root of that
4 faxomania that was going on? It was--

5 (Simultaneous discussion.)

6 MR. GLADISH: --it was the question of what is our
7 vision of what these institutions, if we are going to use
8 that word, ought to be? And our presumption to this point
9 has been, in this conversation, one of probably recognition
10 of reality. We are radically dependent on the Endowment,
11 and on a Congressional interpretation of the Endowment's
12 relationship to the state councils. But is there more than
13 that? Should it be? I am just asking the question. I am a
14 little bothered by the fact that we focus so much on the
15 relationship to the other divisions, because I think there
16 is a larger question that lies behind it. We haven't wanted
17 to put that larger question on the table yet.

18 MS. E. YOUNG: Let me respond to one thing, Ken.
19 I don't know that we can assume that the assumption is there
20 that we are going to be radically dependent. I don't.
21 Virginia, and I will say more than maybe anybody else, but
22 certainly along with some others, has moved away from that.
23 I mean, we became an independent foundation when I was still
24 on the board, and we are no longer a council. We are, in
25 fact, somebody used the term a mini-NEH. I am not sure I

1 would describe it that way, but it is moving toward being an
2 autonomous foundation, which happens to get a good deal of
3 its money, and would like to get more from different pockets
4 of the NEH. But I can see a day--If the NEH went away
5 tomorrow, the Virginia foundation would still be there. I
6 don't know that I could have said that five years ago, but I
7 think I can say that today.

8 MR. GLADISH: It would be, but in a radically
9 different form, even yet. Right?

10 MS. E. YOUNG: Yes. Yes, that is right. And, of
11 course, the presumption is you know you would have a little
12 advance time before the NEH went away so the transition
13 would happen even more quickly, but therefore, I don't
14 assume that we all assume that the NEH is the only and the
15 most--It has to be the most significant part in states not
16 as fortunate to have larger populations, and that gets back
17 to the idiosyncratic nature of what we do.

18 But I am not so troubled by slightly different
19 models. If Virginia wants to be more independent, fine.
20 And if it can sustain its role and get grants within the
21 state and from outside the state, and from other people than
22 the NEH, I think that is terrific, as long as it is
23 supporting the humanities, which I think it is doing. If
24 Wyoming needs inevitably to look to the NEH for most or all
25 of its money, that is fine, too.

1 MR. GLADISH: But then, Elizabeth, do you have
2 under those circumstances, a national state-based program?
3 If the idiosyncrasy is so--is on the edge, in this instance,
4 we all need to give up the notion that that is the case.

5 MS. E. YOUNG: Well, the only national program I
6 see, is that the legislation requires that there only be one
7 entity in the state that the money goes to, and we have
8 that. That is all I am concerned with. I don't think there
9 has to be a monolithic state program. I never have. Maybe
10 others don't share that belief, but that doesn't trouble me,
11 and I don't think we ever had it.

12 MS. MYERS: Anymore than the states have perfect
13 symmetry.

14 MS. E. YOUNG: It doesn't mean there can't be
15 national initiatives in which everybody participates. It
16 doesn't mean there certainly have to be--again,
17 unfortunately, I hark back to public broadcasting. How a
18 station in Memphis functions is very different from how a
19 station in Duluth, and the network in South Carolina
20 function. But you know, sooner or later, a lot of kids see
21 "Sesame Street", a lot of people contribute, there is a lot
22 of community involvement, and that is fine. I don't think
23 South Carolina has to look like Duluth.

24 MR. GLADISH: But there is a statement, is there
25 not, that--Carole, is there a statement about the Endowment

1 having responsibility for ensuring, or assessing, an
2 adequate state program, in order to make that grant? So
3 what is the image of adequacy?

4 MS. WATSON: It is defined by the state. We
5 haven't withheld funding for any state council in over a
6 decade. It used to be fairly routine.

7 MR. CHEATHAM: But does that define them as
8 adequate?

9 MS. WATSON: Pardon me?

10 MR. CHEATHAM: They are all adequate right now.
11 You are defining adequacy. You have to, don't you? To give
12 them the money.

13 MS. MYERS: You are accepting--

14 MS. WATSON: Through the review process.

15 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes, but you just said they are all
16 adequate according to--because you never withheld money.

17 MS. WATSON: I didn't say never. I said it used
18 to be routine.

19 MR. CHEATHAM: Okay.

20 MS. JONES: To what degree is the review process a
21 dinosaur?

22 MS. MYERS: The review of the state councils?

23 MS. JONES: Um-hum.

24 MR. : What do you mean?

25 MS. JONES: Well, it seems to me that when we talk

1 about a review process, we are talking about something that
2 is comparable to--I mean, that state councils undergo a
3 process that looks somewhat like, say, the Association of
4 American Historians wants to do a higher education project
5 in the Division of Education, and we go in and put together
6 a proposal, and we get reviewed, and maybe it is not a good
7 proposal, so we don't--You know, maybe there is not enough
8 money, but in any case, we take our chances, and maybe we
9 don't get funded.

10 But in reality, that is not what happens with
11 state councils, as you just said. Money hasn't been
12 withheld for more than a decade. It isn't as if there are
13 50 councils applying, and only 20 of them are going to get
14 funding. So how is that review process different from other
15 divisions? How should it be different? Is it something
16 where the agency is going through forms rather than a real
17 review process? I mean, I really am asking questions. I
18 really don't know. It sounds to me, it looks to me from a
19 distance like a dinosaur, and that there might be other
20 functions that state programs--And I guess the other thing I
21 am reacting to is, I have heard a lot this morning about
22 inform--and yesterday--about information we don't have,
23 connections that are not made that could be made, and, you
24 know, we haven't said this, but it always takes somebody to
25 do all that stuff, and where that somebody is going to come

1 from, and I guess what I would like to see out on the table
2 is maybe a different role for the staff in the division. I
3 don't know. I mean, if the review process is increasingly
4 perfunctory over the years, and if there are other needs
5 that are not being met--

6 MS. WATSON: I didn't say it is perfunctory. And
7 I didn't say it wasn't serious. It is quite serious. And
8 does anybody else want to hear about how it works? Have
9 you--?

10 Basically, states get three year grants. They are
11 allowed to apply for two or three year grants. It is
12 reviewed by peers, primarily people in the program--

13 MS. JONES: Out of state programs?

14 MS. WATSON: Yes. Not active members or staff,
15 but chair--

16 MS. JONES: People who have been involved in state
17 councils.

18 MS. WATSON: Yes. Exactly. We try to create a
19 peer review that is reflective of the geography of the
20 country, for those councils that are coming into that round,
21 male/female, large state/small state, all the balancing out
22 that you would try to do in an effort to create a peer
23 panel, which would also mean that there would be public
24 representation as well as scholarly representation. We try
25 to make sure that at least one person on the panel has had a

1 lot of experience with large organization or foundation
2 work. I think the most important part, though, is that the
3 person have a very important--having had an important role
4 in the operation of the state humanities council.

5 The panel members read the proposals before they
6 arrive. Each is judged against the ideal program in the
7 state. We record, not record, but we write, several people
8 write what the course of the discussion is, and the outcome
9 of the discussion is conveyed in a very thorough letter to
10 the council, so that they will understand, have an outside
11 view of their work. It is very efficient. As a result of
12 that review also (which involves the national council), we
13 make grants in the range of 600,000 in smaller territories,
14 to over \$4 million in the largest state.

15 MR. GLADISH: That is over a three year period.

16 MS. WATSON: Three years, yes.

17 MS. JONES: How much evaluation goes on in that
18 process of what the council has done over the last decade?

19 MS. WATSON: The council itself writes. Half of
20 this document is an evaluation of the council of its work,
21 and the other half is what it proposes to do with the
22 funding over the next period of time.

23 MS. E. YOUNG: Carole, let me join in, because I,
24 as you know, I have participated more than once on the peer
25 reviews. I think the process is pretty good. I can

1 certainly remember times, and I don't know what the absolute
2 outcome has been, when we have said, "This council needs to
3 be advised that this project really is not well thought out.
4 Maybe we want to give them a little--recommend a little bit
5 of--"

6 MS. JONES: This project is specific--

7 MS. E. YOUNG: Yes, a specific thing. Yes, I mean
8 they were asking for--Yes, not--never the whole--you know, I
9 don't think, at least in the time I have been involved that
10 we have ever said--

11 MS. JONES: "This area needs more work."

12 MS. E. YOUNG: Sure. If they were asking in a
13 three year program to do XYZ, the XYZ we know other states
14 that have done this. This project isn't well thought out.

15 But it doesn't preclude people operating
16 differently. You know, it doesn't preclude the state that
17 we know and they know are totally dependent on the NEH. It
18 is judged on the--what they are asking to do with the money,
19 versus a Virginia that may say, "By the way, we plan to get
20 money from six different sources to do this program. We are
21 only coming to the NEH for A, B, and C, but not X, Y, and
22 Z."

23 MR. GLADISH: But it is not a competitive process
24 in the way that, you know, if you submit a proposal. That
25 is the difference. It is not a competitive--

1 MS. JONES: Well, and it strikes me that it has
2 much in common with what happens, say, for instance, when
3 you know, the Middle States Association comes to Earlham
4 College in Indiana, or something, and they are reaccrediting
5 them, they are examining their work to see if they are doing
6 what they say they do, and if they are missing
7 opportunities, and they are not doing--You know, so that it
8 is--In a sense, it has more to do with that kind of process
9 in my mind, than the kind of review that other proposals are
10 in, in other parts of the agency. Am I wrong, or am I
11 right?

12 MR. CHEATHAM: I absolutely agree that that is the
13 process that we are going through. The difference between
14 the accreditation process at Earlham, and this process, is
15 that there is not a conversation that goes on.

16 MS. JONES: A conversation where?

17 MR. CHEATHAM: Between the evaluator and the
18 evaluatee.

19 MR. HAMMER: At NEH.

20 MR. CHEATHAM: At NEH. I mean there is--We
21 produce a proposal, and then the evaluation occurs, not in
22 our presence. So we can't add--There is no dialogue
23 between--

24 MS. JONES: You know, the other thing that
25 happens, just to carry on this comparison a little bit, and

1 I don't, you know, myself, get that involved in it with a
2 private non-profit association, but a lot of my members do,
3 you know. "The team is coming. The evaluation team is on
4 our campus. I can't be there, because I am going to have to
5 be dealing with these people." They go on-site. Does that
6 ever happen?

7 MS. WATSON: Well, the staff visits regularly with
8 the councils, and visits projects.

9 MS. MYERS: Pat.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: I just want to continue Arnita's
11 line of thinking here, because I think it is a very valuable
12 process to maybe think about that as self-assessment, you
13 know, and having along with state council some criteria,
14 identifiable factors of adequacy and even excellence. Maybe
15 even thinking about a way to move from adequate to
16 excellent, as a state council that gets NEH support. You
17 were talking about, you know, Florida needs help, or--They
18 are not here, so I can say that.

19 (Simultaneous discussion.)

20 MR. CHEATHAM: It is not their problem.

21 (Simultaneous discussion.)

22 MS. WILLIAMS: --and so how it comes and how it
23 flows, which are--It sounds like you are currently doing is
24 basically sort of a post-audit of what they have done and
25 accomplished, and maybe there is even a way of changing that

1 to make it more fruitful. I think the on-site evaluation
2 helps so much.

3 MR. GLADISH: AAM does this, right? For
4 recertification--

5 MS. WILLIAMS: And we do it with peers, we don't
6 do it with staff. We use peer reviewers.

7 (Simultaneous discussion.)

8 MR. CHEATHAM: And peers are defined as people
9 active in the work at this time.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: Right, so it would be somebody from
11 another state council, maybe somebody who is not currently
12 on a council, but had been, or a chair, or a staffer. It
13 can be really a powerful instrument to help you.

14 MS. MYERS: Bill?

15 MS. WILLIAMS: I think it is a really interesting
16 idea you have got on the table.

17 MR. WILSON: Two points. Having served on panels,
18 it seems to me that one of the virtues is, the panels I have
19 been on, there is always someone that is not always
20 acquainted with the state, and a great virtue is getting the
21 right person to say, "I don't understand how you people do
22 what you do.". And I think it is a fairly fruitful and
23 critical process, and the last one I was on, the questions
24 were more fundamental than some specific programmatic
25 element, and involved a real follow-through. And of course,

1 the staff person who has followed the particular state
2 council in the intervening time, speaks to it as well. I
3 mean, this is a-- Very often it is viewed by--It is always
4 viewed by someone who wants the grant as kind of a huge
5 hoop, and a pain in the neck. The question it seems to me
6 is, "Does the process of formulating the proposal, is that
7 central to the planning process that the organization should
8 do?".

9 MS. JONES: That is a very good question.

10 MR. WILSON: Now, it seems to me, if 90% of their
11 funding is coming from NEH, then that hoop is a crucial and
12 deliberate hoop. If you reach the point, and 15% or 20% of
13 their funding is from NEH, then how to fit that hoop into
14 the broader strategic plan that they have to engage in
15 becomes much more complex. Probably they are less happy
16 with this doggone hoop from NEH, because they end up with
17 separate sets of books, and everything else they need to
18 integrate it.

19 We are for the most part, it seems to me, still in
20 the process where the triennial proposal, or biennial
21 proposal, still is the central planning document, and still
22 becomes a worthwhile exercise. But if we change over time,
23 then it is much more complex in turns of planning, because
24 the comment to the state council may be, "Well, gee, we kind
25 of like what you do for us.", but in fact, there is always

1 the question how does that fit into the other things that
2 you do; that is only 15% of your effort.

3 MS. JONES: Is it the central planning document
4 for most councils?

5 MS. MAY: Well, I think so, because your whole
6 sort of life depends on, like you were saying, 80% or 70%,
7 and it is somewhere between 70 and 80 for us, so that we
8 structure our planning around planning for that proposal.

9 One of the interesting things is, I work with a
10 lot of not-for-profit organizations that have not had the
11 benefit of consistent funding from somebody who has demanded
12 long-range planning, and God, they don't have long-range
13 plans, you know, and they are coming at things every which
14 way. So one of the benefits of having had this 20 year
15 experiment, where we did proposals, and that sort of thing,
16 has been that yes, we do, we are forced to long-range plan.
17 And I think a lot of bigger organizations, like a lot of the
18 museums, that have larger budgets than we, don't have long-
19 range plans in place, and so we get forced to. In all the
20 time when--One of the interesting things about running this
21 program has been, for me anyway, if I say it is time that we
22 have to get to planning because we have to put in an NEH
23 proposal, everybody gets serious. If I just walk in, or
24 talk to my chairman and say it is time to plan, they will
25 say, "What a pain. We don't want to plan. We have got

1 better things to do.". They hate planning anyway. I mean,
2 there isn't anybody that loves to plan, and so planning
3 because you have to, because you are going to get money if
4 you plan, is a bigger incentive to plan.

5 So I think in that way, writing those proposals is,
6 you know, especially the planning part of the proposal, but
7 in order to do a new plan, you have to evaluate, and the
8 board has to consider what it has done and what it has
9 accomplished and--But it is a great motivator to have to
10 plan.

11 MS. MYERS: Robert.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: Is what you are saying, that the
13 real profitable part of the review process was complete for
14 you yesterday?

15 MS. MAY: Yes. Oh, in December.

16 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes. So you feel the work that was
17 useful to you was completed in December.

18 MS. MAY: Right.

19 MR. CHEATHAM: So the rest of this process is not
20 particularly useful to you. How are you going to use your
21 review letter, for example?

22 MS. MAY: Well, I will take that review letter to
23 the board, and we will talk about it in the context of what
24 we planned. Normally, my review letter just says, "Oh,
25 everything is great.", and "What a wonderful thing.", and

1 never picks out anything. You know, I mean I haven't had a
2 review letter that picked anything out that the board really
3 had to chew on.

4 MR. GLADISH: And you are not inviting any changes
5 in that.

6 MS. MAY: No, I am not. No.

7 (Simultaneous discussion.)

8 MS. MAY: --review letter where it told them they
9 were wrong one time, and a review letter that told them they
10 were right. However, I think it is good for them to know
11 that some peers think they are right.

12 I was kind of interested in the actual visitation
13 type of thing, though. But I keep on--I am an
14 administrator, and I know that that is going to cost a lot
15 more money, and boy, that would be a problem, if you started
16 spending more money coming to state.

17 MR. CHEATHAM: And bringing a panel to Washington.

18 MS. MAY: Yes, I think so.

19 MR. CHEATHAM: Bringing a group to Oklahoma City--

20 MS. MAY: From each state. Each state. Now we
21 are talking about each state having--

22 (Simultaneous discussion.)

23 MS. MAY: --lot more money. I think a lot more
24 money. I don't know. It would be fun in a way, and they
25 would get to know things much more intimately, that is the

1 part of the process that appeals to me, and you would see--

2 MS. WATSON: What would you have them look at?

3 MS. MAY: Well, you know, we would have to plan
4 that out the way a college or university did. I never
5 thought--

6 MR. CHEATHAM: If you could just see the office.
7 You know, nobody from NEH has been to our office, except
8 Sheldon Hackney, since 1977, when Jim Vore came.

9 MS. MAY: But it is an interesting thing. I mean,
10 you could plan it and structure it in a lot of different
11 ways, and it might be more help in some senses than that
12 described in the letter.

13 MS. MYERS: Bob.

14 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes, I would have them look at a
15 ground lizard while we were trying to get a program going
16 395 miles away, and I would have them see how we operate,
17 let's say, on the Wind River Indian reservation, how we
18 operate in towns of 50 people.

19 And I think, having just finished a triennial, I
20 still think it is a good planning process. There is no
21 doubt about it. As much of a hoop as it is, and believe me,
22 it is an important hoop for us, because over 90% of our
23 funding is dependent on it, and as tough as it sometimes is,
24 when you finish the document you realize, "God, we have done
25 this, and we do have this."

1 But I think Robert's point and Arnita's point is
2 important. I would like to see somehow, some more of a
3 dialogue. Not necessarily, you know from DSP staff, but
4 work out something where it would come to be more like an
5 accreditation conversation, if you will. I can't tell you
6 how many times I have been driving around and I am saying,
7 "God, I wish Marjorie Berlincourt was with me right now."
8 You know, this kind of thing, is to say how the actual--the
9 mechanics actually work.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. R. YOUNG: Well, you know, I mean I never have
12 seen--How do you--Do you really know how you get a program
13 going in Meeteetse, Wyoming? And I think the idea of maybe
14 bringing in some peers from, or alumni, from other state
15 councils, who understand the process, as part of a
16 refinement of the review process might be healthy.

17 MR. GLADISH: But if it has no connection to the
18 award of resources, then it is effective, or in some other
19 way has influence. Because in essence, the way the process
20 works now, for the most part, Carole, as you suggested at
21 least the last ten years, is you are pretty much stuck in a
22 formula, because you have limited resources.

23 The councils themselves, most of us have argued
24 very strongly to eliminate, and there is a big debate now,
25 let's get rid of all the competitive elements in the

1 Division of State Programs, you know. And there is that
2 debate right now about exemplary awards, whether that is the
3 last kind of piece of this competitive element. Should we
4 get rid of that as well?

5 And so it seems that the trend has been toward
6 this kind of annual award, irre--not irregardless, because I
7 think the quality and character has improved in a decade, so
8 what purpose does this larger process serve, if it has no
9 connection. Does it just make us feel good?

10 MR. R. YOUNG: No.

11 MR. GLADISH: Are we going to learn anything from
12 it?

13 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes, I think we would. I think we
14 would learn something. Again, I think the ultimate--the
15 ultimate goal is still refining. We are not, even though we
16 may think we are great, and we get our letters back saying
17 everything is fine, are we really? Is there some other
18 outside independent observer, who is also familiar with the
19 process, who may provide some ideas that would stimulate, I
20 think, our planning, in a genuine conversation, that is not
21 quite so dependent upon the abstract paper work. And
22 perhaps we then wouldn't even have to worry about all the
23 appendices, you know, that sort of thing. But the abstract,
24 we construct the abstract picture of our states, right? But
25 I think there may be some ways where there might be a more--

1 more of a dialogue going on with--

2 MS. MYERS: That would be part of the process.

3 MR. R. YOUNG: Someone not necessarily in--
4 directly related to DSP, but within the enterprise.

5 MS. MAY: One of the things that I was thinking
6 about is that national kind of feedback is so interesting.
7 What--I just want to recount something that just reminded me
8 when you were talking about what you were saying. I was on
9 a task force. It was called the Higher Education Task
10 Force, in Oklahoma, to evaluate Oklahoma colleges, because
11 the state was facing decreasing funds, and they wanted to
12 figure out if they could close a few colleges, or what
13 standard they were meeting, and everything. And we went
14 around on this task force, and we visited each of the
15 colleges; as many of us as could visited as many colleges.
16 We divided them up. And I remember distinctly being at East
17 Central University in Ada, Oklahoma. Has anybody heard of
18 it?

19 MR. : Um-hum.

20 MS. : Yes.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. MAY: East Central University. And East
23 Central University is a former state teachers college that
24 was turned into--We sat at this meeting and they said that
25 they thought that they were one of the best small

1 universities in the country. And I was flabbergasted,
2 personally, by that. Because I had no clue why they would
3 say that. I mean, this--It just amazed me. But that is
4 what I found. They were so insular, the faculty was so
5 inbred, and incestuous, and there was absolutely no idea--

6 MR. : Pretty sexy.

7 (Simultaneous discussion.)

8 MR. CHEATHAM: Maybe their idea of best was
9 incest.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. MAY: They had no idea of any national norm.

12 MR. GLADISH: What is the phrase? Incest is best
13 kept in the family?

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. MAY: There was no idea of any national norm.
16 Why would they think they were the best?

17 MS. WATSON: What did you do to make them--
18 disabuse them of the notion?

19 MS. MAY: Well, it was our role to go there and
20 listen to their self-assessment, and then make an assessment
21 and a judgement on the basis of all this material we were
22 collecting. So we--Ours wasn't to give any feedback. But I
23 was blown away by that.

24 And sometimes I feel like (we are talking inside
25 the family now, so I can say this), but we say we are great,

1 and we all believe we are great, and we are great, and we
2 are having this tremendous impact, but you know--But there
3 is people out there who may have a different point of view,
4 and we are not getting the answers. And inside our own
5 state, we can think we are doing such tremendous things.
6 But to get somebody from out of your state looking at it in
7 a more concrete way, maybe--You know, I think about this all
8 the time. When I write it down here, I am writing the best
9 possible picture of the State of Oklahoma for you. And if
10 you visited Oklahoma, you might see something, actually,
11 that I can't see. I am stumbling over this every day, but I
12 don't see it.

13 MR. GLADISH: But Anita, you could do this
14 voluntarily now. A lot of colleges and universities have
15 visiting committees or other kinds of groups--

16 MS. MAY: Boards of visitors.

17 MR. GLADISH: --and besides which the
18 accreditation model, if I understand it correctly, by North
19 Central and Mid-Atlantic, sets minimum standards at least,
20 and you are measured against those standards; like size of
21 the library per student, and all that business. If we want
22 an accreditation model, it has got to be more than, "Oh, we
23 will define what an adequate program is in Indiana. We will
24 tell the Endowment that we are fulfilling that adequate
25 program. The Endowment will send us our money.".

1 Now, my feeling is that, generally speaking, in
2 the field, the councils prefer that approach. "Send us the
3 money, and stay in Washington."

4 MS. MAY: That is right.

5 MR. GLADISH: Right?

6 MS. JONES: Is that true?

7 MS. MAY: I think so.

8 MR. CHEATHAM: It is not true in Tennessee.

9 (Simultaneous discussion.)

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. GLADISH: Send more money, and stay in
12 Washington.

13 MR. CHEATHAM: I would much prefer to have an
14 accreditation, a visiting team, to come from Washington, or
15 wherever, for a site visit, than write a proposal that goes
16 to Washington, gets misread (frequently, not always), and
17 results in a review letter that really doesn't comprehend
18 our program.

19 MR. GLADISH: But Robert, what impact does that
20 have, that process, on the resources that are available to
21 you from NEH?

22 MR. CHEATHAM: None.

23 MR. GLADISH: And what impact would this other
24 process you are suggesting have on your resources?

25 MR. CHEATHAM: None.

1 MR. GLADISH: So--

2 MR. CHEATHAM: But I see it as a better process.

3 MS. MYERS: Pat?

4 MS. WILLIAMS: I would just say, our own
5 experience with it over 25 years, is that it does have an
6 impact on the institution. They voluntarily enter into it.
7 And we have done 750 institutions, and we have done, we have
8 done them, actually, all twice. And we are now starting the
9 third round.

10 They will tell you that their resource base has
11 increased, their ability to go out and raise money. And at
12 some point, the state councils are probably going to have to
13 do that, as Virginia has done, is tap other resources to
14 make this pot grow. It is absolutely, directly connected to
15 their accredited status. And the larger institutions, who I
16 deal with as a development officer, they don't want to say
17 they are not accredited, you know, because they have direct
18 ties in the pot. They can see it; they can track it. They
19 know the money flows.

20 The other part of it is, this building, this
21 ability to really, from that conversation with the peer
22 review team, really build the capacity, and strengthen the
23 program. And they look forward to that part of it. But
24 they will tell you always, as you have just said, the self-
25 study part is the most important. And you can see it

1 ranked. It is like, you know, 90% of it is the self-study
2 part, you know, and about 50% is the visiting team.

3 MS. WATSON: It would seem to me that if we were
4 to embark on this, we would have to take it seriously.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes.

6 MS. WATSON: Not just do it because it would be
7 somewhat helpful. Although as a way of making grants, we
8 would have to take it seriously, maybe there is a way to do
9 some of this that doesn't have a direct relationship to
10 grantmaking.

11 I guess that having listened, I still feel that
12 asking the federal government to seriously increase the
13 degree of oversight, which is what this is, and to set
14 national standards--

15 MR. HAMMER: Why is it an increase over the
16 present--

17 MR. GLADISH: Let her finish.

18 MS. WATSON: To have a team come and spend time,
19 several days a week, then return, have a meeting, agree,
20 come up with a report, send that report to us, to the
21 council, is a very different, and very cumbersome
22 undertaking.

23 MR. CHEATHAM: How often is your accreditation?

24 MS. WILLIAMS: We do it every five years. Some of
25 it we do seven.

1 MR. CHEATHAM: So if you reduce it to five years,
2 rather than three, you are cutting costs that way.

3 MR. ROBERTS: But how many institutions do you
4 accredit?

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Do a year?

6 MR. ROBERTS: No, how many--

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Seven hundred and fifty are
8 accredited.

9 MS. WATSON: Every year?

10 MS. WILLIAMS: No, no. We do--

11 MS. MAY: How many--

12 MR. : Is that--

13 MS. WILLIAMS: On that standard cycle we are doing
14 about 140 a year.

15 MS. MAY: How much does that cost?

16 MS. WILLIAMS: The institution pays for it, and we
17 don't have to think about that. It is about \$2000.

18 MR. : Per institution.

19 MS. WILLIAMS: That is just the visit part of it.
20 The self-study would remain the same, since they are
21 currently doing it, and that is a big investment. You can
22 tell us, better than--

23 (Simultaneous discussion.)

24 MR. GLADISH: But AAM is not using this to
25 distribute its resources to its members. This is a

1 voluntary process which reflects the judgement of the
2 community about adequacy.

3 MS. WILLIAMS: Right.

4 MR. HAMMER: And you are not using AAM people to
5 conduct the visits?

6 MS. WILLIAMS: No.

7 MR. WILSON: It seems to me the distinction is
8 that New England States comes in and accredits the college,
9 it is one thing. But at the end of the process, they don't
10 give us a check. And it seems to me that that is a crucial
11 part of the process.

12 (Simultaneous discussion.)

13 MR. CHEATHAM: Don't you lose your federal funding
14 if you lose your accreditation?

15 MR. WILSON: Maybe so.

16 MR. : It seems to me--

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MR. CHEATHAM: If the University of Tennessee
19 Medical School loses its accreditation, I will bet it loses
20 all its federal money.

21 MS. WILLIAMS: I think also accreditation has
22 shifted a lot, away from just resource measuring, counting
23 the books in the library to outcomes assessment.

24 (Simultaneous discussion.)

25 MR. GLADISH: There is a huge controversy about

1 this right now. All the accrediting agencies are mad
2 because the administration wants to establish much more
3 concrete and measurable outcomes, and specific designations
4 for curriculum and the rest of that business, and the higher
5 education community is up in arms about this. Isn't this
6 right, Jim? And there is this gigantic controversy about
7 the use of this accreditation system, and what we seem to be
8 sitting around the table saying is, "Well, we really ought
9 to tighten up and have an accreditation process.", which
10 means that you have to have standards, and you have to have
11 an image of what the state council is, Elizabeth, not simply
12 kind of everybody does what they want to do. Is that the
13 direction we want to go? I don't--

14 MS. MYERS: But don't you have to do that with the
15 peers sitting in Washington?

16 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes, don't you have to have
17 criteria to base your review on?

18 MS. MYERS: I think it is just another approach to
19 the grant review process, I guess.

20 MR. ROBERTS: If it is AAM that does it for the
21 museums, then maybe what we are talking about more is the
22 Federation, and if the individual museums pay for it
23 themselves, then maybe what we are talking about is the
24 individual councils paying for it themselves. If we really
25 want that kind of peer review interaction, then maybe we

1 should be willing to absorb it ourselves, and have it
2 coordinated through the Federation, if that is the
3 equivalent, it seems to me. That it is not tied to the
4 check. That is not the outcome. The outcome is we learn
5 more about ourselves, and tell more about ourselves in the
6 process.

7 MS. SEMMEL: I think there is another issue that
8 is connected to--I hope that we get back to Ken's point,
9 because I think that it is so important. But it has to do
10 with accountability, and accountability to your funding
11 sources. And as you all know, it is not just the NEH that
12 has to look at what we do, and be accountable for what we
13 do, but our grantees and their accountability for what they
14 do. And as the state councils move to be more and more
15 independent entities, if you are talking about percentage of
16 dollars that each state council gets from the NEH, then
17 those other funders are going to be demanding, I think,
18 increasingly, measures of accountability. And you are
19 right, I mean. It is a huge debate right now. But it is--

20 MR. GLADISH: But there is a presumption. Do the
21 state councils, ought they to be increasingly independent
22 institutions?

23 MS. SEMMEL: Well, that is why I think we need to
24 get back to your question.

25 MR. GLADISH: Even in the instance of councils

1 like Virginia, where if you look at the relative balance of
2 resources, the federal dollars have declined. Or in
3 Indiana, where the relative balance has declined. I know in
4 our case, and I think, Elizabeth, from what I know about
5 your budget in general, in our case the 610,000 from NEH is
6 the sine qua non. The other 1.5 million would never be
7 there without the 600,000, because it pays the salary, and
8 the heat, and the light. And it provides the national
9 connection which gives a kind of imprimatur of significance
10 to the program.

11 And there is a sense in which we are dealing in an
12 artificial economy of independence. We are not independent
13 actors, autonomous, or capable of standing on our own. Is
14 that, should it be, a goal of the national program? In
15 every state. Not just in Virginia and Indiana, but also in
16 Wyoming and Idaho and wherever. You know, we could have the
17 same conversation 25 years from now, and we would be in the
18 same position.

19 MS. E. YOUNG: Ms. Chairman, I guess what I meant
20 from Ken, is why is that an important question? In public
21 television you have got exactly the same situation. Many
22 stations came on the air only after the corporation was
23 there to supply money, and it is a formula, and they
24 wouldn't be able to operate without it. Many of them, the
25 WGBHs and the WNETs and the KERAs, sure, it is a big part,

1 and it is their biggest single source, but they would
2 operate, and they all provide a valuable function, so I am
3 not sure why it is--

4 MR. GLADISH: From a mission perspective, if the
5 Endowment disappears, or the relative assignment of funds
6 changes, let's say it goes down to 10 million for the
7 Division of State Programs, then in a moral sense, if you
8 will, have we fulfilled our obligation to sustain this
9 program over the long term in the absence of such funding,
10 or using that funding as a piece of maybe a four-legged
11 stool, rather than a one-legged stool?

12 I think there is a moral question here about the
13 use of public resources. Do those of us who have had access
14 to those resources for 25 years, and does the Endowment
15 itself as well, have an obligation to set a circumstance up
16 that allows the councils to sustain and grow in the absence
17 of growth of support from the Endowment itself?

18 MS. MAY: I think we should get to the questions
19 under the funding issues, which are, how can state
20 government be encouraged to play a more active partnership
21 role in the state council program, and how might the NEH,
22 state councils, and the Federation, work together to raise
23 public and private sector support for public humanities
24 programs, because that--You, know, there we would have to go
25 looking for other funds.

1 And I was just thinking as you were talking about
2 that, the NEH could force my board to look for state
3 funding, if it wanted to. My board members are not going to
4 go for state funds. They are against it. That is what they
5 say, because no one has ever said, "You have to go.". And
6 if you said they had to go, I am certain that they wouldn't
7 say, "Well, we are closing. Sorry, we are not going.". I
8 know they won't say that.

9 The other says--The other is the working for the
10 private sector support that the chairman could help us with,
11 because those big foundations would come around if they
12 understood the national significance of it, I am certain.
13 We can't go after Pew Charitable. I mean, it is hard to get
14 Pew Charitable Trust to look at one single state, but I
15 think that the overall thing is important.

16 But the other thing that is really important is
17 the challenge grant money for endowments. Every other
18 "humanities institution" that I know of, can come to the
19 Endowment and get a challenge grant to build an endowment.
20 And I know that, for instance, the Oklahoma Arts Institute
21 got a challenge grant from the National Endowment for the
22 Arts to build its endowment, because the Oklahoma Arts
23 Institute started with a grant from the state arts council,
24 and has a summer program for students in the arts at Quartz
25 Mountain in Oklahoma. And they are building an endowment

1 with a challenge grant from the NEA of something like
2 \$300,000., and they are matching it.

3 We, you know, I mean, so there should be a three-
4 pronged stool. Actually, I was talking to Ken last night,
5 and I said, "In my dreams, I think that eventually there
6 will be state funding for the state humanities councils, and
7 we will have a private foundation of an endowment, just like
8 the universities do, that kicks in 250 or \$300,000. a year,
9 to this program fund.".

10 The other thing, if you are talking about visions,
11 I think my funding vision would be that we would get
12 millions of dollars from the state, and the NEH money, and
13 have 250 to \$300,000. a year, or maybe even more, coming
14 from a separate foundation. It would be a big thing,
15 wouldn't it?

16 MR. GIBSON: Great dream.

17 MS. MAY: And I am going to die before it happens.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MS. MYERS: It is a pattern that has occurred.

20 You have models to look at.

21 MS. SEMMEL: Can I ask a question?

22 MS. MYERS: Sure.

23 MS. SEMMEL: You know, we have been bringing up
24 lots of important issues, for which we don't seem to have
25 the adequate data, or we haven't asked the question in the

1 ways that will be useful for us, and I think, I agree that
2 one of the important byproducts of this meeting will be some
3 of these questions. And I guess I would like to ask Jamil,
4 or people who are--or Robert--from the Federation, how, when
5 you take the temperature of the measure of the new members,
6 of the Federation members, how would you answer this
7 question about independence versus dependence? I mean, what
8 kind of--We have been talking about particularism, but can
9 you give us a sense of--Can you give us a portrait, from
10 your perspectives on the Federation, of the identity of--
11 coordinating ideal identity, or the directions of the state
12 councils? I know that I have certain images, and I don't
13 know whether mine are correct or not.

14 MR. CHEATHAM: I think the whole notion of a
15 partnership implies mutual independence and dependence. I
16 mean, I don't think you can say we are independent, or we
17 are dependent. We are clearly both. And I think it goes
18 both ways. Clearly, when you go to Congress from the NEH,
19 and relay this thing, you say there are "hundreds of
20 programs". But when you go to state councils, you say
21 "thousands of programs". You are dependent on us to reach
22 certain parts of this nation, and of course, we are
23 dependent on you all.

24 So, I mean, I think--I don't think, I mean--I
25 don't think any state would say they want to be independent

1 of NEH, nor do they want to be fully dependent upon the NEH.
2 They want to be whole and individual, like any human being
3 with any kind of relationship. They want to be respected
4 for their gifts they bring to this relationship, and they
5 want to have respect for those gifts. I think we are all--
6 we are all doing as much as we can do, and we are doing only
7 one part of what we need to be doing.

8 So I think, we are dependents, but we are
9 independents, where the states start feeling independent, or
10 want more independence, is when we feel that, from up here,
11 the things that you want to do--I think we are running into
12 this, but we will run into this problem with the
13 conversation. I think when people--with the National
14 Conversation. I think when--When we in Tennessee are doing
15 everything we can possibly do, and Washington says suddenly,
16 "Well, would you add to the things you are doing, the
17 National Conversation? And here is not enough money to do
18 it, but you know, we know you are used to that.". I think
19 that is going to cause friction. It is inevitably going to
20 cause friction, and I think any time those kind of
21 directives come from above to below, there is a built-in
22 tension.

23 MS. A. YOUNG: Can we go back to Marsha's
24 question?

25 MS. SEMMEL: Let me put it a slightly different

1 way, and then it goes to institutions with which I am a
2 little more familiar. But museums have gone through stages
3 of evolution. I mean, there are still museums at every
4 stage of evolution from, you know, infancy through senility.

5 (Laughter.)

6 (Simultaneous discussion.)

7 MS. SEMMEL: --critical mass of museums at any
8 point in time that are at a certain stage, say, of
9 institutional development, and I think one of the functions
10 of the accreditation process is that it not only reflects
11 back at where those museums are, but increasingly it is
12 giving those museums a little bit of a nudge. And the
13 general operating support program at IMS is doing the same
14 thing. Because as we all know, in the way we ask questions,
15 and what kinds of questions we choose to ask, through this
16 process, we can help move institu--We can both fund key
17 functions of institutions, and then kind of nudge them in
18 another direction. And we hope that that direction is one
19 that fulfills our mission and makes them better, makes them
20 better institutions, and more self-sufficient, and makes the
21 work that they do of a higher quality.

22 So I guess that is again, what I am trying to get
23 at with, where would you, if you had a critic--if you were
24 to think about the critical mass of--

25 MR. CHEATHAM: You are asking about the maturity

1 of the state councils?

2 MS. SEMMEL: Sort of where are they in all of
3 this? And I don't know whether--Maybe I need to ask it in a
4 better or a different way, but that is what I wonder about.

5 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I think--I think part of the
6 tension between the agency and the states is that the system
7 that was developed was started--We were infants. We didn't
8 know how to do this, or even what this was. And then
9 gradually we have grown and matured and learned how to do
10 this. I think--I shouldn't bring this up.

11 MR. GIBSON: Oh, sure.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, okay. I will bring it up.
13 I think some states don't want to leave home. They don't
14 really want to grow up. There is a certain security in the
15 mother's arms. And there is certain--there is a certain
16 tendency among some councils to want that protection. At
17 the meeting in Richmond, it was mentioned that some--about
18 oversight and accountability, that there had been some, I
19 guess, hanky-panky with the money in some states, and
20 somebody asked, "Name names.", as a joke, and Carole said
21 that we don't name names; we are very discreet about this.

22 There is a protection built in there, that we are
23 going to be protected from Washington, and I think there is
24 a lot of states that like that protection, and that we all
25 like it some days, of course, but I think most of the states

1 are now at a point where they are mature enough that they
2 see themselves as independent institutions.

3 One director--An assistant director of one state
4 told me that they had a development director come in, say,
5 "What would you do if you didn't have to worry about making
6 NEH happy?". And he said that was the most freeing--It
7 freed them up to plan in ways that they had never dreamed of
8 before, because they had always worried about making NEH
9 happy.

10 I think most of the states are at the point where
11 they basically pursue their own plans. They do their own
12 planning, they pursue it their way, and then they write the
13 report. And I don't think that they are being led so much
14 by NEH, as writing a report on what they are doing.

15 MS. SEMMEL: Do you think there is an overlap of
16 mission?

17 MR. CHEATHAM: Between NEH and--

18 MS. SEMMEL: Between the NEH mission and the
19 mission of the individual states?

20 MR. CHEATHAM: I think there needs to be a
21 distinction between local and national projects. I just
22 think there needs to be that distinction. I think it is
23 always going to be difficult when we are doing our work, and
24 not feeling we have enough money, and then suddenly a grant
25 from NEH comes in for \$250,000. that we don't feel is a good

1 grant, and we feel like we could do more with that money.
2 And I think that is a built-in problem so long as there is
3 some duplication of work.

4 MS. WATSON: Robert, is--

5 MS. A. YOUNG: Is there a lack of sense of mission
6 of the state councils? Because that is--I think I am having
7 trouble; I am not hearing that. And I think it speaks to
8 Ken's question an hour ago. And it may tie into Marsha's.
9 Is--What--Is there a changing mission of state councils as
10 an entity unto themselves, distinct from the individual
11 state missions? And does that mission change over time? Is
12 there a sense of meeting challenges in the late '90s,
13 walking into the 21st century, which is different from the
14 1980s? And if there is, or are there discussions about at
15 what levels do they occur? Is this part of the Federation's
16 role, for example, in helping to foster and nurture that
17 changing sense of mission, or is that Congress, or is it
18 NEH?

19 MR. CHEATHAM: I think if you look at the document
20 prepared, at Barcroft's statements, and the document
21 prepared on the history of NEH about the early founding, and
22 the public policy, et cetera, I think that vision, however
23 it has changed over time, is the vision that unifies and
24 drives the state councils. I don't think the state councils
25 ever dropped that vision. I think when there were the 12

1 years at NEH of--I will say it--totalitarianism, that the
2 states adapted their language to the new--the states adapted
3 their language to the new realities, but they didn't have to
4 adapt their vision. And I think that the states have moved
5 forward with this vision. I think we have difficulty
6 articulating it in a unified way. I think we are beginning
7 to get to. And the vision is the place of the humanities in
8 our states' lives, and this does not mean simply--I mean,
9 there is one vision of that, and that is the logic of "We
10 will be doing our job if every person in America is
11 accompanied by a scholar to interpret life for him or her.".

12 (Laughter.)

13 (Simultaneous discussion.)

14 MS. A. YOUNG: This is at least a concrete
15 concept--

16 (Simultaneous discussion.)

17 MS. A. YOUNG: But really let's put some--a little
18 bit of reality on the table here. It is the same kind of
19 trouble I have with my boss's mission, much as I love him,
20 and think he is absolutely headed down the right course.
21 Increase public participation in the humanities. Amen. But
22 what does that mean? And can we develop some concrete steps
23 to get us there?

24 MS. MYERS: Jim, did you still want to--

25 MR. HERBERT: I have an issue that I would like to

1 raise, a financial issue, before the end of the morning, but
2 I think--And it is kind of a bridge to the partnership issue
3 in the afternoon, and I feel very--It is quite urgent, but I
4 think this discussion is a very interesting one, and I would
5 rather not interrupt it.

6 MS. MYERS: Bill.

7 MR. GLADISH: I was going to say the question
8 Marsha asked--

9 (Simultaneous discussion.)

10 MR. GLADISH: --interesting here but--

11 (Simultaneous discussion.)

12 MS. MYERS: I see.

13 MR. GLADISH: Oh, sorry.

14 MS. MYERS: And then Bill. Okay, so Jamil do you
15 have--

16 MR. ZAINALDIN: I really don't have much to add to
17 what Robert has said, except that I don't think that the
18 councils see their relationship with the Endowment in terms
19 of talking about triennials as burdensome. I think what we
20 are talking about is how, in the language of partnership,
21 how do we make one plus one equal three. How do we take
22 advantage of efficiencies, whatever those may be? What are
23 the things that we have been doing, because we have been
24 doing them for a while, that we no longer need to do? Are
25 there things that we can do to make the system work better

1 for everybody? Not just what is working now, but what can
2 work better?

3 MS. MYERS: Bill?

4 MR. WILSON: I keep thinking of Ann's dilemma of
5 how to sell, in the sense of give visibility and connection.
6 One of the things that is a centralizing idea that we
7 started out with was this conversation. Certainly state
8 councils are not happy with the idea of saying, "Gee, here
9 is another thing" (school districts deal with this all the
10 time) "Here is another thing, by the way, that you should
11 do.". On the one hand, this is a great centralizing idea.
12 On the other hand, as one more thing on the laundry list of
13 things that need to be done with no more funding, it is not
14 very attractive.

15 Now another option, if this is National Endowment
16 monies, is to say, "Look, here we go. For the RFP gang, 10%
17 of your programs have to go to the conversation." Their
18 sense of unity, their sense of "If you want to do this, here
19 is the resources to do it", but how would councils react to
20 that?

21 MR. CHEATHAM: I think that--I am going to give a
22 history of our council, if I can, because I think it--and
23 how we respond to the conversation.

24 When I first came to the council--(This precedes
25 me, which I want to make clear. This is not my idea.) I

1 came to the humanities council and I didn't know what the
2 hell it was. I got a job without knowing what it was. So I
3 had to start learning what it was, and I dug out the first
4 proposal we submitted to NEH, and--which was a beautiful
5 document that a group, the original planning committee, had
6 put together. And they had gone around the state talking to
7 people. They had coffee meetings all over the state. And
8 what they finally found is that the biggest problem was
9 divisiveness in the state, much like the National
10 Conversation.

11 Back then we had to do themes. So we chose--We
12 had to have a theme on which all of our grants were based,
13 and you had to name that theme. And our theme was "Them and
14 Us: What Divides Us, What Can Unite Us?". And in
15 substance, that has never changed. We then went when--Then
16 we did the public policy business. And we saw all the
17 problems with it. All the problems which we all know, and
18 we can all recount, the great successes, and the real,
19 genuine disasters. And we all know them.

20 Part of the reason is that when people come
21 together to talk about public policy, if they are not
22 bringing the humanities with them, it is not going to be a
23 humanities discussion. They have to have it before they get
24 there.

25 So we started doing local history, because that

1 seemed to be where people were really interested in what
2 really was the humanities, where the public policy
3 distinction dropped. We picked up local history. And we
4 pursued local history for a long time, even at times when it
5 was difficult to pursue, because it was not considered--It
6 wasn't the local history of Athens, Greece. It was the
7 local history of Selmer, Tennessee.

8 MS. JONES: Sparta, Tennessee.

9 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes, or Sparta. Exactly. Or
10 Athens, Tennessee, for that matter.

11 But we continued to pursue it, always keeping in
12 the back of our minds this "Them and Us". I mean, that
13 always was an undertone in all of our discussions, and never
14 left us. So we did the local history, and then we started
15 seeing--we started trying to move beyond that. We felt like
16 we had done that as well as we could do it, and needed to
17 move on, and we started playing with language, because we
18 seemed to find that the problems we were having in local
19 history projects, in bringing scholars together with public
20 people, was a problem of language.

21 The first question was "What is history?". Is it
22 the first families of Athens? Is it my genealogy? Is it
23 the history of ordinary people? Is it the history of the
24 relationships of everybody in this community? We started
25 realizing that having a local history project, when you

1 brought in a scholar, and the community people, and the
2 diversity of people within that community, you had to have a
3 language. You had to have a common language. You all had
4 to be speaking the same language, at least in the context of
5 that project.

6 So we started concentrating on language, which led
7 us to the Southern Festival of Books, got us there, and then
8 we see that as an arena of bringing all the diverse people
9 of the South together who are writing, and suddenly you see
10 what is going on is an interchange of stories. That what
11 people are doing is swapping stories, be they stories of
12 history, stories of literature, or whatever.

13 So then we come back, and now we are doing a
14 project called "Telling the Story of America in the 21st
15 Century", retelling the story of America--of Tennessee for
16 the 21st century, in which we are going back and retell the
17 story of the state. So we are bringing in local history, we
18 are bringing in our language that we worked with, we are
19 bringing in this exchange of narratives, and we are starting
20 from day one with this region that became a state first was
21 inhabited by human beings. And we are going to start from
22 day one, and speak of our history as a relationship between,
23 among, all the groups. So you first have the Native
24 Americans, then you have the European Americans, the African
25 Americans, and you just tell it from the start, as a story

1 of relationships.

2 So in a sense, when this National Conversation
3 comes, I want to say, "We have been doing this. We have
4 been doing this for 20 years.". And I think lots of other
5 states are responding, saying, "Wait, this is what we have
6 been doing for 20 years.". And what I fear is (and it
7 involves this relationship between NEH and the states), what
8 I fear is this is going to be defined somehow abstractly up
9 here, instead of coming from the states, and from their
10 definitions.

11 MS. A. YOUNG: Well, that troubles me, Robert,
12 because that is not, to us, what the National--

13 MR. CHEATHAM: I understand that.

14 MS. A. YOUNG: --Conversation is, and--Is it our
15 rhetoric that would give you the impression that--

16 MR. CHEATHAM: I think it is--I think it is part
17 sitting in this room, and not being fully convinced, with
18 some exceptions, that everybody in this room knows the state
19 council stories, and what we have done, and what we have
20 accomplished, and what we are doing, and the thought behind
21 it.

22 It is like we are people here without history. It
23 is, in fact, very similar to the whole problem we have in
24 the South among blacks and whites. I mean, when African
25 Americans come to the table to talk with white people, they

1 are coming with a knowledge of the white people, but we
2 don't have a knowledge of them. So they are coming without
3 a history, and they are having to communicate to us without
4 a history. So we have got to go back and get that history.

5 MS. A. YOUNG: Well, that is a good point, because
6 I think we are jumping agendas here, but one of the major
7 missions of the National Conversation is to give--In many
8 ways it could be a metaphor maybe, for the model of this
9 entire enterprise in terms of the humanities--is to give a
10 sense of recognition to the National Conversations which
11 exist throughout the country at the local level, and a sense
12 of interconnectedness of movement forward. Is that--There
13 is a progress part of this that is supposed to be an
14 element, I think, that we are trying to help facilitate, is
15 to take what you are doing and combine it with what Vermont
16 is doing, and Wyoming, and begin to move forward a movement.
17 So I would hope that that impression is not--I mean, I--

18 MR. CHEATHAM: It is not an impression, it is
19 just--

20 (Simultaneous discussion.)

21 MS. A. YOUNG: That is what I think our mission is
22 in the National Conversation, and that we want very much to
23 link arms and move forward.

24 MR. WILSON: But it seems like there is still--
25 There is enough room to get together, but what I am saying

1 is, if saying "This is a priority. You can figure out how
2 you are going to implement it, but we are going to give you
3 federal funds for this specific purpose.", then it means you
4 have got to sign on to that purpose. People will be very
5 inventive in finding ways to do it. But in some sense, a
6 little logo of National Conversation starts to be flagged on
7 a whole variety of activities, so at the end we find that
8 however we proceeded individually, it does add up to
9 something that says there has been a conversation in all
10 these different 50 states, although it has been different
11 subjects on occasion.

12 MS. MYERS: And I mean, it seems to me that the
13 amount of directedness, and the amount of money, is not so
14 great as to topple you on your side, you know, to become a
15 different--needing to become a different entity. If
16 anything, you know, making this connectedness--

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MR. CHEATHAM: --the Federation presented for the
19 National Conversation, in fact, urges the conversation to be
20 defined from the bottom up, in a sense.

21 MS. MYERS: Yes.

22 MR. CHEATHAM: It basically is saying the states
23 are doing this already. Now you identify what they are.

24 MS. MYERS: And it will be, you know, since it is
25 going to be spread in all of the guidelines, it is going--

1 responsiveness is going to be the mode, even though there
2 are going to be kits and helpers, you know, ways of helping
3 groups to have conversations.

4 MR. WILSON: Do we have a precedent for this? I
5 mean, where the National Endowment has set a theme, if you
6 would, and states have been invited in to participate in the
7 theme.

8 MS. MYERS: I don't know, but states certainly
9 have their themes, as Robert said--

10 MR. GIBSON: Has NEH (Inaudible.)? The answer is
11 it has not. I mean, there are a couple of examples that we
12 can cite. We have had the various initiatives, the
13 bicentennial and the quincentennary and things of that type,
14 but that was simply an announcement of interest.

15 The only real parallel would be the American
16 Issues Forum that occurred in the late '70s. Some of you
17 may remember that. When we were working on the National
18 Conversation, I read the long and extensive evaluation of
19 that. One of the criticisms of the American Issues Forum
20 was that it had invited the states, but not significantly
21 engaged them in dealing with them, and that was cited as one
22 of the failures of the American Issues Forum. I hope we
23 don't fail this time.

24 I think that it is the--The real challenge is, or
25 one of the real challenges that we face, is building this

1 nation's reputation on American pluralism, the definition
2 thereof, based upon much of the experience state councils
3 have had, and other funding programs at the agency that
4 might grow out of that. The definition of American
5 pluralism that may be operative for this period may be
6 slightly different than that used by some of the states that
7 may not be as inclusive as some of--I think, for example, we
8 are going to have a conversation on interaction, thinking at
9 this point, rather than individual groups telling their
10 stories, though those stories do build on American
11 pluralism. But that is only one example, and that hasn't
12 been determined yet.

13 So I guess I repeat what I was saying before, we
14 must be acutely sensitive to the history of the program
15 within the states, or the National Conversation will fail.
16 And I really worry about failure. I wake up at night,
17 worrying about the National Conversation.

18 MR. WILSON: But everybody has got to be in it,
19 right?

20 MR. GIBSON: Everybody has to be invited in, and
21 we want everybody in, but there should not be a directive
22 out of Washington saying that you must be in. The
23 invitation must be warm and generous and sincere.

24 MR. WILSON: Generous, yes, generous.

25 (Simultaneous discussion.)

1 MR. R. YOUNG: I don't think we need a kit. Not
2 at the state council. I don't think we need a kit to
3 contribute to the National Conversation.

4 MR. GIBSON: We will talk about that this
5 afternoon. There is an interesting little twist on that.

6 MR. R. YOUNG: Okay.

7 MS. E. YOUNG: Sondra, just a couple thoughts on
8 what we are hearing. I think we are hearing a couple things
9 here. First of all, that there is, if you will, a unifying
10 purpose that the councils have evolved together, and a large
11 part of that is because of their own affiliations in the
12 Federation. These conversations do go on outside of this
13 room, and with a much broader participation of chairs and
14 council staff, and I have seen that over the years, and I
15 think there is--I rather like Robert's idea that the basic
16 goal of all of us is to have everyone on earth accompanied
17 by a humanist. The second best one would be to get
18 everybody to ask the question "why", you know, before they
19 utter a word or think a thought. And I think that is really
20 what most of the councils are about.

21 However, I would still say that for me, it is very
22 easy to divorce that discussion of whether there is a
23 cohesive division or there should be, or how we get it, or
24 whether we had it and we have lost it, or whether it is
25 several visions, from structure. I don't relate the two at

1 all. The amount of money that people get, and how they are
2 structured, and how many staff they have, of course bears on
3 how successful they are. But to me, you can accommodate a
4 number of different structures forever, and still have
5 shared vision, shared goals, as appropriate to get the
6 humanities appreciated by the vast number of people. So, I
7 am more interested in the discussion, I think, that says,
8 "Is there a role for the NEH in getting the state councils
9 to think more collectively about their role?". I personally
10 believe that is happening anyway. I think probably the NEH,
11 if they saw that it wasn't, could enter in in ways that
12 would facilitate it, but I think, fortuitously that is
13 happening through the Federation, and through goodwill, and
14 through the fact that we have been blessed with some pretty
15 articulate people who manage the councils on a day to day
16 basis. And that need not be a serious worry right now, even
17 if not everybody articulates the vision the same way.

18 MS. MYERS: Okay. We are winding up, and the
19 drafting committee is going to go to their work soon. Who
20 wants to have some more to say this morning?

21 MR. GIBSON: Where do we eat?

22 MS. MYERS: That is a good question, yes. We are
23 eating upstairs in a portion of the restaurant where that
24 has all been--The buffet will be set up and we can either,
25 you know, hold the food on our laps, or eat at tables. They

1 have tables for us up there. Thank you.

2 (Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m. a luncheon recess was
3 taken, after which the meeting resumed as follows.)

4 MS. MYERS: Okay. It is--My watch is fast, and it
5 says 2:00. Is it ten of two? Okay, there seems to be a
6 consensus that we can end at 4:00 if we work hard, and don't
7 take a break, probably because we have already talked about
8 partnership, and National Conversation, and partly because
9 we have--we will have the benefit of the summaries or
10 comments of the committee, the drafting committee, that met
11 at lunch. So if everyone is in agreement, we will aim to
12 adjourn at 4:00, having completed what we have completed.
13 That is, the advising process, stage one.

14 So let's start with Jamil. I understand you are
15 the rapporteur?

16 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, because I am the only one who
17 can read my handwriting.

18 MS. MYERS: Okay.

19 MR. ZAINALDIN: What we did was just to try to
20 recreate, or to try to organize some of the discussion or
21 questions that we heard being asked yesterday and the first
22 half of today. Although these--And we did not include
23 National Conversation kinds of things in this. We just ran
24 out of time.

25 MR. CHEATHAM: You will have a nightmare again

1 tonight.

2 MR. ZAINALDIN: And this is based on, I think, an
3 assumption that this conversation will continue--

4 MR. GIBSON: Yes.

5 MR. ZAINALDIN: --that there is some kind of a
6 study process, and--But this was the way the issues fell
7 out, into two different sections. One is simply funding
8 considerations, and another one our partnership
9 considerations.

10 And on the funding considerations, first there is
11 the question of the distribution, distribution of equity,
12 and the implications of the materials that we saw yesterday.
13 And that is both, you know, the relationship between the
14 council and the Endowment at large, and then there is the
15 other sort of issue that we spent a little bit of time
16 talking about, trying to get a handle on it. We don't know
17 quite who talked about it, but somewhere in there is a
18 consideration of needs. And you might have different ideas
19 of how you talked about need, but somewhere there is a
20 consideration of need, that need--that wants to be thought
21 about within the dimension of qualitative evaluation of
22 applications.

23 Second, under funding considerations is adequacy
24 and capacity. What does it mean to have the capacity to
25 carry out a statewide program, for a state council?

1 The third element under funding consideration was
2 quality. My notes break down at this point. I don't know
3 if Ken, or Marsha, or Carole want to--But just quality came
4 up. Also--

5 (Laughter.)

6 (Simultaneous discussion.)

7 MR. ZAINALDIN: There is a question of economies,
8 economies of scale, economies of efficiency, economies of
9 effectiveness in doing programming, the state level, the
10 national level. Diversification of basic support, we talked
11 about that.

12 Also under the funding consideration is access to
13 other divisions by humanities councils, applications to
14 other divisions.

15 MR. GIBSON: Do you include in access,
16 applications, communication or--

17 MR. GLADISH: Both. I think we meant both.

18 MR. ZAINALDIN: Both. Although under partnership
19 that access--and communication really is stronger there.

20 Acknowledgement by NEH of what it takes to run a
21 statewide program, and then what are the current models of
22 the state humanities council? What models exist out there,
23 or what are the typologies--

24 MR. GIBSON: Of the way they are currently
25 structured.

1 MR. ZAINALDIN: --of the way that--yes.

2 MR. GIBSON: Function.

3 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, function better, yes.

4 Then under partnership questions, there is the
5 question of the relative size of grants from NEH, and from
6 state humanities councils to local institutions. Also under
7 partnership is the review process. You have the advantage--
8 you have the benefit of local intelligence at the state
9 humanities council level, and you have an added value of the
10 review process at the national level, but what does that
11 mean? How do those two things work together?

12 Effective communication between the NEH and the
13 councils is important. What are new models for effective
14 communication?

15 We talked about the idea of the environmental
16 impact statement, and the awareness of the impact of a
17 project on a state that is funded by NEH. What is the logic
18 of federal support from multiple sources of the same agency
19 that goes into a state? What is the logic, when it is
20 coming from different sources within the agency? What is
21 the im--you know? What is the logic, or what should the
22 logic be?

23 Assessment and evaluation, all around, of the
24 state humanities councils themselves, and the review process
25 with the Endowment; the conversation that we had right

1 before lunch, that got into peer accreditation issues; the
2 train of proposal, but also the assessment and evaluation of
3 the Endowment's own programming, the impact of other
4 division grantmaking in the states, the impact that that has
5 on the environment of the humanities in the state.

6 And then we concluded with kind of four sets of
7 questions, that I think are also under this category of
8 partnership. What are the shared, and what are the
9 divergent missions between the councils and the NEH? What
10 do they share, and what do they not share in terms of their
11 missions? That was one question.

12 The second question was, what do councils want
13 from NEH, and what does NEH want from councils?

14 The third question was, what do councils need to
15 know, about how the NEH does its work, and what does NEH
16 need to know about how the councils do their work?

17 And then fourth (and I think we sort of felt this
18 was sort of the heart of part--this was almost a definition
19 of partnership), how can the NEH and the councils work
20 together to create greater resources, and greater impact?
21 You know, in the use of that \$177 million.

22 MR. VORE: Could you repeat two?

23 MR. ZAINALDIN: What do councils want from NEH,
24 and what does the NEH want from the councils?

25 MS. WILLIAMS: And four?

1 MR. ZAINALDIN: How can the NEH and the councils
2 work together to create a greater--to create greater
3 resources, and a greater impact, and impact. I mean, that
4 picks up on fundraising issues, but also, how do we put the
5 two strengths together to reach more people?

6 MR. GIBSON: But it is sort of also the matter of
7 how--coordinating so that existing resources can be
8 enhanced.

9 MR. ZAINALDIN: Well--

10 MS. MYERS: Shall we try to go through these
11 questions, and would that be a useful way of talking about
12 partnership?

13 MR. CHEATHAM: And be through by 4:00?

14 MS. MYERS: Yes, and be through by 4:00. Only in
15 terms of--Or we can look at the questions that we have in
16 "Toward a Stronger Partnership", some of which are really--
17 you know, cover the same ground. So why don't we take up
18 the ones that came from lunch? I think that there is a
19 great similarity, actually, if you look at the questions
20 under "Toward a Stronger Partnership". So let's start with
21 the shared and divergent missions. You know, what are the
22 differences? Bill?

23 MR. WILSON: On the part of the NEH, the mission
24 is defined nationally, and states are defined geographically
25 by the boundaries of those states. The next dimension is,

1 going back to those three functions, I am not sure you can
2 divide those up between NEH and state councils, although it
3 seems to me there is greater emphasis on the part of state
4 councils on participation of citizens, and more all three,
5 let's say, for the NEH in terms of creation of new
6 knowledge, and translation, and the curriculum.

7 MS. MYERS: That seemed to be the consensus, even
8 though that isn't the law of the land now, that the
9 propensity is to reaching out to a greater public than we--
10 Is that in general how the state councils see themselves?
11 Those of you from state councils?

12 MR. R. YOUNG: Well, I think it is more than
13 reaching out. I think this talks a little bit to the
14 different models. I think, you know, different state
15 councils obviously do different things, but I think one of
16 the things that some state councils really do a lot of is to
17 put an awful lot of work into encouraging community
18 initiated projects, which takes an awful lot of listening,
19 more than perhaps reaching out, or--These things don't just
20 sui generis happen automatically. There has to be an awful
21 lot of groundwork laid before solid projects that come from,
22 you know, the grassroots, as we always talked about, come
23 into being, and I think there is more than just--Outreach
24 always strikes me as--

25 MR. CHEATHAM: Taking it out there.

1 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes, taking it out there, and I
2 think we are--

3 MS. MYERS: Bill, then Tom.

4 MR. R. YOUNG: You are also eliciting.

5 MR. ROBERTS: It is kind of--It is also sowing of
6 the seeds that creates the grass for the roots to--I mean, I
7 see part of our mission as bringing--I mean, Bob says it is--
8 -People come to us at the state level who would never come
9 to NEH. And that is true. It is in part because we have
10 gone to them first, made them feel comfortable with us, and
11 also made them understand what we perceive the humanities to
12 be. So that it becomes something that they say, "Oh, well
13 that is something that we do, or we would like to do.", but
14 in many cases that we do anyway; we just don't call it that.
15 And if we can define it differently, I mean, bring the
16 people in to help us, then we could create programming,
17 where we don't have it now.

18 So I think I see part of our mission that the
19 Endowment doesn't do on a national level is bringing things
20 to places, bring the humanities to places where they don't
21 exist. And in some instances, which the Endowment does do,
22 trying to, for example, with education, to improve the
23 level, improve the delivery system for humanities where they
24 do exist, for improving in the more traditional
25 instructional settings. So trying to improve the quality of

1 the humanities as it is taught in elementary schools.

2 So I see our mission, part of our mission, as
3 having that dual sense, bringing it some places where it
4 hasn't been, bringing it some places where it already is,
5 but trying to improve--improve it and make it more designed
6 for the people who consume it in those settings. So I mean,
7 I guess I see the humanities as a product, and that we have
8 different ways of marketing that product on the national
9 level and the state level. I mean, we are, you know, we are
10 one of the Avon ladies, and they are more the national
11 corporation, and--

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. MYERS: Revlon. Revlon and Avon, and if we
14 can get them to underwrite our work--

15 (Simultaneous discussion.)

16 MR. GIBSON: Okay, I got it.

17 MS. MYERS: Okay.

18 (Simultaneous discussion.)

19 MR. CHEATHAM: I see the humanities more as a
20 process, or at least as often, as a process.

21 MR. ROBERTS: I mean, the humanities themselves
22 are a process. I am just saying that what our programs are,
23 I see as a product of--

24 MR. CHEATHAM: But I think what Bob was talking
25 about is, we are trying to get involved, to get communities

1 involved in that process.

2 MR. R. YOUNG: Let me just expand on that a
3 little, because I think there is more than--I like the idea
4 of process because once you get communities involved in
5 projects of their own, whether they initially know it is in
6 the humanities or not, what you develop is an enormous
7 amount of enthusiasm, at that level, that really brings
8 people into the process, that I think, at least in Wyoming,
9 could probably only be accomplished by a state council. And
10 I think that the enthusiasm for the examined life, if you
11 will, becomes part of the process, in the volunteer, in-kind
12 time that is--without which these projects wouldn't go. And
13 it reverberates for years.

14 MS. : Let me comment. Go ahead.

15 MR. GIBSON: Let me just--Part of what I am
16 hearing is--and maybe it is some of the current jargon in
17 management--but is that what we are talking about is much
18 greater customer sensitivity, engaging the people in the
19 process of defining their own projects. And that is very
20 important in all this. But I am also sort of hearing that
21 state councils and NEH have a role beyond grantmaking, that
22 it has been leadership beyond grantmaking that is something
23 that in an area, perhaps a very fruitful area, that we can
24 discuss as this process continues. Not necessarily before
25 4:00, but I think there is an area of collaboration and help

1 there, and this whole idea of leadership beyond grantmaking,
2 or leadership without grantmaking, leadership without a
3 specific project, or whatever.

4 MS. WATSON: We were talking as we were getting
5 the report done, written, at lunch, about the disappearance
6 of the capacity of state councils to do grants, to do
7 grantmaking, in the same volume that they did in earlier
8 years, and that this is an essential element that seems to
9 be disappearing from their work, and that that should be
10 part of the environmental scan that we are doing of the
11 status of the councils at this stage.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: I think it is a particular kind of
13 grantmaking. I think the kind of grantmaking that Bob was
14 talking about, where we are really getting in the community,
15 we don't have the staffs, really, to do that sort of--that
16 you get so many of those that you can't fund them anyway.
17 What we see in Tennessee at least, what is really suffering
18 are those medium-sized institutions. I mean, we are doing a
19 lot of the small grants, and in some of these community
20 grants you don't need those small grants. But the medium-
21 sized institutions that can't compete nationally for grants,
22 and then we don't have enough money to give them for grants.
23 So there are a lot of these medium-sized community
24 institutions that have nowhere to go for grants of this
25 type. And they are medium-sized nationally, but for

1 Tennessee they are major. The Tennessee State Museum has
2 never gotten a grant from NEH. Not all NEH's fault, I might
3 add, but--

4 MS. WATSON: Is this what you are talking about?

5 MR. R. YOUNG: That is part of what I am talking
6 about, you know. But I guess that I would even say that we,
7 unlike the trend that you just described, Carole, I would
8 say that our grantmaking has almost risen exponentially over
9 the last five years, precisely because, I think, of the
10 networks of tiny organizations that hardly even would think
11 of us, unless somehow we went out there and sat around with
12 a woolgrowers association, and discussed the difference
13 between a coyote and a humanist for a while until they
14 finally got the message, and then they came to us. And--

15 MR. GIBSON: What is that?

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. R. YOUNG: And in either case, the sheep are
18 nervous.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. R. YOUNG: That is not to disagree with what
21 you are saying, Robert, but I think what has struck me, I
22 guess, is the incredible energy that can be developed at
23 just the very local level, once people--once you build up
24 this enthusiasm so that groups are coming. Then they begin
25 thinking. They know what the humanities are, they know that

1 this little project might be able to fit into the
2 humanities. And I find that--I find that energizing.

3 MR. CHEATHAM: We are giving more of those--

4 MR. R. YOUNG: But to take up on what you were
5 saying, too, I think there are institutions--For example, we
6 went so far--It was an enormous grant for us. We made a
7 grant of \$30,000. to the Wyoming State Museum for a three
8 year project on World War II, and we had to think long and
9 hard about \$30,000. That is an enormous grant for us, but
10 it was something that I don't think the Wyoming State Museum
11 would have gone to another division of NEH for. It wasn't a
12 national project. It was the World War II in Wyoming. So I
13 would agree with what you are saying, too.

14 MS. MYERS: Okay. And I think Don's emphasis on,
15 or mention of, leadership is good, as we proceed in these
16 discussions, that in different ways there is definitely a
17 leadership role to play in both, and that there are times in
18 which there can be a kind of collaborative leadership.

19 Well then, let's go on to the second question.
20 What do councils--How did you phrase that, Jamil, because my
21 shorthand is--short.

22 MR. ZAINALDIN: What do councils want from NEH,
23 and what does NEH want from councils?

24 MS. MYERS: Well, what do councils want from NEH?

25 MR. CHEATHAM: More money.

1 MS. MYERS: Money.

2 MR. GIBSON: Money and power, right?

3 (Simultaneous discussion.)

4 MR. GLADISH: No more sheep.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MS. WATSON: Well, Robert, when you were talking
7 about the accreditation panel, it wouldn't necessarily have
8 resulted in more money. I think you--But the way you
9 described it, there would be more of an interchange between
10 the panelists and the council, and more understanding on
11 their part that would presumably convey, I suppose, to the
12 NEH, about the work of the councils.

13 And Bob, you were saying that sometimes when you
14 are driving out there, sometimes flying out there, in very
15 lonely and dangerous situations, that you thought of
16 Marjorie, and wished that--

17 MS. MYERS: She were there to protect him.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. GLADISH: Lonely Wyoming man.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MS. WATSON: And that wouldn't necessarily have
22 gotten you any more money either, and I think that my
23 advocacy--

24 MR. ROBERTS: It would have been an experience,
25 though.

1 MS. WATSON: Right. But my advocacy for the work
2 of the councils, I think, is evident, and desire that there
3 would be more funding. But those two struck me, those two
4 struck me as statements about wishing somehow that there was
5 a more of an acknowledgement, more of an appreciation, more
6 of an understanding, over and above funding, that--At least
7 I heard today, and I would like if you would be willing to
8 say just a little bit more, if I am hearing you correctly,
9 if I am not, fine, about that.

10 MS. MYERS: A more three-dimensional picture of
11 what is going on?

12 MR. R. YOUNG: Let me just add to that a little
13 bit. I think it is perhaps an understanding of the enormous
14 amount of time and effort, over a long haul, that it takes
15 to elicit, evoke, from frontier communities--These sorts of
16 things don't happen overnight. And I think that that is not
17 something that you can easily put in a triennial proposal,
18 you know, that it was seven years before finally something
19 happened, let's say, on the reservation. It is a lot of
20 listening and I know state councils are different, and I am
21 not saying that we are not--in any way that we are not
22 appreciated, but some sense of the, maybe of the structure,
23 the way that staffs, very small staffs work almost
24 incessantly with groups who I think in Washington, you know,
25 I think, well, who cares about these people? Well, we care

1 about these people. But on a national level, does anybody
2 really care about them? Yet that is the guts of the
3 program.

4 MS. WATSON: You mean except for me.

5 MR. R. YOUNG: Of course.

6 MR. ROBERTS: I don't think it is so much they
7 don't care about them, as they don't know about them the way
8 you do, because they are not out there, sitting and talking
9 to the wool growers.

10 (Simultaneous discussion.)

11 MS. MYERS: Arnita, and then Pat Williams.

12 MS. JONES: Yes, well I was just, you know, in
13 terms of hearing this morning, it seems to me that it wasn't
14 just more understanding, acknowledgement of what you are
15 doing by state program staff, but NEH staff. I mean, you
16 know, that it is not a program, that is a problem that is
17 division specific, but that the whole Endowment--

18 MR. CHEATHAM: I think it even extends beyond
19 that. I mean, now and again, somebody who is in academia
20 discovers the public, and comes out, and because they are
21 coming from academia, they are supposed to know the
22 humanities. It is like our knowledge has no value. It is
23 like our knowledge of 20 years of working in these
24 communities, trying to do the public humanities, as if
25 somehow that could be wiped out if we suddenly sat down a

1 group of scholars, like in Chicago, to talk about the public
2 humanities. Suddenly that group of scholars would know more
3 than the state councils would. I think that is simply not
4 true. I think the state councils, if you are talking public
5 humanities, I think the state councils know it better than
6 anybody in this country. With the exception of museum
7 people when you are talking about their disciplines. Those
8 people out doing the work know it. And they know it better
9 than all the great scholars who don't do the work. And it
10 is not because we are smarter or better. We are doing the
11 work.

12 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes, I agree.

13 MS. JONES: So I don't understand you as well as
14 Carole and Don.

15 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I think some people do.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. CHEATHAM: I think in fact, the history
18 profession--

19 MS. JONES: That is true.

20 MR. CHEATHAM: I think in fact the history
21 profession is further along in understanding the state
22 councils than even the other disciplines.

23 MR. GLADISH: Sure.

24 MR. CHEATHAM: Because we work more closely with
25 them, and there are ways that our programs are developing

1 scholarship, even. I mean, there has been that marriage--

2 MS. JONES: Oh, absolutely.

3 MR. CHEATHAM: --in history, where there has been
4 in no other discipline. Maybe anthropology.

5 MS. MYERS: How about being--

6 MR. CHEATHAM: Not English.

7 MR. GLADISH: I would like to add something else
8 besides to this. Robert started with that we wanted money,
9 and now you want love, too.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. CHEATHAM: But if we can't have both, we will
12 take the money.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. GLADISH: So, but isn't there--There is
15 another thing, I think, that would be appropriate to add to
16 the list about what the councils want or desire from the
17 Endowment, and that is advocacy on behalf of the state
18 council and the public programs, on a larger national
19 platform, with the groups, funders, political enterprises,
20 et cetera, to which the Endowment, as a consequence of its
21 standing, has access. Advocacy, I think, is a key thing.

22 And I suppose then, coming along with advocacy
23 would be a kind of more activist effort to have our work
24 visible and interpreted in the larger press, television, et
25 cetera. I think those are things that go hand in hand with

1 this business of resources and respect, also this advocacy
2 and kind of information capacity.

3 A little effort that was underway, Carole, when
4 Doug Ford was working with you, and has extended still, is
5 the Federation's active engagement with the disciplinary
6 societies, and trying to be certain that our work was on the
7 agenda at AHA, at APSA, at the Anthropological Society, that
8 kind of business.

9 That kind of work is stuff that was very valuable,
10 and resulted in an impact for us in Indiana, and I know in
11 many other states, because people would come back and say,
12 "Well, I am going to call these people I run across, maybe
13 we can do something together." That can change the
14 environment for our work. I think that is a really
15 important asset that the Endowment brings that we can't,
16 except in fits and starts. I know Arnita because she is in
17 Bloomington, but if the OAH wasn't there, the NEH, for me
18 anyway, would be the principle interpreter, along with our
19 own Federation. I think there is a place where the Division
20 of State Programs and the Federation can work very
21 constructively together, because that is one of the things
22 that we as members assign to the Federation as an obligation
23 and responsibility. So that goes along with advocacy and
24 information kind of business.

25 MS. MYERS: Can we turn it the other way now, and

1 say what does the NEH want from the councils?

2 MR. CHEATHAM: We are not through yet.

3 MS. MYERS: Oh, you are not? Well, money. You
4 wanted to mention money, is that right?

5 MS. SEMMEL: I will just take a cue from you, Ken,
6 because one of the things that is important from my
7 perspective, is that at gatherings that you have, if there
8 ways in which some of the things that are funded through our
9 division can get better notice, publication, public hearing,
10 I think that would also be helpful, either at your
11 Federation meetings, or through joint appearances at some of
12 these academic conferences. I think that could be very
13 helpful for all of us, to show how in many cases there is
14 this partnership that does work in conjunction with certain
15 projects, to further the public dissemination of humanities.
16 I have been frustrated at some of the annual meetings of the
17 Federation that, you know, I am not on your time schedule,
18 and I know you have got lots of things to discuss, but there
19 are some interesting models that could be presented in your
20 Federation sessions.

21 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, but--Sort of a theme running
22 through a number of our comments, are mechanisms.

23 MS. MYERS: Are what?

24 MR. ZAINALDIN: Are mechanisms. I mean, we have
25 got--

1 MS. MYERS: Communication.

2 MR. ZAINALDIN: Well, yes, but you know, it all
3 comes down to who does what. I mean the coordination--We
4 have two mechanisms, the Division of State Programs and the
5 Federation. But there are other mechanisms, too, and some
6 that may not even exist yet within the Endowment. But I
7 mean, I think at some point in the study that you are going
8 to be doing, it would be--That is the next step, is to
9 connect some of this with some sort of network.

10 MS. SEMMEL: And I will just say one more thing.
11 That is, that I am very sensitive to Robert's point about
12 medium-sized institutions, because this is something that we
13 agonize over time and time again. And even more than the
14 state, the local-national dichotomy, it is the large-medium-
15 small sized institution mix that is breaking down, and those
16 institutions that do good serviceable proposals, that do
17 well but not quite well enough, because of our limitations
18 on funds. It is a real issue for us, and we really struggle
19 with how we can address it. And even a massive infusion of
20 funds to the state councils wouldn't necessarily accommodate
21 the needs of some of those institutions--

22 MR. CHEATHAM: If we had enough money to give one
23 \$50,000. grant a year, I think it would make a lot of
24 difference.

25 MS. SEMMEL: But then we see proposals, again say

1 from museums. There might be ten museums in a state that
2 have projects that a decent, appropriate budget for that
3 project which could deal with the permanent collections of
4 that museum, could be in the several hundred thousand dollar
5 range, and the request to us is only a fraction of that
6 total project budget, and yet if that project, almost but
7 not quite makes it time and time again, it is very
8 frustrating for us, too.

9 So, again, I guess I just wanted to--What I want
10 from you, I guess, is just more dialogue about that issue.
11 About how we can come up with either categories, or ways of
12 dealing with that size institution. At the Federation
13 meeting in Providence, when we did a session like this, one
14 of the main issues that emerged at that session, and what we
15 are all trying to do--

16 MR. R. YOUNG: Well, let me ask you, Marsha, is
17 there--Do you see any possibility of a way in which your
18 division could work together with the state council for a
19 medium-sized institution in which there was joint funding?

20 MS. SEMMEL: Well, I don't think any of that
21 should be off the table. I mean, I think that that would be
22 something that we should think about. Again, I am not quite
23 sure how it would work, but I--

24 MR. R. YOUNG: I mean, to meet Robert's \$50,000.--

25 MR. CHEATHAM: Fifteen thousand now.

1 (Simultaneous discussion.)

2 MR. R. YOUNG: Fifteen thousand from the state
3 council, 35,000 from the--

4 MS. SEMMEL: In fact, it often happens with the
5 projects that we fund. There is this cobbling together by
6 a--

7 MR. CHEATHAM: But that really--

8 (Simultaneous discussion.)

9 MR. GIBSON: --maybe self-conscious problem.

10 MR. R. YOUNG: Yes.

11 MS. MYERS: Any other comments on this category?
12 Yes, Pat.

13 MS. WILLIAMS: I just think always it is helpful
14 to have from the state up to the national level more
15 communication about what is happening at the local level.
16 Because your fingers are on that pulse, as you persuaded us,
17 and I think there is a lot more going on in the humanities
18 that the state councils aren't funding, that are being
19 funded at the county and local level, that we should at
20 least have anecdotal knowledge of, if not statistical
21 information about, because we could make a better advocacy
22 case for really how extensive the humanities really are, you
23 know, while we are lamenting not being able to get out
24 there. I know just from my own sort of personal avocational
25 experience, there is a lot that goes on at the local level

1 that would fit into the humanities, that are being funded
2 from other funny little sources.

3 MR. CHEATHAM: Or not being funded at all, just
4 happening.

5 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, we are funding three archival
6 projects in Prince Georges County. Nobody would ever count
7 those, because they happen to be coming out of a
8 preservation fund instead of a humanities fund. So it would
9 be very interesting to get a better picture, and I don't
10 think we will ever have the statistical instrument to do it,
11 so we need a combination of the statistical and anecdotal
12 coming up.

13 MS. MYERS: Tom.

14 MR. ROBERTS: I guess, I mean, that would have to
15 come from the councils through the Division of State
16 Programs to the rest of the Endowment. Presumably,
17 certainly individual program officers within DSP are aware
18 of the anecdotal, and even to an extent, even though it is
19 only every three years, the statistical situation in a
20 particular state. How can that be translated into
21 information that goes into other divisions, so that Public
22 Programs finds out that there is an exhibit on a particular
23 topic going on in Wyoming or Maryland or wherever that you
24 wouldn't have known about, because they would never come to
25 you. But somebody else might be coming to you, and it might

1 influence your dealing with this larger applicant, if you
2 knew that something of mid-sized situation that from all
3 reports was very well done existed in another site. But I
4 don't know what you would do. If you would somehow try and
5 make the applicant aware of the other thing, or if you would
6 feel that it was replicating something that had already been
7 funded with NEH money that filtered through the state
8 councils, or what. But would it--Would having that kind of
9 information about other humanities pursuits going on
10 somewhere else influence you somehow or other?

11 MS. SEMMEL: Very much so. I mean, we are always
12 trying to keep track of what is going on, and there is no
13 way that we can. But it is--So it is very, very important
14 for us to know when these kinds of efforts are going on.
15 And people, too, people who you work with who maybe would be
16 good reviewers for us. You know, all of that would make a
17 better exchange for us--

18 MR. ROBERTS: Maybe we should--Somewhere in the
19 course of today or yesterday, somebody said that this is
20 really, I think, something that--It is the DSP staff that
21 has to be the instigator of that. I mean, we can send you
22 all kinds of information. How you distill it, and then
23 dispense it within the--just within the Endowment is really
24 a burden for you. But it would seem that there is a need
25 for this, or a gap there.

1 MR. CHEATHAM: It seems to me, that it would be
2 pretty easy for Public, and Education, and all those, to
3 keep up with what is going on in the states, if we put them
4 on the mailing list, if they went to our national meetings,
5 not to make presentations, but to listen and participate.

6 MR. ROBERTS: To an extent, but I would say also,
7 I mean, I think it has to be centralized. I mean, if you
8 read the Tennessee newsletter this week, and then 12 weeks
9 from now you read the Indiana newsletter, I am not sure if
10 you are going to put it all together that way. And I am
11 saying that somehow--

12 MR. CHEATHAM: I think that is true, but there is
13 a mechanism to keep it going. I don't know how to find out
14 about your programs. I read everything that comes down to
15 us.

16 MS. SEMMEL: Are you talking to me, or--

17 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes, yours.

18 MR. ROBERTS: He doesn't care about mine.

19 MS. SEMMEL: So you are saying through--

20 MR. CHEATHAM: See, I can keep up--

21 (Simultaneous discussion.)

22 MR. CHEATHAM: No, I can keep up with the states
23 very easily. I mean, there are mechanisms. It is out
24 there. I don't know how to keep up with what you are doing
25 in quite the same way. Because there is not any kind of--I

1 mean, I was really quite impressed by that group of people
2 that you all got together, and talking to them about their
3 projects, the study group, the group we had--When was that?

4 MS. MYERS: The Public group.

5 MR. CHEATHAM: The last--

6 (Simultaneous discussion.)

7 MR. CHEATHAM: That was really impressive, and
8 talking to those people about the projects they are doing
9 afterward. But I didn't know those things were going on. I
10 mean, I might have seen a title somewhere, but I didn't know
11 they were going on.

12 (Simultaneous discussion.)

13 MS. MYERS: We have to work on this.

14 (Simultaneous discussion.)

15 MR. GIBSON: --really superb work. And we do need
16 a new mechanism for doing that. The mechanisms you
17 mentioned, talking about Jamil's comment, would be useful.
18 I mean, newsletters and attendance at meetings, and so
19 forth. And I am not quarreling with that at all. But I
20 think it does need to be a more systematic means of getting
21 information. Especially about what Public and Education are
22 doing. I think those divisions are of greatest interest to
23 the--And part of that mechanism may be the electronic--

24 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I think we don't want to hear
25 it so much from Public and Education. What I really want to

1 hear is the project people.

2 MR. GIBSON: See, that is tougher. Yes, yes.

3 (Simultaneous discussion.)

4 MS. MYERS: But don't you think, if through the
5 divisions, you know, where there are potential tie-ins, if
6 not definite or obvious ones, there is some language coming
7 beyond information, sort of neutral information coming out
8 about what museums are being funded in Tennessee, that there
9 might be, in some language used by the program, Public
10 Programs let's say, a suggestion, it doesn't have to be a
11 requirement, but something that brings the other programs
12 closer to the State Programs, where it can be useful, in
13 terms of--where there is a real complementarity. And some
14 mechanism that the Endowment can devise to make that happen
15 more regularly, and not accidentally.

16 MR. GIBSON: I really can't--Allow me to turn to
17 telecommunications for one second, if I could. The
18 Endowment, as you may know, has finally gone--has finally
19 pulled into the 19th century on telecommunications, that we
20 have all learned and will have Internet soon.

21 MR. R. YOUNG: I sent an Internet message--

22 MR. GIBSON: Hopeless, yes.

23 MR. R. YOUNG: And it didn't get there.

24 MR. GIBSON: Right.

25 MS. : That happens frequently.

1 MR. GIBSON: The--Of course, e-mail, we have
2 internal e-mail, and I had a very disturbing experience last
3 week. Marsha sent me a note on her internal e-mail, and it
4 came back to her and said "Recipient Unknown."

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. GIBSON: I found that mildly discouraging.
7 What has Sheldon done now? But we will have Internet, and
8 we really hope to be connecting with all states in the near
9 future, so we can communicate electronically. You can
10 access our application files--grant files, not application
11 files--access our grant files, and you can (Inaudible.) that
12 way. But it is not as good as that kind of meeting you are
13 talking about, and we can, I think, come up with some means
14 or mechanisms for that as well. But I think electronically
15 it should help a lot.

16 MR. ZAINALDIN: We should be talking, though,
17 because we have got Humnet on-line, but people are afraid to
18 use it. But it is a tremendous resource, and we ought to be
19 doing it now, not after--

20 MR. CHEATHAM: We ought to be talking about
21 statistics, too.

22 MR. GIBSON: Yes, agreed.

23 MS. MYERS: Yes, Bob.

24 MR. R. YOUNG: I was just--Along this line of--I
25 think our boards need to be brought into this, our board

1 members need to be brought into this more directly, and
2 maybe that is something that--I think, I think that the
3 state councils are now at a point where they are doing a
4 pretty credible job of orienting their members to what they
5 need to do on their boards. But what I find among my board
6 members is they really don't have any idea except the blue
7 booklet, et cetera, what Education is doing, what Public
8 Programs are doing. Maybe in the orientation of new board
9 members there could be--we could begin talking about
10 possibilities of cooperation between--

11 MS. MYERS: Enterprise. Enterprise and potential
12 for cooperation.

13 MS. SEMMEL: Even within our division, which has
14 five programs, we find that the history people don't know
15 what art museum people are doing, film makers don't know
16 what museum people are doing, librarians don't necessarily--
17 So it is--There are these pools of projects, and pools of
18 resources, and they need to be connected in some way.

19 One of the things we are considering in our
20 division is some regional workshops, where we would try to
21 work with state humanities councils in certain areas, and
22 then just come out with representation from all the programs
23 in the division, and try to not only do a better job in
24 disseminating information about our programs, but have the
25 sub-benefit of drawing people from various kinds of

1 institutions within an area, that we all assume that they
2 all know each other, and it never turns out that they do.
3 Getting together to not only talk about how to get a grant,
4 but to talk about some other larger issues that we all face
5 in doing effective public humanities programs. That is why
6 we are trying to get more travel money from Don.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MS. SEMMEL: Never mind. Anyway, that is one of
9 the issues we are really trying to look at.

10 (Simultaneous discussion.)

11 MR. VORE: Jamil, could you comment more, because
12 I know as a result of the last Federation meeting, all of
13 us, collectively, were very excited about the potential on
14 that program. And then you mentioned no one is using that
15 here. So what is--Where are we, and why is that network not
16 being utilized, and if we could use it for one of the
17 future--What do we do?

18 MR. ZAINALDIN: Well, part of it is that, I guess,
19 in our department there are 20 or so users of it,
20 individuals who sort of use it.

21 MR. CHEATHAM: There is more than that.

22 MR. ZAINALDIN: You mean actual daily users?

23 MR. CHEATHAM: Not daily, because there is nothing
24 on it.

25 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes. Clearly it is--

1 (Simultaneous discussion.)

2 MR. ZAINALDIN: I mean, what we did was we broke
3 it down into categories of information, where you could
4 actually have a conversation online, or you could
5 communicate in a particular conference area. The conference
6 area might be something about speakers bureaus in your
7 state, and we have a file there where you could actually
8 pumpload information into it, by simply using a disc, and
9 then you could review it on the machine, and then download
10 it into your disc, and print it out, you know.

11 But it--Creating it is one thing. Finding--you
12 know, somehow--We just had a committee meeting, that is
13 basically restructured the whole thing. Enticing people on
14 to it and using it is another, and that involves identifying
15 people out there who will take responsibility for a
16 particular conference area, and actually trying to get some
17 conversation going, encouraging state councils to begin to
18 upload some information, because it is not going to be used
19 until there is useful information in it. But nobody yet has
20 made much of a decision about actually beginning to upload
21 information that they have in the machine. So it is kind of
22 sitting there, largely being used as e-mail, as an e-mail
23 function.

24 MR. VORE: Do you think it--Does it (and I don't
25 know that much about it), does it have the potential of (I

1 have been listening to this conversation) to where Jim could
2 put something on to it that would be of potential interest
3 to all of the state councils? And I am sure there are a
4 number of things that Jim might want to say, "Hey, this is
5 something that I should alert all the state councils to.",
6 or other divisions--

7 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, definitely. Definitely. I
8 really think, you know, if we could just sort of sit down
9 and show you what we have got, and as I say, it is almost
10 blank at this point.

11 MR. VORE: The same with Marsha. I don't know. I
12 am sure--

13 (Simultaneous discussion.)

14 MR. ZAINALDIN: It has got a huge capacity. We
15 wouldn't need to worry about it being filled up for 10 or 15
16 years.

17 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, here is the problem with it
18 in part. Now bulletins are one thing, you know, if you want
19 to send out a bulletin of information. But that is not very
20 exciting or very interesting, and you can do that by the
21 mail anyway. When these things get really interesting and
22 exciting is when you are having conversations over them.
23 There is only one active conference right now, and that is
24 ours. The one that we are doing--the database--our database
25 users, and that conference is active you will see. If you

1 go in there you will see that we are talking to each other
2 about issues.

3 MR. : You mean, ARAC (?) ?

4 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes. But that is the only active
5 conference. None of the other conferences are active,
6 because nobody has started talking on them. If we take Ed's
7 fax machine away, we can probably have a good conversation.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. CHEATHAM: If that had been the way he had to
10 do it, you probably could have gotten something going there.
11 Unfortunately, it is happening on the fax, rather than on
12 Humnet. But it would be better if that kind of thing would
13 go on.

14 We are going to reduce the number of conferences.
15 Right now that is overwhelming to a lot of people, and they
16 don't know where to have their talks and stuff.

17 MR. ZAINALDIN: I mean, speaking of partnership,
18 that is a good area. I mean, if it is at the beginning.

19 (Simultaneous discussion.)

20 MR. ZAINALDIN: It doesn't belong to anybody, it
21 is simply a network.

22 MR. VORE: I agree with you, Robert, that
23 bulletins isn't enough, but again, we have got to start
24 somewhere.

25 MR. CHEATHAM: Oh, bulletins are fine. I mean,

1 they are just not what can be really exciting about--

2 MR. VORE: What existing mechanisms do we have
3 that--

4 (Simultaneous discussion.)

5 MR. ZAINALDIN: And I am thinking there had better
6 be one, and I am thinking also about our conferencing. We
7 have talked about the various kinds of meetings that we
8 have. Maybe what we need to do is to--I am thinking about
9 the Federation conference, some of the things that you said
10 you got out from you know, from the Providence one. I mean,
11 well let's sit down and figure what should we be doing. I
12 mean, it is actually not too late for--

13 MR. GLADISH: Has NEH become an Internet domain?
14 Is that what has happened? Or have you connected with
15 somebody else?

16 MR. GIBSON: We will be--Well, we are connected
17 with GW right now, but it is a dinosaur type system. We
18 will be going with Internet within a matter of months.

19 MR. GLADISH: So you will be your own domain.

20 MR. GIBSON: Yes.

21 MR. GLADISH: I mean, there is an area of--Many of
22 the councils are connected through their inst--through other
23 institutions, but a very large number are not. And that
24 connection, that is an area for potential collaboration.

25 MR. GIBSON: Well, I think it would be very

1 fruitful. I can't tell you exactly how soon we will be on,
2 but I have already committed the money to buy in, and it is
3 a matter of selecting the vendor to order the configuration
4 of it. But that is coming shortly.

5 MS. WATSON: And you might consider councils as
6 part of our domain?

7 MR. GIBSON: Yes, I am not technologically
8 sophisticated enough to--

9 MS. WATSON: I know, but that is a good question
10 to ask.

11 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, what you can do, we can
12 connect, have an e-mail drop, through Humnet. That is
13 possible. We know that. We can send and receive into
14 Internet, from Humnet. That is possible.

15 MS. SEMMEL: Would you be able to do a Humnet
16 demonstration for members of our staff? Just for doing--

17 MR. ZAINALDIN: I could find someone who could do
18 it for you, I couldn't.

19 MS. SEMMEL: Because I think it would be good for
20 us to--

21 MR. ZAINALDIN: Definitely. Definitely. Oh, yes.
22 And you know, we will be doing it at the national
23 conference. We will be doing it, you know, with the screens
24 and everything again this year, so we will be glad to, you
25 know, to do that. If you want to do it before then,

1 definitely. We will do it.

2 MR. CHEATHAM: The problem with it is, the problem
3 with Humnet is, you can send bulletins all day, but unless
4 what is going on is interesting to people, they are not
5 going to come on and get the bulletins. They have got to be
6 interested in getting on, before you can send a bulletin,
7 because nobody is going to--If they are not on, the
8 bulletin--

9 MR. ZAINALDIN: But we could make it sound like a
10 conversation--

11 (Simultaneous discussion.)

12 MR. ZAINALDIN: --on Humnet, you know, dedicated
13 to the Public Programs Division, you could ask some
14 questions, and then give it two weeks to get out there and
15 to cook, and then see what you have got in three weeks.

16 MR. ROBERTS: Great idea.

17 MR. GIBSON: Leave Education out of it, though.

18 MS. MYERS: Jim?

19 MR. HERBERT: I actually have a shopping list
20 also, of things that NEH needs from the state councils.

21 MS. JONES: Could I say one thing on the online
22 stuff, before you start? I mean, you all funded H-net,
23 right?

24 MR. HERBERT: Um-hum.

25 MS. JONES: If anyone is coming to my meeting next

1 week, there will be demonstrations of that, which is a
2 similar kind of system.

3 (Simultaneous discussion.)

4 MS. JONES: So you might want to drop into
5 Jensen's (?) show there, so--

6 MR. GIBSON: Who is going? Greg?

7 MR. HERBERT: It is true. We funded H-net, and
8 lots of other things like that, so this is such a whole new
9 domain, that there is much that can be done.

10 MR. : Is that History Network?

11 MR. HERBERT: Yes. The shopping list that I have
12 sort of accumulated has mainly to do with elementary and
13 secondary education. The data I have learned is the
14 principle focus here. It has two areas of immediate
15 concern, I think, that really could become the agenda for
16 some kind of working subgroup.

17 One is this matter of local institutions for
18 teacher in-service support. This is an area that many state
19 councils have been active in. It is an area of importance
20 nationally as well, and it is an area that has a great deal
21 of change in it; the sort of post-Sputnik residential
22 institutes for individual teachers is a model which really
23 has been completely suspended by private funders now, and
24 one that we have been transforming as well. Its successor,
25 I think, will involve a great deal of collaboration between

1 local agencies, and the NEH. And so this whole area of what
2 should be done, and what can be done, to be more effective
3 with less money in the matter of teacher in-service
4 development, is I think, a very important area, where we
5 need to know more about what is happening on each side, and
6 learn more about how we can multiply effectiveness. That is
7 a very complicated issue, I think, and will take, although
8 it is the one that got on the table first, in fact it would
9 be harder to pull off.

10 The second issue, was just barely--I don't think
11 got quite on the table; it was in the corner a lot. It has
12 to do with this, what you might call the promulgation and
13 implementation of national standards in elementary and
14 secondary education in the humanities fields, history,
15 literature, and foreign languages. This is most obviously a
16 national/state kind of issue. We are now beginning to get a
17 lot of proposals from various organizations who would like
18 to undertake to promulgate the national standards as the
19 mathematicians have done. It was in the teaching
20 communities of history teachers and English teachers,
21 language teachers, precisely because the reform is shaped
22 like a national/state partnership. It seems to me that the
23 most important kind of promulgation structure would be a
24 national/state partnership, in any given case. And so it
25 seems to me that here we have a kind of--I don't know if the

1 states want to go into it. There is certainly an area where
2 there is the possibility of, and the need really, I think,
3 for some large-scale cooperation. So those are two very
4 practical issues that I think a subgroup should address.

5 I have a long list of more general things, that
6 include this exchange of intelligence, and sort of
7 interaction with local government agencies that would be
8 important in the field of education. We find it hard to
9 keep up, obviously, with so many states.

10 The notion that the state councils want to know
11 more about the project people in their states dovetails very
12 nicely with their desire to share the results of their work.
13 There is always great pressure put on them to disseminate
14 and otherwise extend the effectiveness of what they have
15 been doing.

16 There is also an area, I will just mention
17 briefly--Don and I have talked a lot about it--of somehow--
18 which extends beyond Education and into the domain of Public
19 Programs as well, of somehow using the resources of the NEH
20 to right the balance of academic resources in metropolitan
21 areas, between the periphery and the center. Right now, the
22 center is, from an educational point of view, impoverished.
23 School systems in the District of Columbia have zilch.
24 School systems in Montgomery County and Prince Georges
25 County and so on, have a great deal.

1 If one tries to right the balance of those
2 resources, one begins to think of the way in which public
3 resources, such as public television stations, public radio
4 stations, and museums and libraries, which are also located
5 in the core city by and large, may be brought into the
6 equation to balance the resources available to the entire
7 metropolitan educational system. So this is sort of--This
8 is a very large endeavor, and one that probably lends itself
9 to demonstration projects, rather than to a national
10 program. But it is, in my view, at the heart not only of
11 the educational crisis in the country, but our crisis of
12 polity as well.

13 MS. MYERS: Yes, Arnita?

14 MS. JONES: If I could just follow up on what Jim
15 was saying a little bit, in terms of the education reform
16 side of it. My organization is very interested in what is
17 happening with history education reform. It is one of the
18 disciplines named in the national goals. And we recognize
19 thoroughly that what is happening is happening state by
20 state. I mean, there is the national goals movement, but
21 then it is going to be implemented out there 50 different
22 ways, and it is very hard to find out what is happening,
23 where, when.

24 I mean, it is just what you have been saying. What
25 is happening with local governments? What is happening with

1 legislation that relates to the Department of Education
2 nationally? I mean, John keeps me up with what is happening
3 with NEH, but he can't do the Department of Education, in
4 his spare time, although I have leaned on him once or twice
5 to try.

6 You know, it is--that is something we could use
7 from both state councils and the national organization. I
8 mean, people in the states, I think, frequently--I mean,
9 they know the status of education reform, in some degree at
10 least. And I don't know that people here in the agency
11 nationally are fully aware of what is going on with other
12 national efforts, or legislation that relates to other
13 federal agencies. But it does seem to me that you might be
14 able to do that a little bit better than I can do it from
15 Bloomington. And at least what you do know could be
16 channeled out to organizations like mine, as well as state
17 councils, and so forth. So, that is a real need, because
18 this is going to be with us for a number of years, and--

19 MR. HERBERT: Jamil was just talking about a
20 substitute session at the Federation meeting. All three of
21 these--Well, most of the standards projects in the
22 humanities areas are, in fact, cofunded by the Endowment.
23 So there is a kind of interior knowledge of these projects,
24 and their implications for curriculum in the state, and for
25 teachers in the state. It is obvious, I mean, one would

1 hope, this one does hope, that this would be a matter of
2 interest to the state councils, and that they would take a
3 lively advocacy role in making sure that what ends up being
4 practiced in the states are, in fact, the humanities.

5 MS. JONES: But it comes back to Don's question.
6 Are there areas where NEH and state councils can take a
7 leadership role above and beyond grantmaking, alongside
8 grantmaking, and that certainly is--

9 MR. GLADISH: Jim, you mentioned earlier, I think
10 yesterday, this--the comparative experience in the math and
11 sciences, where NSF has joined together with local advocacy
12 and curricular groups. Ohio is the closest one to us with
13 which I am familiar. In fact, the former associate director
14 of the Ohio Humanities Council is one of its regional
15 directors, Chris Nicely-Angle (?). The southern half of
16 Ohio is her responsibility for science and math activity.
17 Are you suggesting that we ought to be looking at whether or
18 not we could identify and create, in a collaborative way
19 between the Endowment and some state councils, a similar
20 model for--to approach all those issues? Now I know NSF has
21 a hell of a lot more money than we have, but I mean what did
22 they put in? Five million dollars into Ohio, or something?
23 A single state.

24 MR. HERBERT: NSF's education budget last year
25 increased more than the entire budget for the National

1 Endowment for the Humanities. So it is a different scale of
2 thing that we could try.

3 MR. GLADISH: But if there were some states, not
4 56, but--Would you be receptive to those kinds of
5 discussion?

6 MR. HERBERT: Absolutely. I mean, in fact the NSF
7 business only works in a certain number of states. And our
8 statewide initiative may not be very systemic, or at least
9 systematic, but there is clearly a role, a very important
10 role to be played in this kind of--to find a humanities
11 analogue for this--for the NSF statewide initiative.

12 MR. HAMMER: Could the Education Division, if a
13 regional grouping of state humanities councils came together
14 to form a cooperative project to do just what you are
15 talking about, say the Old Midwest, or something like that,
16 and then since you can't make a grant to a state council,
17 could you then make a grant on this kind of a subject, to a
18 collaborative that had a, you know, an institution that
19 wasn't a state humanities council as the applicant?

20 MR. HERBERT: You know, John, I don't think we
21 should try to solve bureaucratic problems by fudging the
22 issue. Maybe we can't make a grant to state councils now,
23 directly, but--

24 MR. HAMMER: No, that is not the point. The
25 question is, is it within the work of the Education Division

1 you could make a grant like that, to do that kind of work?

2 MR. HERBERT: Sure. I mean, my point is that I
3 don't think this is a multistate issue in most cases. I
4 think it really is a state-by-state issue.

5 MS. JONES: State-by-state.

6 MR. HERBERT: That is what lends itself to this
7 forum so well. So you wouldn't--Whatever invention you--
8 Whatever devising you do to address this problem, you
9 probably won't keep it state-by-state. But given that, yes,
10 absolutely. There are important, important issues that need
11 to be dealt with here.

12 MR. HAMMER: What I was thinking of, is that it
13 would be--the money would be divided to address the issue in
14 the states, but you would have a mechanism so you didn't
15 have to make hundreds of grants.

16 MS. WATSON: Could you say a little more about how
17 NSFs--what NSFs funding for national standards--What does
18 the funding pay for?

19 MR. HERBERT: Well, there are various levels of
20 funding, but it pays basically for conferences and planning
21 meetings. And the content of those conferences and planning
22 meetings varies as the reform process moves along.

23 The first goal, in the case of mathematics, is
24 that the mathematics teachers of a state simply understand
25 what the standards are. And they have done elaborate work

1 in figuring out how many teachers know that there are new
2 standards, know how they are different from current
3 practice, are able to think their way into those standards,
4 see the implications for changes in practice. So the first
5 stage really is just familiarization and understanding of
6 the new directions.

7 Then you go to the stage of--well, various kinds
8 of implementation projects in--Well.

9 MS. WATSON: And does that involve changing state
10 law perhaps, prior to--Or does it skip that step and just go
11 straight to curriculum, or are there just a lot of different
12 ways to--

13 MR. HERBERT: The state law is getting changed for
14 states. That is to say, there are various devices being
15 used by the federal government that will force states to
16 accommodate these national standards. The board forces,
17 probably not welcome in humanities circles, but when you tie
18 \$7 million worth of state aid to the standards, that is
19 force.

20 MS. WATSON: By the way, we sent a fax to all the
21 states just on this very topic the week before last,
22 informing them of what Jim has reiterated today. But what I
23 take from it is that something that we can reinforce and
24 continue to discuss, and perhaps maybe discuss at the
25 national meeting.

1 MR. HERBERT: You know, I don't want to spend too
2 much time on this topic, but an important point to be made
3 about the mathematics standards is that they are good in
4 themselves. They are, in fact, the reform of mathematics
5 education. Consequently, there are plenty of people who
6 believe that it is important that mathematics teachers
7 understand these standards, and know what to do with them.
8 It isn't simply the force of law, and in fact, the
9 mathematics business has been going on now for five years or
10 so. It has been very effective, reached maybe two-thirds of
11 the math teachers without the force of law.

12 One can entertain the same kinds of hopes for the
13 three standard efforts in humanities areas. And so one
14 wouldn't necessarily want to simply be driven by state law,
15 or federal law. The good parts of the history standards,
16 for example, are worth understanding, and promulgating, and
17 supporting with in-service activities, in and of themselves.

18 MR. GLADISH: Jim, the three areas are history,
19 language arts--

20 MR. HERBERT: Well, we say history, they say
21 social studies. We say English, they say language arts. We
22 say foreign language--

23 MS. JONES: No, no. History is--

24 MR. HERBERT: No, no. I mean, we in this case,
25 are the standards efforts, and the Endowment, and the

1 humanities. But in state departments it is usually a
2 different terminology.

3 MS. MYERS: Any other comments? We are actually,
4 as we speak, addressing the several questions, I think, that
5 are two of four.

6 MR. HAMMER: That are 2 of 27.

7 MS. MYERS: Of the four questions.

8 (Simultaneous discussion.)

9 MR. CHEATHAM: That just took an hour, so--

10 MS. MYERS: Yes.

11 MR. HAMMER: She meant 4:00 in the morning.

12 MS. MYERS: I meant the four questions that Jamil
13 put forward that we thought we would focus on in the
14 discussion of partnership, and I think we have been talking
15 about them. What do they have to--What does the NEH have to
16 know about the way the councils work, and what do the
17 councils have to know about the way the NEH works? And I
18 think that we are getting into that. Yes, Bill.

19 MR. WILSON: I am sensitive that I am the lone
20 chair here remaining. It seems to me that one of the
21 strengths all the way along has been kind of orientation to
22 board members at the outset. We get the big picture, but we
23 probably don't know a lot more coming onboard, so it is a
24 little bit of a blur.

25 It seems to me crucial that the kind of

1 conversation we are having, and what it means, needs to be
2 integrated into meetings with the board. Too often I find,
3 at least when I was on the board, when you shift to a kind
4 of a national, an extrastate perspective, that is the time
5 when people tend to go get coffee, and it seems to me there
6 really needs to be an emphasis to keep--

7 (Laughter.)

8 MR. GLADISH: We don't want to talk about
9 Tennessee anymore.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. WILSON: It is crucial to keep board members
12 thinking about this on an ongoing basis, and not let it be
13 just an episodic aspect.

14 MS. MYERS: Any other? And that is a challenge,
15 isn't it? To get your individual boards doing that, in your
16 individual states. Pat, and then Tom.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: I was going to say just as an
18 aside, I have been working with the National Assembly of
19 State Arts Agencies, that has some money from NEA to do
20 board training, and they are developing a new board training
21 handbook that the Federation and the state office might want
22 to look at, because I think they have done a good job about
23 figuring out the modules, and how poor board members learn,
24 and come into a board and get oriented as to the work of
25 boards. They will probably have a finished product in the

1 fall.

2 MS. MYERS: Good. Tom?

3 MR. ROBERTS: Mentioning boards, I think it is
4 good to recall that some of the things we have been talking
5 about today, we have just been referring collectively to
6 "we" meaning the state councils, but I think it means both
7 board and staff. When Bob talks about talking to the wool
8 gatherers about coyotes, I think it is not always the staff
9 that has those conversations, it is frequently members of
10 the board, who initiate those conversations.

11 And similarly, going back to Elizabeth's model,
12 the gatekeeper model which she threw out on the table for
13 discussion. That would not be a function of the staff alone
14 to perform that kind of review, layer of review. It would
15 be a function of the council itself. The council made up of
16 the staff and the board. So I don't think we have been
17 leaving out the board. Maybe we have been leaving out
18 mentioning them, but certainly that has been part of the
19 process as I have understood it. A lot of what we have been
20 discussing--

21 MR. WILSON: Yes, but it is always--I always
22 remember the imputation that the relationship between the
23 executive director and the chair is not unlike, I forget who
24 mentioned, he went to a family wedding and could not dance,
25 but obviously the occasion arose when he was going to have

1 to, and his wife said, "Don't worry. We will get out on the
2 dance floor, I can make the dance--I can do the dance, but I
3 can make it look like you are leading."

4 (Laughter.)

5 MR. ZAINALDIN: Tom Greenfield.

6 MR. WILSON: That has always struck me. I have a
7 hard time dancing with Victor, but--

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. WILSON: It is a crucial, very delicate dance
10 that does take place in terms of pushing and leading and the
11 like, so it takes some work.

12 MR. GLADISH: It is better than what I was told, I
13 think I shared with some people, about the relationship
14 between an executive director and his board. When I asked
15 this of my new trustees during the interview process, one of
16 them said, "Well, it seems to me that it ought to be
17 something like the relationship between an organ grinder and
18 his monkey."

19 (Laughter.)

20 MS. MYERS: Did you ask the obvious question?

21 MR. GLADISH: Well, I didn't. I wanted the job,
22 so I didn't ask the obvious question. So I started dancing,
23 and then I started--

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. GLADISH: Sorry.

1 MS. MYERS: Yes. Anything more on that?

2 MR. GLADISH: I wonder about that, if we are just
3 talking about what the NEH would--Is there something, you
4 know, let's say from the perspective of the division, that
5 the division would like from the boards of the state
6 councils that we are not now getting, or that would be more
7 ideal than we are getting?

8 MS. WATSON: You have touched on one very key
9 issue, and that is that the vitality of the boards be
10 maintained, the volunteer element of this program be
11 honored, and respected, nurtured, and that we realize that
12 it is a crucial, and very delicate, and very difficult
13 balance to maintain. But I think it is--The lifeblood of
14 this program is based on keeping that healthy.

15 The other broader question earlier, what would NEH
16 want of the councils, I guess I was not going to answer
17 that, sitting in the chair that I am sitting in, because I
18 would have to really think very carefully, and I will leave
19 something out. But one thing that I would like to see is, I
20 have said it in different ways today, and in hall
21 conversations with one or two or three of you, and that is
22 somehow I don't think that we have the clarity of a sense of
23 our mission that we need in order to attract the support
24 that I think that we are going to have to have in the
25 future, and that if we could continue to talk about it, not

1 evade the question of our mission, our common mission. And
2 I think everybody here knows how much I respect the need for
3 every council to be individually creative and independent,
4 and our commitment to respecting that. But nevertheless, I
5 do think that we can manage without it, but I don't think it
6 will be optimal if we can't figure out how to talk with each
7 other about the critical things that we are doing for the
8 American public, and that we are doing in common. And that
9 is a discussion that we haven't had for a while.

10 MR. GLADISH: I kind of like this language.

11 MS. MYERS: Arnita--oh.

12 MR. GLADISH: I like this language that Robert
13 used a little while ago, in the morning I think, maybe--Yes,
14 in the morning, in which he said that in a sense we want
15 programs--We want for programs what we want for our
16 families, ourselves. We want these programs to be whole and
17 individual, and yet we also want them to share a common
18 passion and vision. That is where we get--It is difficult.
19 I like that notion of whole and individual. It appeals to
20 me, coming from a state. Yet it also appeals to me, and
21 there is power in its connection to and participation in a
22 national vision and mission. Both ends of that spectrum
23 have to be represented.

24 That is, frankly, one of the exciting things for
25 my volunteers. Both pieces of it. And it was exciting for

1 me for ten years, to have both pieces there.

2 MS. JONES: If I could follow-up on both of those
3 comments. You know, one of the things that I have been
4 thinking for a couple of days, indeed before we got to this
5 meeting. You included in the packet a document of
6 historical information on the state councils and the
7 Division of State Programs, and it is sort of a documentary
8 history. I think it could be very useful to develop the
9 story a little bit more.

10 There has been an evolution over 15 or 20 years of
11 mission. There has been an evolution of expertise,
12 sophistication, both on the part of staff in the agency that
13 are working with the councils, and staff of the councils,
14 and people who serve on them. I mean, there are 50
15 different stories, and you could end up with a fairly long
16 history, but I think it would be useful to try to put a
17 little bit of effort, and I don't think you would be talking
18 about a lot of time or a lot of money, to sort of
19 systematically try to tell the story on paper, and think
20 through.

21 I mean, I notice, for instance in the documents
22 that we have, I kept wanting to know, you know, what would
23 Jeff Marshall think about this now? Wouldn't it be
24 interesting to talk to some of the people who were involved
25 in the early days, about their view, and how it has worked

1 out? It would be interesting to talk to some people who
2 served on a state council, back in 1977, and get them to
3 look at the process, the child as it has grown up today.

4 As I have been hearing people from the state
5 councils talk about the need for more understanding of what
6 they do, one of the things that I am struck by is that there
7 really isn't all that clear knowledge on the part of a lot
8 of people, of just what it is. I mean, on one level of
9 course there is. But at another level there are a lot of
10 interesting stories that haven't been told, and I think, you
11 know, as I am giving Don this list of research and studies
12 that I think it would be great for you all to do, that is
13 another one you might think about.

14 MS. WATSON: I would like to ask you. You are an
15 historian--

16 MS. JONES: Yes.

17 MS. WATSON: --and you have worked in evaluation
18 as well. And this is--

19 MS. JONES: Actually, I haven't, but--

20 MS. WATSON: No? Okay, but okay, you are an
21 historian. What, as an historian, not--I mean, I could
22 write a very self-serving history.

23 MS. JONES: That is right.

24 MS. WATSON: I would love to, you know. What--I
25 mean, this is a new thing in, I think, in government, and in

1 the partnership of government and volunteers. That is, I
2 see it in that light. But as an historian, what themes,
3 what angle, should be taken? And I am just discounting any
4 kind of self-serving, or you know, really positive, rosy
5 kind of thing, although that would be there. But what kind
6 of hard history--I mean, is this significant historically,
7 or--I mean, do you know what I am asking you?

8 MS. JONES: I think so. I think so. I mean, in a
9 way it sort of fits with a genre that I would call policy
10 history. And a lot of it is done in the federal government.
11 A lot of it is done in corporations, or other kinds of
12 institutions. It is not the kind of stuff you see that
13 comes out in scholarly monographs published by Oxford
14 University Press. But policy history is something that
15 social scientists understand, and it is how do we get, you
16 know, from where we were in 1977, to here? What kind of
17 choices were made?

18 Let me put something else on the table here. I
19 have to--I have to believe that a lot of choices were made
20 about the way state councils have developed, both inside the
21 agency, and in terms of their own programs, because of who
22 was running the Endowment at a particular time. It is kind
23 of like the elderly, senile aunt that is locked up in the
24 attic. And we don't very often talk about--

25 (Simultaneous discussion.)

1 MS. JONES: We don't talk about the impact of
2 politics on this agency. And why not? It is not evil. I
3 mean, this is a federal agency. Its legislation is
4 constructed so that it is supposed to be responsible to the
5 presidents, who get elected by the people, who name people
6 to run it, and I mean, that is the way it is. And things
7 are going to change, from one year to the other, based on
8 those choices, and those national elections. And we don't
9 ever seem to recognize it. I mean, we kind of talk about
10 the evolution of these programs, and other ones at NEH,
11 because they would have happened this way anyway, even if
12 Joe Duffy, or Lynne Cheney were not elected.

13 MR. GLADISH: Well, Arnita, you and I can talk
14 about that, but there are limitations on what some other
15 people in the room actually can talk about in terms of
16 partisan political--

17 MS. JONES: I am not so sure--

18 MS. WATSON: Actually, we have a much more
19 thorough history.

20 MS. JONES: I am not so sure there are those
21 limitations.

22 MS. WATSON: When we pass something out, we have
23 got to make it short enough for people to read it on the
24 plane here.

25 MS. JONES: Well, on the plane going home, I could

1 probably--

2 MR. ROBERTS: Was this document done just for this
3 group, or--

4 MS. WATSON: We knew that this year we would need
5 to have a kind of a succinct history.

6 MR. ROBERTS: Because it is missing two important
7 things.

8 MS. WATSON: Tell us.

9 MR. ROBERTS: I mean, one, it is missing--

10 MR. CHEATHAM: The state humanities councils.

11 MR. ROBERTS: --missing the councils. I mean, if
12 you look at--Just read the footnotes, and it is Don Gibson,
13 fascinating man, Lynne Cheney, fascinating woman, Jeff
14 Marshall, Claiborne Pell. I mean, where is Bruce Seibers,
15 or Jim Van Ingle (?), or--

16 (Simultaneous discussion.)

17 MR. ROBERTS: Right. Or Russ Frigley (?) or one
18 of the earlier chairs, or whatever--

19 (Simultaneous discussion.)

20 MR. ROBERTS: --nice stories that, I mean, I don't
21 know again, who it is for, but to me what is interesting,
22 and when we write our triennial report, because we are
23 assuming that it is some cross-section of people, we do some
24 of this, but we also say, "And there was this--the baking
25 powder project in East Providence", and why that was very

1 interesting, and why it makes a wonderful story. And why it
2 was good history, and why it was good community work. And
3 that is not in there, at all.

4 MS. WATSON: It is short.

5 MR. ROBERTS: It is short, but I mean, I could
6 deal with less of some of what is in there to get more at
7 the heart. What is missing is the heart, I think, of--

8 MS. JONES: Yes, the human side of it--

9 (Simultaneous discussion.)

10 MS. JONES: --the vanity side of it.

11 MR. ROBERTS: --are there, but the human is not.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: It takes until page 18. Out of its
13 20 pages, it takes 16 or so to get to 1980, and then '80 to
14 the rest of the time is covered in four pages. And that is
15 the period in which the state councils really grew, and came
16 of age. But that is all missing from here.

17 (Simultaneous discussion.)

18 MR. VORE: Can I respond to that? Let us respond
19 to that. We absolutely acknowledge that 100%. But I think
20 part of that fits into--and I agree with everything. It
21 goes back to what Carole said about clarity of mission of
22 the NEH, and clarity of mission of the state councils. And
23 what you will find in that document is that clarity up until
24 1977, because all of us were in exactly the same enterprise.
25 You had to have a theme. You had to focus on public policy.

1 You had to address only the adult public, and you could only
2 regrant your own money.

3 So therefore, that history is much, much easier to
4 tell. But also it takes 18 pages because it was for those
5 six years, fundamentally top-down. And Arnita, you are
6 right, because of a man by the name of John Barcroft. And
7 in the early days Wally Edgerton(?). So that is actually
8 true.

9 Now, we agree with you, Robert. When you get to
10 1976, from 1976 to 1978, all of us are pretty much
11 floundering around, trying to figure out how we are going to
12 reconceptualize this once--this enterprise that once had a
13 very clearly defined purpose, audience, and structure. The
14 committee structure was quite simple. One-third, one-third,
15 one-third. That was just the way it was going to be.

16 Then you get to 1980, and it would probably take
17 us--

18 (Simultaneous discussion.)

19 MR. CHEATHAM: Jim, you are confusing mission and
20 structure. Mission--

21 MR. VORE: No.

22 MS. MYERS: Does the Federation have a role here,
23 too, in telling the story?

24 MR. VORE: Oh, I think that is what we--

25 (Simultaneous discussion.)

1 MS. MYERS: And, you know, we talk about stories a
2 lot, in terms of the kind of history projects that the state
3 councils do, and I think maybe Arnita is looking for those
4 stories, or maybe not. History, and examples of the kinds
5 of--

6 MS. JONES: Some area history would be eliminated,
7 as I say. And you know, go back and talk to some of the
8 early people, and I mean, you know, maybe some of that is
9 down on paper, but have you asked them what they--I mean,
10 have you tried to let some of those people have a look at
11 where things are now? And kind of--I mean, I think that
12 would be an interesting angle. I mean, I--You know, it
13 seems to me it would be good to get an outside look. I
14 mean, I would call a federal history office, or a university
15 in the area, and see if there was someone at liberty to do a
16 short policy history.

17 I think you, you know, you have got the building
18 blocks, because you collected all the paper. It is clearly--
19 -I mean, that is a good documentary history you gave us, but
20 it doesn't--And maybe you have somewhere else the flesh I am
21 looking for, but it is not there. On the other hand, it
22 would be interesting for someone outside the kind of people
23 who are sitting at this table to take a look at it, you
24 know. I think that would be very useful.

25 MS. WATSON: I guess what I was asking is, since

1 we are pursuing this, what elements in a history would be
2 helpful to the members of state humanities councils, who are
3 coming on board, or to the few people who would read an
4 entire history that we want to get money from. I am
5 thinking of the uses now, of such a document, because that
6 would also determine what--the kind of document that should
7 be produced. One is one kind of document, and one is
8 another. And I am very concerned that the people who are
9 coming on to these boards have a good history, and have a
10 sense of being a part of the history, being a part of a new
11 experiment in government.

12 MS. JONES: And I think, in a way, that is not
13 quite the audience I was thinking of. When I said policy
14 history, I really--I mean, a policy history is for decision
15 makers. A lot of the policies that get written are never
16 open to the public of a corporation, or a government. They
17 are not for those people. They are for the people inside to
18 understand where they have been and what they have done.
19 And that is kind of what I am thinking is needed here.

20 Now maybe there is another need that you are
21 thinking of, and I hadn't been thinking about that, and
22 that--that is a little different maybe.

23 MR. ROBERTS: And maybe there is yet another
24 thing, too. Maybe it is too early to write it, but I mean,
25 when James Agee wrote about the Farm Home Administration, he

1 didn't write about all the bureaucrats who put it together.
2 He wrote about the people who were affected--

3 (Simultaneous discussion.)

4 MR. ROBERTS: It is a wonderful book, so--

5 MS. JONES: That, too.

6 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, and maybe that takes some more
7 distance--

8 MS. JONES: What does it all mean?

9 MR. GIBSON: I hear a need for several histories--
10 (Simultaneous discussion.)

11 MS. MYERS: And a kind of a storybook, too. I
12 think that that would be--

13 MR. GIBSON: Yes, and I think that is one of the
14 things where this conversation can continue.

15 MS. MYERS: --one of the things as we go on.

16 MR. GLADISH: I have another question I want to
17 ask that goes beyond this particular issue of what we each
18 want from each other. It goes to the question of
19 partnership. I wonder about--One of the areas in which we
20 have a lot of relationship has been mentioned briefly around
21 the table this morning and this afternoon is what--and we
22 got to a little bit with boards of directors--How do we work
23 together on, for instance, the issue of, if you will,
24 training, orienting, introducing staff and board to the work
25 of the councils around the country?

1 There has been some, in the last few years anyway,
2 a lot of discussion about our--either of us--that is, the
3 Endowment on the one hand, the Federation on the other hand,
4 doing effective enough work separately, not to say together,
5 because we haven't been together on these questions. We
6 have a Federation conference, and we have some regional
7 meetings of the councils themselves, and then we have NEH-
8 sponsored orientation, and NEH-sponsored meetings for
9 directors and staff, and then we have some locally-sponsored
10 meetings for staff. I don't necessarily think that
11 everything has to be under one umbrella to be effective, but
12 one could ask the question, are we using the resources we
13 have, all of us together, in the most effective, and
14 efficient, and cost-effective way, with regard to this whole
15 area of partnership. It ought to be one in which we do some
16 real good thinking.

17 There have been, I think, some suspicions on both
18 sides about the question. I know, you know, sometimes when
19 the councils get together it is like, "Well, you know, why
20 does NEH need to round up all the new board members when we
21 do a pretty good job of orienting them at home?". And then,
22 I am sure that sometimes when some of my board members have
23 been, they have come back and said, "Well, how come I didn't
24 know about this piece of NEH?", you know, so, challenging
25 the stuff that we have done at home. That whole area would

1 be an interesting area for us to really examine much more
2 closely, for both effectiveness and efficiency, because we
3 are spending, all of us together, quite a lot of money on
4 that, given our range of resources. And that--

5 MS. MYERS: And if you really feel your boards
6 don't have a clue as to what is going on, then given that
7 kind of investment, then there is--

8 MR. GLADISH: And you know, and these are
9 expensive things, given our range of resources. Not in the
10 whole, you know, world of resources, but we have limited
11 amounts of money, so--And I don't think we have really
12 addressed that as much as we ought directly, together. Who
13 should be doing it? How should it be done? When should it
14 be done?

15 MR. R. YOUNG: And I think that may have led to
16 some of the diffuseness that Jim is talking about,
17 especially in the last decade. And one of the things that
18 has been floating here, and Carole, you brought it up. Ann
19 has talked about it. Arnita, you have talked about it. And
20 it made me this afternoon, think about, you know, our
21 enterprise at the state level. We are so intense about it,
22 we are so into it, if you will, for all the very good
23 reasons. And when we talked about this accreditation thing,
24 I--I sometimes, in the few moments where I have some spare
25 time, wonder, well, are we so intense that we are becoming,

1 you know, inbred, and neglecting the national picture, or
2 not thinking about it. And then as we look at the way
3 issues are talked about, sometimes at the Federation,
4 sometimes at orientation meetings, et cetera. Maybe we need
5 to bring those fora closer together, so that the larger
6 national picture does not always--does not escape us. I
7 think our board--my board, for example, is so busy all the
8 time doing its work that we often don't as a board, you
9 know, talk in these terms, either. And I think that that is
10 why this idea of some maybe objective observer--I don't know
11 how that--

12 MS. MYERS: Robert.

13 MR. CHEATHAM: I need to understand what Carole
14 and Jim mean by we had a unified mission in 1976, and we
15 don't anymore. Does anybody--we don't have a mission. We
16 are not aware of our mission.

17 MR. VORE: I am not saying that, Robert. I am
18 saying, I am hearing (I cannot speak for Carole)--From what
19 I am hearing around this conversation, from what we heard in
20 Richmond, and what I think we will hear in Tempe, is that no
21 one is really saying what--Is there a mission for the NEH?
22 NEH says, "Yes, we do have a mission.", and we put that out
23 there. You saw, and others will see, chairs will see, the
24 draft mission statement that the division drafted for
25 itself. And the state councils are a part of the NEH, and

1 part of the overall legislation, and then that was one of
2 the first questions. Is there a mission of a national
3 program, state program, in the humanities? Is there?
4 Should there be? Or are there 56 separate missions of
5 individual state councils? And I think that is, or I don't
6 know, that is the clarity, I think, that we are all
7 searching for.

8 MR. CHEATHAM: Well, I think--

9 MR. VORE: And maybe we shouldn't be.

10 MR. CHEATHAM: I don't--I think that they are--I
11 can't articulate at this table, but I feel, and I have been
12 having to try to think nationally, which has not always been
13 pleasant.

14 MS. WATSON: Don't look to me for sympathy.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. CHEATHAM: And I feel that there is--I feel
17 like number one, we are all struggling to articulate our
18 missions in language that people other than us will
19 understand, anyway. So I think there is a question of
20 articulating our missions in some sort of accessible
21 language that is going on everywhere. But I get a real
22 sense of commonality of mission among the state councils,
23 though each mission is very separate and each is very
24 distinct. And I don't, with one or two exceptions, I don't
25 feel like when I speak to my colleagues I feel like I am

1 speaking to somebody doing the same thing. And even those
2 colleagues who don't seem that way, probably are doing the
3 same thing. We just can't speak that way.

4 MR. VORE: Well, but let me state one more time.
5 Up until '76, you would find in every proposal, even though
6 we didn't call it a mission statement at that time, as a
7 result of setting forth the standards and principles that
8 were all very well observed in the history, and it was
9 including a public policy, a volunteer board, an adult
10 public and regrants.

11 MR. ROBERTS: But that is a structure.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: That is a structure. That is not
13 a mission. The theme, in fact, was in some sense the
14 mission, and those were different.

15 MS. WATSON: But the mission was to have an impact
16 upon public discussion in this country, by placing it within
17 the framework of the humanities.

18 MR. VORE: And only involving adult citizens.

19 MR. GLADISH: And issues.

20 MR. VORE: And issues. And now when you look at
21 proposals, you will find 56 different mission statements.
22 Some state councils--

23 MR. CHEATHAM: But they all essentially are saying
24 the same thing.

25 MR. ROBERTS: Okay, but I mean, if you say that

1 the whole Endowment can be said to have a unified mission,
2 then I think you have to say that the 56 state councils can
3 be said to have a unified mission, too.

4 MR. VORE: Okay, then I think that should be
5 stated--

6 (Simultaneous discussion.)

7 MR. ROBERTS: Dan Young said it, or he and
8 Sheldon, I guess said it. It is to bring the humanities to
9 as wide a public as possible. I think you need more--You
10 want more something that is--

11 MS. WATSON: When I am explaining the program,
12 even to, say, a new council member, someone thinking about
13 joining a council, I feel that I must explain to them that
14 although the councils are generally doing this, this, and
15 this, your council is perfectly free to look at its state,
16 and make a judgement. And if it wishes to, then it can put
17 all of its resources into this area that is completely
18 unlike what any other council may be doing.

19 MR. CHEATHAM: But that doesn't mean it has a
20 separate mission.

21 MR. ROBERTS: The way it delivers the goods may be
22 different, but--

23 MS. WATSON: It could decide, in Mississippi, that
24 Mississippi was so crucial to the civil rights movement that
25 they are going to spend all of their money to preserve the

1 papers of this, this, this, and this.

2 MR. CHEATHAM: But they don't--

3 MS. WATSON: And there is not one single public--

4 MR. CHEATHAM: But they don't do that.

5 MS. WATSON: But exercising individual judgement
6 for what is best to be done in the state, is a principle
7 that I have argued for, and will continue, and which I
8 believe in. And I think that a lot more judgement about
9 what is needed in a state is going to have to happen,
10 because there is not going to be a great deal more money.
11 And I don't think that some of the things we are doing, as
12 much as we would like to have it different, is challenging
13 enough for people to kind of go to the mat for, and that
14 that is what we are going to have to do, is to feel this is
15 something to really be worthy of fighting for. And looking
16 at somebody and saying it is this instead of the homeless,
17 or it is this instead of whatever.

18 MR. CHEATHAM: See, I don't see that. I am having
19 trouble understanding what you are struggling for.

20 MS. WATSON: That was not true before 1976, when
21 the law changed, but this was defined for all councils, and
22 it was public issues--

23 MS. MYERS: But isn't there this commonality
24 which-- Ken read something that you had said earlier. Isn't
25 there a commonality of --

1 (Simultaneous discussion.)

2 MR. CHEATHAM: If you want to define it "infusing
3 the humanities and community life in our state", or
4 something like that, you could come up with lots of phrases.

5 MS. WATSON: That is no problem, but what I would
6 like to see is an agreement, that the councils had come to,
7 that thought that that is it. That is fine.

8 MR. CHEATHAM: It is in the legislation.

9 MS. WATSON: I would like to see the coun--I think
10 we could discuss the legislation, but I would like for that
11 to be a shared agreement within the program, and it is not
12 there right now.

13 MR. ROBERTS: What do you mean, a shared
14 agreement?

15 MS. WATSON: That whatever formulation of mission
16 there is--

17 MR. CHEATHAM: I think that--I don't think in the
18 executive directors meeting last week, that anybody had any
19 particular problem with the mission as you were stating it.
20 That was not the problem. I think the problem was, whose
21 mission is this? And that is, is it the divisions mission
22 to see that this is done, and the instruments are the state
23 councils? Or is this a way to state the overall mission of
24 the state councils, but the doers of, the carriers out of
25 the mission, are the state councils themselves? To carry on

1 in their own way. And I think that was the--

2 MS. WATSON: I think the principle of carrying it
3 out in their own way, is one that we all share.

4 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes.

5 MS. MYERS: We have about 25 or 30 minutes left
6 now.

7 MR. CHEATHAM: And only 23 questions.

8 MS. MYERS: And a promise that this is not the end
9 of the conversation, that we will continue. Do you--Would
10 you like to use this, these last moments, in a particular
11 way? For example, like looking to the partnership and the
12 National Conversation. If we referred to the National
13 Conversation before, we have not talked very much about the
14 Federation and its role, although it has been infused in the
15 agenda all through. Let's decide how we want to close this
16 particular conversation. Yes, Jamil?

17 MR. ZAINALDIN: Just one question. And that is,
18 how are we looking at the discussions that have happened in
19 the last day and a half? In other words, you know, we are
20 going to all have questions when we leave this meeting.
21 "Well, what did you guys talk about?", you know. "What did
22 you decide?"

23 MS. JONES: "What happened last night?"

24 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, "What happened?". But I
25 would, you know--What is your pleasure in this? Is it to--I

1 mean, yes, I mean, this is obviously a process. Do we just
2 sort of say, "Well, you will be hearing from the Endowment
3 soon. There will be a report.", or--Yes, how do we describe
4 what has occurred here?

5 MR. CHEATHAM: And what will occur in the future?

6 MR. ZAINALDIN: Yes, so--

7 MS. MYERS: Don, what would you suggest?

8 MR. GIBSON: I would state that what has happened
9 in the last day and a half has been the identification of a
10 number of issues, funding, partnership, (I would leave those
11 in, two ways you do that), a number of highly significant
12 issues for further discussion and conversation. I think the
13 meeting succeeded. The group was successful, I think, in
14 identifying a lot of the questions and issues that are
15 facing the Endowment, and the councils, and the Federation.

16 MS. MYERS: And I can say some interesting
17 suggestions to be explored.

18 MR. GIBSON: Some excellent suggestions, I think.
19 And also we identified not only some issues, but we
20 identified areas of (thank you, Arnita) research that should
21 occur. And I think what will result from this, the next
22 steps, as Sondra has said several times, this is sort of the
23 first in a series of conversations, not necessarily of this
24 particular group, but of conversations, I think, that will--
25 that the Endowment will initiate, the Federation will

1 initiate, and the Endowment will talk to the Federation, and
2 the Endowment will talk with state councils about, that we
3 hope will lead toward a much better partnership, or
4 partnerships, among all this. I think this meeting itself
5 has probably helped increase our--the trust level, and the
6 level of candor about councils. That is what I think came
7 out of this, and I think it was highly valuable. It is not--
8 there is no closure, that has come here, but I think it is
9 probably premature to come to closure.

10 MS. MYERS: Robert.

11 MR. CHEATHAM: Can we set some schedule for the
12 study that the Federation has asked for of the public work
13 of the agency, to examine that work and see what is there,
14 and see how best we can pursue that work in the future,
15 given the limited amount of dollars?

16 MR. GIBSON: Well, obviously a study of the
17 Endowment and of the councils, right?

18 MR. CHEATHAM: Yes, right. Of all the public
19 funding.

20 MR. GIBSON: Sure. I don't think I can sit here
21 and give you a schedule, though.

22 MR. CHEATHAM: No. Well, I will tell you why
23 there is something of a deadline. There are several members
24 of the Federation who have at various times, with some
25 degree of seriousness, or with more or less of a degree of

1 seriousness, urged that the Federation pursue 35% of program
2 funds, as you know. We do not want, as Patricia and I
3 talked about earlier, we do not want the same sort of
4 divisions in the humanities community (I don't think we do)
5 that occurred in the arts community as a result of this kind
6 of decisions.

7 By the same token, we have got reauthorization
8 coming in a very short time, and we have got councils out
9 there who, I can tell you, will not be happy when they see a
10 proposal from the administration, from the agency,
11 requesting another increase in administrative funds for the
12 agency, and a decrease, overall decrease, in the councils'
13 funding. And there, you know, we say "more money" as if it
14 is a joke, but there are people that are really getting
15 desperate out there. They are getting to the point of
16 having to cut back on staff, they are not having raises,
17 they are cutting back on grants. There is all sorts of
18 anxiety out there, and the communicat--what it communicates
19 to them, when the Endowment's administrative budget
20 increases, and their overall budget decreases, is a lack of
21 concern about these problems, and a feeling that perhaps we
22 need to go it alone. And I have tried very hard to work
23 toward unity, and toward partnership, so that we don't have
24 these divisions, but reauthorization is coming. It is going
25 to be on the table. It is going to be an issue. And we are

1 going to have to have some kind of answers, if we are not
2 going to divide our community.

3 MR. VORE: I am missing something here, Robert.
4 What is the connection between that and the study that you
5 are asking for?

6 MR. CHEATHAM: If when reauthorization comes, the
7 Federation is going to have, and the membership is going to
8 have to take a position on reauthorization.

9 MR. VORE: Right.

10 MR. CHEATHAM: When reauthorization--
11 Reauthorization is going to be an opportunity to change the
12 formula, the 20%.

13 MR. VORE: Um-hum.

14 MR. CHEATHAM: If nothing is happening, that seems
15 to be changing, and offering any other kind of promise to
16 the councils, there is going to be a lot of councils out
17 there that want to go after the 35%.

18 MR. VORE: Promises such as?

19 MR. CHEATHAM: Some sort of feeling, and I don't
20 know, I can't say what it specifically has to be. I can't
21 say what has to be. But if you are going--If you feel like
22 you are once again going up against the wall, and there is
23 not going to be any change unless we take it into our own
24 hands to make that change occur, there is going to be a lot
25 of pressure on the Federation to take the 35% option.

1 MS. WATSON: What is the bottom line?

2 MR. CHEATHAM: I don't know the bottom line. I am
3 just saying, we cannot sit here and wait, and hope something
4 happens and makes things better, because at some point,
5 somebody has got to make decisions.

6 MR. GIBSON: The purpose--The chairman, on
7 October--in October, (might have been the tenth, I don't
8 recall). the chairman in October delivered a speech at
9 which he called for a new partnership. This meeting is a
10 definite response to that. This meeting, in my judgement,
11 raised lots of the issues that we now can fruitfully
12 discuss. I do not believe, and we are sincere--The chairman
13 is sincere; I am sincere; Carole is sincere; The Division of
14 State Programs is sincere. I am confident the Federation is
15 sincere. That we can craft a new partnership, not one that
16 will necessarily satisfy everybody, but one that will
17 address the serious concerns that we have. And among those
18 serious concerns is engaging more Americans in humanities in
19 a more effective and efficient manner. I am confident that
20 the issues we have raised, the questions we have devised,
21 and the studies we have called for in this meeting, will
22 yield concrete results that will make this partnership more
23 effective. That I can promise to you, but there is no more
24 that I really can say today about the--

25 MS. MYERS: I think you would want to say that we

1 will continue this conversation sooner rather than later.
2 We are not going to let it just sit on the shelf. As well
3 as the internal discussions.

4 MR. GIBSON: I believe in following up some
5 meetings, and we will have them. I think I pretty well
6 ended the meeting.

7 MR. VORE: I think at the Tempe meeting--

8 MS. MYERS: Pardon me?

9 MR. VORE: --these issues will be discussed. The
10 meeting with chairs and executive directors in May.
11 Basically, as you know, Carole wrote a memo that all of
12 these issues are basically going to be involved in all 56
13 state councils, so I think that kind of continues the
14 conversation.

15 MR. GLADISH: Clearly, from the--If I read the
16 Federation materials, and if my own participation is
17 correctly interpreted--

18 (Simultaneous discussion.)

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. GLADISH: I read everything that comes from
21 North Dakota.

22 (Simultaneous discussion.)

23 MR. GLADISH: Clearly, the two highest priorities
24 for the Federation, if you look at its work plan as approved
25 by its membership, are resource development and relationship

1 with the National Endowment and the federal government. And
2 I think that is why Robert appropriately emphasizes that as
3 a concern from the membership's association. Now within
4 that broad parameter, there are a range of opinions about
5 what is the most productive result from such an emphasis.
6 And we have seen that in recent days, and--But it really is
7 key, because the membership has said that what they need is
8 more resources, and where the resource issue gets asked is
9 at the reauthorization and appropriation period, and if we
10 are to go ahead, we need to respond to that kind of call
11 that Carole has been making about this question of unity.
12 Because we are in a weak position, all of us, on Capitol
13 Hill. It is not like this is the favorite thing of the
14 Congress. And unless we are together on these questions,
15 strongly, we are going to face some serious, serious
16 difficulties in the current resource environment.

17 MS. MYERS: Jim, then Jamil.

18 MR. HERBERT: I want to raise this issue, and I
19 won't raise it in detail. I have before. But following on
20 this remark, I think there is a great danger to the
21 Endowment, and I say that from my brief experience this
22 summer, working on the reinventing government effort. And
23 the name of that danger is "devolution".

24 Some of you may have read Mandate for Change, the
25 platform for the Clinton administration's entry into

1 government. You may have even read the chapter by David
2 Osborne, the father of reinvention in the federal
3 government, in which he argues that certain programs in this
4 federal government need to be shed, in order to use only the
5 two trillion dollars we collect, instead of the three
6 trillion dollars we spend. And he had a list of those
7 programs. He says certain programs are state functions, and
8 on the list of state functions which should be financed by
9 states, not by the federal government, were The National
10 Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the
11 Humanities.

12 MR. CHEATHAM: What about the National Science
13 Foundation?

14 MR. HERBERT: The current deputy head of the
15 Office of Management and Budget has written a major book on
16 this topic of devolution, Alice Rivlin, and I have heard her
17 say many times that the only way we are going to solve the
18 problem of the federal budget is by this mechanism of
19 devolution, of pushing back functions that the federal
20 government now performs that are the properly the state
21 functions. And the Endowments are on every list of
22 devolution. Leon Panetta has made the same argument.

23 And so, the current budget climate of the federal
24 government is a very extreme one. I myself, actually ate,
25 that is, put into my pocket, an issue paper, and walked out

1 with it, that called for wiping out the Endowments on the
2 grounds that they were state functions. It seems to me
3 extremely important--and such paper didn't appear. It seems
4 to me extremely important that we argue the partnership
5 case. That we say what is great and strong about the
6 Endowments, the unique role that they play, is in fact, this
7 cooperation between the two levels. To publicly make the
8 argument that some percentage of the Endowment's activities
9 are purely local, purely local, in all aspects, is to hand a
10 weapon to people who want to cut the budget, and maybe even
11 the reality of the Endowments. I am not saying they will
12 succeed, but I can tell you, there is a very strong party
13 who is of that opinion. And it seems to me that that is
14 part of the resource climate in which this issue is being
15 developed. We have to make a partnership case, not a--We
16 cannot hand ammunition to the advocates of devolution.

17 MS. WATSON: I should say for everyone's
18 information that Jim was on the National Performance Review,
19 President--Vice-President Gore. He knows the actors.

20 MS. MYERS: Jamil?

21 MR. ZAINALDIN: I guess what I would just follow
22 up in saying, Jim, is that your concerns are the concerns of
23 the Federation board. That is what has brought us here, and
24 we do have a membership. There are various interests in the
25 membership. I think, I think--So, what more can I say,

1 except that we don't want that result either. And for me,
2 partnership is a way of talking about it.

3 And again, for me the whole is greater than the
4 sum of its parts. One plus one equals three. I don't know
5 how else to say it. We don't know what--we don't know where
6 the energy is coming from, but we all know it is there. In
7 some ways, it is already functioning. We are trying to
8 articulate what that is, what that common--what that common
9 enterprise is. So I want to assure you that this issue has
10 been studied, fought, hashed--You can ask any Federation
11 board, they have looked at it from ten angles, the up sides,
12 the down sides, and the conclusion was, this is the process
13 that we have to begin.

14 Second point is that when we--The Federation is a
15 funny entity, because there is a way in which when it is
16 talked about, you sort of think of it as the Federation of
17 Humanities Councils and the NEH. It is as if there are
18 three different entities. And it is sort of not that way,
19 of course. The Federation is an organization. It is a
20 501C3. It has a governing board; it has relations with its
21 members. It is governed by a board, and it is accountable
22 to its members. But I would like to try to find a way--I
23 mean, the point that Ken made a little earlier, about fu--
24 you know, finding a--and maybe even in the way that we talk
25 about how we begin these discussions with the state

1 councils. If we can get into an "us" frame of mind. And so
2 that the Federation and the Endowment are working--that the
3 Federation and the Endowment and the councils are somehow--
4 Or that the Federation and the Endowment--You know, that we
5 are--we are together involved in working through these
6 things. And I think that if we have the communication, if
7 we have meetings like this, then we can say that what is
8 coming out of this are improvements in our education and
9 understanding, that is the Federation board's education and
10 understanding. Of course, the humanities councils are
11 there, too, and presumably in this give and take, is an
12 education and understanding on the part of the Endowment.
13 After a day in this room I feel very confident that if this
14 continues, we are in good shape. I mean, I don't see--What
15 I see is a desire for all of us to come out in the same
16 place, and a lot of confidence that we are all on the same
17 side. And if we had had these conversations a couple of
18 years ago, three or four years ago (we know that it wouldn't
19 have been possible), we would be that much further down the
20 road. So I am thinking about this, not as somehow we have
21 to please one party or please the other party, or that we
22 have to deal with the Federation, we have to deal with the
23 Endowment, we have to deal with the councils, but rather
24 that we are all looking on this together. And at some
25 point, these structures are not as important as we might

1 have thought a year or so ago.

2 MS. MYERS: Well, Jamil, I think that that is the
3 sentiment around the table. I think that it has been here
4 in this day and a half, the feeling that we really do want
5 to work earnestly for the partnership that will help the
6 individual parts, but more important, the people that we are
7 serving. And if that--if there weren't enough incentive in
8 the room to do that already, which I think there was, the
9 rather gloomy pronouncement that Jim brings to us--

10 MR. CHEATHAM: Gloomy Jim.

11 MS. MYERS: No, it is not Gloomy Jim, but bringing
12 that kind of punctuates this meeting, I think bringing us
13 greater resolve to work together, and usually it is danger
14 that is that added element that helps people and groups to
15 come together. But I think that the commitment is there.
16 And on that note--

17 MR. WILSON: Just a cautionary tale, having gone
18 through this in the past year when the non-profits felt
19 compelled to testify independently before the state
20 legislature, and the net result is the governor proposed to
21 cut our budget 15%. We escaped with only seven. But the
22 difficulty was--

23 MR. GLADISH: Whose budget, Bill?

24 MR. WILSON: This is the budget for an adult basic
25 education program. It is a similar relationship, and it

1 seems to me if only we can agree to be as ferocious in this
2 discussion to a certain point, and equally committed to
3 stand together past that point, that seems to be a crucial
4 element to this, and I think this has been a good start.
5 And the momentum becomes crucial.

6 MS. MYERS: Well, you all--

7 MR. ROBERTS: Well, I mean, in the 21 years that I
8 have been involved with this, I have been to a lot of
9 meetings, not with this particular mission, but that have
10 had--

11 MS. MYERS: --with this cast of characters.

12 MR. ROBERTS: Right. Many of the same guests.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. ROBERTS: And what happened to them was that
15 the good intentions remained, but the resolution never
16 arrived. And I would like to see this, because of what I do
17 think was a very productive day and a half, to see it
18 continue, and also to see some deadlines. And I agree with
19 Robert that we need to set a time goal, and that as part of
20 that goal, we say not just to come together and discuss
21 again, but that the next time the group gets together, or
22 however it is constituted at that time, that it have some
23 proposals--

24 MR. HAMMER: Some options.

25 MR. ROBERTS: Right. I mean, we come with--I

1 mean, Elizabeth was great. She had a concrete proposal for
2 one aspect of this. We discussed it a bit, and we kicked
3 part of it out, and part of it is still on the table, but it
4 was a proposal. It was something to deal with. And I think
5 that is how we are going to achieve something. It is not
6 only expressing our opinion and seeing where there is
7 confluence and where there isn't, but to come with something
8 tangible, something substantive, that we say, "Let's do
9 this.", and somebody else says, "Well, we can't do it
10 exactly that way, let's--", and that we start tinkering with
11 it. We have something to tinker with. Because other wise I
12 think--I fear it is just going to be another set of very
13 well-meaning and very earnest discussions.

14 MS. MYERS: Well, the chairman is very serious
15 about this partnership, and this is his meeting, in a way.
16 This is the meeting that he--the first of the--in the
17 discussion. The first of the discussions toward that
18 partnership, and I can only say that about it. To say that
19 this is a serious matter, and it is not a conversation that
20 is going to end in this room.

21 MR. ROBERTS: For my time--for a deadline, I mean,
22 I think--We have a national meeting of the state councils in
23 the fall. At least two, and possibly three, more of these
24 sessions should have happened, at which by the time that
25 national meeting happens, when somebody comes to Jamil at

1 that national meeting, or to Robert, or to any of us, and
2 says, "What did you talk about?", we won't have to say what
3 we talked about, we can say this is it--

4 MR. CHEATHAM: This is what we are doing.

5 MR. ROBERTS: --the plan.

6 MR. CHEATHAM: This is the plan.

7 MR. GIBSON: That is entirely reasonable and fair.
8 And I stand rightly accused by Tom Roberts of having
9 attended many such meetings, well-intentioned, but sometimes
10 didn't produce all they should have, but some of them did.
11 But I think we are dealing now in a different context, with
12 a different budgetary context, as Jim so eloquently
13 described, but also in a different leadership or political
14 context.

15 I mean, we have a chairman who is firmly committed
16 to the state councils, and who believes in the work that
17 they are doing, and has committed himself publicly as well
18 as in the privacy of his office, to working effectively with
19 those councils, and to forging a new partnership. I saw
20 this meeting, as did most other people, I think, as a
21 proposal-less meeting, one that in a sense is data
22 collection if you will, in another example of management
23 terminology, in which we get issues on the table, we
24 identify issues, questions and research topics that will be
25 the direct basis for proposals and options to be developed,

1 discussed, and decided upon, and it strikes me that a kind
2 of fall national meeting thing seems a reasonable deadline,
3 but I think we should sit down and think of implications and
4 all that before we say this is the deadline. but that
5 certainly seems reasonable to me.

6 MR. CHEATHAM: When is reauthorization?

7 MR. GIBSON: Well, we are not authorized right
8 now.

9 MR. HAMMER: They can't really start the real
10 reauthorization process until the Senate acts on what they
11 now call the extension.

12 MR. GIBSON: My presumption is, and the
13 presumption that we are operating on, that it will occur
14 next year. That is when it should have occurred. We sent
15 over, as you will recall, a simple extension, no change,
16 authorization bill last May or June. And that is yet to be
17 acted upon, and our authorization expired several months
18 ago. We are operating, which some congressmen are quite
19 uncomfortable about, solely on the strength of the
20 appropriations bill. Now that has happened to us in the
21 past. We do not anticipate that there are going to be any
22 problems, but Ann is on the Hill several times a week--

23 MR. CHEATHAM: So we should turn our vouchers in
24 quick.

25 (Laughter.)

1 MR. GIBSON: I would, yes. I don't think there is
2 any real danger, but there is somewhat of a danger that they
3 will, that Dornan or others may try to attach some kind of
4 rider to the authorization bill that could harm primarily
5 the Arts Endowment, but you never know with those kind of
6 quickie amendments that they throw into a hopper, or add to
7 a bill, that it couldn't affect both agencies, or all three
8 agencies, counting IMS, and that could mean a reduction in
9 the budget authorization level, or you know, something to do
10 with the review process, or whatever. Again, we are
11 reasonably sanguine, but we ain't totally happy.

12 MR. HAMMER: If they get into summer without the
13 Senate--

14 MR. GIBSON: Pardon?

15 MR. HAMMER: If we get into summer, and the Senate
16 still hasn't acted (Inaudible.) coming into play on our
17 appropriation.

18 MR. GIBSON: Indeed. Well, on that happy note.

19 MS. MYERS: On that happy note. Thank you all.
20 You have been superb participants in this discussion,
21 everyone, and it has made it extremely productive. And I am
22 looking forward to the next step as you are. So thank you
23 very much.

24 (Whereupon, at 3:59 p.m. on April 9, 1994, the
25 meeting was adjourned.)