

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : John H. Barcroft
Via : Alex Lacy
FROM : Geoffrey Marshall *gm*.

DATE: 1/6/76

SUBJECT: State-based proposals for February Council

Attached is a grant history for the February Council states. It is a little misleading since the new administrative amounts reflect "program development" while that effort was part of the program budget previously. I will try to point out the real increases in program amounts in the narrative which follows.

The recommendations are based on several assumptions: (1) that it will still be possible to make conditions for the amounts beyond the formula (i.e., above \$385,000); (2) that it is still possible to restrict the amount of definite funds within the formula that can go to administration (the law does not support this assumption, necessarily); (3) that in states where there will not be conditions, the program officer will write a detailed letter of "comment" on the proposal. This letter will be reviewed by the staff and give as much of the reviewers' comments as is useful, plus advice and recommendations from the "staff". I think we need to be more systematic with our comments, and to share them with the entire membership of the state-based committees.

Alabama

1. Previous condition: add scholars and bring into balance; they added Hearn, Philosophy, and other changes brought them to 8 scholars, 6 administrators, and 8 public.
2. This appears to be a steadily improving program, despite a vague executive director and the ill-health of Duard LeGrand. They have spotted the same weaknesses we have, and the proposal contains plans to address them: rural outreach, larger staff with a fully-trained humanist, and an effort to support one or more state-wide projects.



5010-110

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

3. No fund-raising plan was submitted with the proposal, but one will come in separately.
4. We are recommending what was requested. This will provide a 23% increase in program funds, but the total amount of the award will still be at about the current average for category IV states.
5. Either by condition or by letter, we should recommend more detailed thought about how to reach "sparsely-populated" portions of the state, i.e., black, rural Alabama.
6. There is a line for an assistant director in the budget, with that person to be working by May, 1977.

Kansas

1. This is a program held back by an unimaginative and undistinguished committee. Marion Cott could administer a better program and is willing to; she is not encouraged or supported by the committee.
2. They are not exhausting their program dollars this year and the request is a standstill because the program budget last time included \$40,000 in program development money.
3. We recommend approval of the fund-raising plan. It is not strong, but it does reflect committee thought and is an instance where we would like to give advice on how to strengthen the effort rather than to reject. They need to be brought to understand that one sells the program and does not ask for a handout; we need to tell them about challenge grants.
4. We are recommending the amount requested.

Maryland

1. Previous conditions: second professional, additional scholars, a scholar from College Park; they employed Patricia Hunt (a BA in English) and added Boles, Cripps, Driskell, Klaus, and Breitenfeld.
2. This is a good proposal and a very active program, both in terms of number of regrants (more than 80 last year) and in terms of fund-raising (they got a \$100,000 addition to G&M from the Council last time). This appears to be in large measure the result of Maria Heyssel's work.
3. Robert Corrigan may provide better committee leadership than either Castagna or Phoebe Stanton (who apparently was not strong at all).
4. The weakness of the program is in humanities content and involvement of the state's best scholars. The numbers are good, but analysis shows they have not touched the faculties of either Hopkins or University of Maryland, College Park. The committee recognizes this, and has a series of meetings with scholars planned, beginning at Hopkins and at College Park. Corrigan may help.
5. We recommend approval of the fund-raising plan, the most thoughtful and detailed in this batch of proposals.
6. The amount recommended is as high as we can go for several years, and the committee should be so informed. Maryland is near the low end of the III category, and the grant would be near the top of the existing grants in the category. They have the capacity, however, to grow considerably through G&M.

New Jersey (see attached memo.)

1. We are recommending disapproval of this proposal and I have a separate memo attached.
2. We are recommending extension of the current grant through August 31, 1977, with all remaining funds to be used for administration. We assume a new proposal for August Council.

New York

1. William Golden is the new chairman of the committee.
2. The projects supported appear to be of nearly universal quality, with a small tendency to be too heavily scholarly. They have some good and some bad media grants, and are clear about which is which and why.
3. 25% of the grants were made by the staff and are under \$1,000.
4. Previous conditions: (a) Review and submit an analysis of operation without a theme; the Council did not do this. (b) Report plans for use of community organizations and media; they did this on time. (c) Explain the Humanities Study Group; they did this in a series of letters last fall. (d) We required that outside evaluators be appointed by the Council and a report be submitted; they accepted the condition, but did not carry out the planned evaluations.
5. The proposal is terse, intelligent, and confident, even arrogant in that it does not reflect the perception that they need to spell out what their plans are. It does not provide the document of record that we need to justify a grant of the size we want to recommend.
6. Therefore, we are recommending approval of the budgeted administrative amount, but release of only \$94,000 at present, with \$60,000 more upon acceptance of a detailed and analytical essay on the committee's consideration of fund-raising. Nate was present when the committee did discuss this matter, but the proposal does not give enough detail to be satisfactory. We will emphasize "essay" and "detailed". (A scholarly paper would do, if they want to be scholarly.)
7. Also, we recommend release of \$400,000 for program now and \$600,000 upon acceptance of a comprehensive program development plan. The proposal is inadequate in this respect especially, and we have no evidence that this matter has been thought out and planned in detail.

Oregon

1. Previous conditions: second professional (hired in July Carolyn Buan, MA in English); appointment of distinguished administrators and scholars--they added presidents of two small colleges and Robert Clark shifted to scholar from university president.
2. Chuck Ackley is on sabbatical and on the way out. Committee is recruiting at present.
3. They will not use all of their program money this year, and therefore the increase recommended is real, but not exaggerated.
4. The quality of regrants in the past grant has improved considerably from the liberal bias and activism of the preceding grant.
5. We recommend disapproval of the fund-raising plan. We recommend approval of the budgeted amount--\$143,816, but grant only \$94,050 in definite funds. They can either raise the difference or submit a acceptable fund-raising plan to another Council.

West Virginia

1. Previous condition: by-laws revised to include rotation plan; this condition met and rough edges will be smoothed off by compliance plan.
2. The new executive director is a significant improvement and the proposal shows it.
3. They have developed a heavy program development effort reflected in a big promotion budget. They are using all their program money.
4. We recommend conditional approval of the fund-raising plan: require them to submit a more detailed description of the substance of the committee's approach to corporations and foundations. The wording is purposeful, because while they intend to make approaches after they have somewhat more program under their belt, the nature of a "presentation" has not been thought out and, like Kansas, they need advice and some time to think it out.

In addition to these actions, there may be two supplementals--\$175,000 for Idaho and \$14,100 for Puerto Rico (with an extension to May 31, 1977). Puerto Rico will come to the May Council with an operational proposal. We are not sure of Idaho's plans, but they originally requested much less than we wished and a new executive director and chairman have produced a bigger volume program.

Also, there will be perhaps 15 requests for amendment related to the submission of fund-raising plans by committees. These are due to us by January 7. I will submit a supplemental report the following week.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : John H. Barcroft and Alex Lacy

DATE: January 3, 1977

FROM : Geoffrey Marshall

SUBJECT: New Jersey

There seem to be three basic options with regard to the New Jersey proposal:

1. Disapproval and extension of the current grant for six months in order to permit the committee to write a new proposal.
2. Funding for 12 months at the minimum --\$ 238,636
3. Funding for 18 months at the minimum --\$ 358,000

Our original recommendation was to take the first option. Substantively, this is the correct choice. But three factors indicate that we should take the second option instead; those factors are--Harrison Williams, the governor's letter, and the possible change in mission in February.

Here is some background:

When the draft proposal came in, Jim immediately gave me a copy to read because it was so obviously below the standard of state-based proposals, even weak ones. I read it and agreed that it is without parallel. It is the worst written, worst organized, most embarrassing proposal I have ever seen in the program. It reveals confusion about program mission, administrative collapse, and lack of committee oversight.

I called Bernie Peltz and told him that Jim and I had read the proposal and were of the opinion that it would have a very difficult time with reviewers. I asked him to "re-read" the proposal, if he would, and let me have his advice about whether we should go forward with the review process. I explained that there were several options: (1) we could go ahead and see what the reviewers said; (2) the New Jersey Committee could withdraw the proposal and request an extension of their current grant in order to prepare a new proposal.



Bernie called back a few days later, having consulted with Ham Stillwell. Bernie said he thought the proposal was "weak", but argued that the proposal should go through the review process and take its lumps. He was not in a position with the committee to make the judgment to withhold the proposal. He has tried off and on this year (by his account) to institute a number of changes, without success. If the Endowment and its reviewers, on the other hand, find serious weakness, he believes the committee will shape up. Others on the committee want the proposal to be submitted. Jim was called to that effect by Leah Sloshberg and Fred Main.

(b) (6)



The last proposal from New Jersey was also terrible. Clyde did massive editing, and went to New Jersey to consult with the executive committee in order to get a fundable document.

We plan to have Jim go to visit the office in New Jersey in January and then also attend a committee meeting. It is important to have these visits before the February Council.

Bernie believes that the chairman (or at least he as chairman) cannot move the committee toward the sort of massive self-study that is necessary. For whatever reasons, the committee does not respond to his suggestions, and appears to be confident that it is presently on the right track.

In similar circumstances, we made a 6-month grant to Arkansas, but that was their first operational grant and there seemed no reasonable way to extend the planning period.

These facts or interpretations should be part of our recommendation:

1. The proposal has no significant program development activities outlined. One conference is described, and it has vague connections to fund-raising.
2. Their "fund-raising plan" involves spending \$10,000 to hire a consultant (who will, in fact, do the fund-raising), but it is clear from the budget and the text

that they expect to raise only \$10,000. A net gain of \$0.

3. We believe, from a controversy that appeared recently over a regrant, that committee procedures are lax, if not unacceptable. The committee does not require vitae and does not routinely check if participating committees listed in a proposal have actually agreed to take part; financial records between regrantee and committee may be poor; there is no satisfactory or independent evaluation process; there are no satisfactory minutes.
4. The committee is tied to Rutgers' continuing education in at least two ways--the salaries of staff are linked to the Rutgers' schedule and the fiscal agent is Rutgers.
5. The Rutgers fiscal agent allows the committee to go as long as 6-10 months without a cash request. Data for a final expenditures report, requested by us 6 months ago, has not been provided. Cash requests come in without supporting material. All of this has been made explicit, several times, in letters from us to the committee with copies to Rutgers. The committee persists in telling us how valuable the Rutgers services are.
6. The quality of the regrants is very poor. There is an obvious bias in the direction of social action topics, though not to action itself. The prize regrant, according to the proposal, was a conference on international terrorism held at Glassboro. The description is incoherent, but there appears to have been little by way of humanities content and no attempt to explain how the conference relates to the committee's theme or to the interests of the state.
7. The list of scholars who participated in the program reveals 3 scholars from Rutgers; 4 from Princeton (all from the School of Theology and all in one regrant); none from Rider (despite the president of that institution on the committee); 28 from two-year institutions; 29 from Glassboro; 30 from out of state (and it is this group that provided the only distinguished scholars in the program). There were other institutions represented, but the list speaks for itself--they have not had the slightest success with the state's major institutions.

8. The proposal is the work of several hands. It is largely garbage through the first 60 pages or so, and then shows other intelligences at work on various later sections (not including the budget, which is incoherent). The first pages of this document would not pass a freshman course anywhere. These pages are an insult, and we could offer no excuse whatsoever to any public inquiry which sought reasons why we would give so much as \$5 on the basis of this proposal. I believe that the Endowment could be scandalized if a college or university saw this proposal and knew that the agency had funded it.
9. The committee list is quite weak; it is an inadequate reflection of the state's extensive resources.
10. The committee sought and was awarded a \$100,000 supplement on its present grant. It will return at least that much unspent, if the current grant is closed on schedule.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I believe we should assume that the membership of the New Jersey Committee will respond well when they are made aware of the circumstances of their program. The question is how to make them aware of these circumstances.

Neither Jim nor I have personal contacts with the committee at present, and therefore cannot work by force of personality to get them to see how poor their work has been. We need to have some dramatic, "independent" judgment to that effect, and then work closely with them to get back on track. To fund for 18 months would blur the problem--the amount is not dramatically less than their request and I am not sure how they would respond. Substantively, we could disapprove the proposal, but the other needs we have for transition may preclude disapproval. I do not think we could ask a governor to appoint two individuals to a group that had just completely failed.

STATE-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS
FEBRUARY 1977

	<u>Admin</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>G.M.</u>
(iv) <u>Alabama</u>	94,050	325,000	419,050	50,000
27785	60,000	263,000	323,000	
			163,000	
(iv) <u>Kansas</u>	112,448	268,000	380,448	
27782	60,000	296,000	356,000	
			240,000	
			170,000	
			125,000	
(iii) <u>Maryland</u>	125,860	600,000	725,860	290,000
27781	60,000	505,000	565,000	169,000
			280,000	
(iv) <u>New Jersey</u>				
27780	60,000	435,000	495,000	
			375,000	
			180,000	
(i) <u>New York</u>	175,000	1,000,000	1,175,000	500,000
27784	60,000	596,000	646,000	

	<u>Admin.</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>G.G.M.</u>
(iv) <u>Oregon</u>	143,816	400,000	543,816	50,000
27783	60,000	385,000	445,000	
			275,000	
			150,000	
			100,000	
(iv) <u>West Virginia</u>	120,784	300,000	420,784	50,000
27786	40,000	180,000	220,000	
			220,000	
			165,000	

Supplementals:

Puerto Rico: current \$15,000 supplement: ~~14,100~~ 14,100

New administrative plans: