

2/82

CC: 512442

Council 0621

Bennett

Good morning, Council. Good morning ladies and gentlemen, guests, staff, others; well, I guess the first categories cover everybody. The first order of business is minutes, Mr. Wilkes.

Wendell

I believe the minutes of the 62nd second meeting last November has been made available to all members of the council. In addition, there has been circulated in your materials today a supplement which constitutes a reported discussion on the supplemental report on technical assistance and minority access, which has been included at the request of Mr. Newsner. As a practical matter, I don't think it's possible to consider that supplement for purposes of approving the minutes today but we can consider that at the next meeting. So, going on the minutes, as they were previously circulated, is there any discussion?

We need a motion?

Moved.

Second.

Author	_____
Date	_____
L. Mar	R. Mar
Index Guide	_____
Spec Codes	Reverse Index
Special Instructions	_____

All in favor, do we do this all in favor? All in favor? Opposed? Mr. Marsh.

Marsh

In the brown folder before you is a one-page brief, very brief, biography of two welcome additions to the Endowment staff. You have just had a chance to hear, however briefly, from Wendell Wilkey, who is the general council. Joe Sherman has retired from federal service and is in New York in private practice, or shortly will be. Wendell comes to us also from New York City and there is a brief description of his background in your folder. In addition, we have with us today, Jack Croder. Jack, will you stand for just a second? Jack, who has joined our personnel office staff, and we are glad to have him along as well. I have one departure which is not part of your materials and I would like to say just a word about that, and that's to announce the retirement of Jack Whitelaw. Jack has spent 34 years with the federal government. He's been with the Army, with the National Science Foundation for a period of time. He was twice with the Smithsonian, and right before coming to the Endowment, I think many of you are aware, Jack was the Executive Officer of

the National Museum of Air and Space and was, in fact, the Executive Officer for the construction of that museum. It is, one of the, I won't say the first time, but one of the rare times in federal history that a project came in ahead of time and under budget, and Jack got a special commendation for that and deserved it. He's been responsible for a great many changes which have brought us under budget as well, and we are grateful for that. He is going to join Vought Aircraft, which is a subsidiary of LTV, I think many of you know. He will be assistant to the Executive Vice President in the Washington office for Vought Aircraft and we are going to miss Jack's service, and are very grateful for a number of important innovations that he made in our administrative procedures and cost savings that he brought to us as a result. We also have a new chairman and I think most of you have met the new chairman and those of you who haven't will have a chance to very shortly, and I won't do a formal introduction of the chairman at this stage. There's been lots written and lots said, but I'm grateful to have a new chairman, and I think the staff is as well.

Chairman's grants and actions according to council information tab A. Mr. Wilkey.

W. Wilkey
These materials were set forth in Tab B as the chairman has indicated. First, is there any discussion of the specific grants which are referred to in Tab A? Okay. I believe the chairman would like to discuss certain grants which were recommended by the council at its last meeting, but which he believes deserves some further discussion at this time.

Bennett
Well, I don't think I should discuss grants here at this part of the meeting. I think that's more appropriately done in the part of the meeting that's closed to the public. I don't want to make a speech, but I am the new chairman, and let me just take two minutes to go on record, because I do think it is important to establish this for the record. When I came here in late December, actually early January, I found that grants which had been approved, recommended, by this council and the former chairman in November had still not found their way out of the machinery in many cases. That is, award letters had not gone out. I asked for a review of those proposals since I discovered that I would have to sign the letter, and therefore take the responsibility,

at least legally to the world, for those grants. I reviewed a number of proposals and reviewed a smaller number of proposals several times. I found a number of those proposals unsatisfactory on various grounds. Among the most prominent and important and recurring grounds were first, proposals which would seem to me not to be in the humanities. Second, were proposals which seem to me to be ideologically indigenous posing as if they were proposals in the humanities. Really political proposals. Third, proposals which I found to be very badly thought out, plan of execution weakly drawn, or weakly described. If things were otherwise, I would not have signed those grant award letters. In the process, I think several of us discovered exactly how intricate this process is and how the system seems to run almost by itself. I found out that this agency had made representations to the grantees in question, to people in the Congress, to these grantees' representatives and that there was a fair amount of correspondence, a number of representations from the NEH to the grantee that they would indeed be getting these awards. It seemed to me, then, that the principle of institutional propriety, with respect for institutional procedures are to govern. That is, not only must the chairman keep his words, the agency keep its word and when an agency has made representations to a grantee or to a Congressmen it seems to me it has to honor it. But I want to be plain, I would not, if it were not for those institutional matters, those matters of institutional propriety, I would not have signed those grants. There are a number of them. I would like to discuss a few of them, several of them this afternoon, of the points I am making here with the council. The only other thing I would like to say is that they have gone through. I will defend the fact that I signed them out of respect to the institutional procedure. But I will not defend, and I do not feel that it is incumbent upon me to defend the individual merits of those cases; if someone else wishes to defend them, he or she can. I shall not. I think that is all I should say now, with the council this afternoon, we can talk over the ones that gave me trouble, and perhaps come to some resolution for the sake of the future.

Heaven?
Mr. Chairman, after four years of contending with applications, I find it less clear what is humanistic and what is not than when I go home to my university, and out of the anguish of experience I can tell you, you may find it a more complicated question later on.

I find it a complicated question now, that nevertheless, does not relieve me or the council from the ordeal of judgment, and the judgment beyond me.
Application report Tab B, Mr. *J. J. Holman*

This material in the council agenda book, which was sent out to you, and under Tab B we have two kinds of reports. One is the routine quarterly report we have sent to you showing you the results of the actions you recommended at the previous council meeting. It had appeared to us at the beginning about 6 months ago that the application rate through the agency had greatly decreased. We, therefore, began a few months ago to try to track this on a more systematic basis. One of the results of that tracking was shown in the second report, shown under that tab, which reflected a decrease in the applications which were presented to the council and, even more surprising, a further reduction in the favorable recommendations which came from the council. That particular information is summarized on the bottom of page 1 of the memorandum and onto page 2. If you have some questions about that material, I would be happy to respond to them.

What I thought I would spend most of my time on this particular item, discussing, however, was some additional analysis which we have done, which we have not had time to actually type up and distribute to you.

Marshall
Excuse me a second, Armond. Could I ask to be sure that you speak into the microphone because we have a very large audience this time including people in the theater, and they can't hear unless we do.

Jack
Okay. Through this additional analysis, what we've done is to go back and look at the applications which were presented to last fiscal year's November and then February Council, and contrast that with this past November and now this February's council. There were 21 grant programs which presented fairly significant numbers of applications that are regular applications cycles to one or both of those two councils. Of those 21 programs, 18 showed a decrease in the number of applications coming. In terms of the number of applications, there was a decrease of about 25%. In terms of the dollars requested, there was a decrease of about 28%. We believe that this downward trend has begun to change a few months ago once the final appropriation for 1982 was signed by

the president and several programs do report an upswing. However, we haven't had sufficient information broadly across the Endowment in order to draw any judgments from that. As a result of this decrease, two things, I think, are happening. One is that there has been projected surpluses in the 1982 allocations in a number of programs. Secondly, those surpluses, of course, provide opportunities for other programs and I know that in a number of committees yesterday, staff were discussing with their committees how to exploit those opportunities and I guess that we will be hearing about those later on in this morning's session. Another aspect of this is that rather than a greatly reduced grant application ratio which we had anticipated this year, it does appear that the ratio will be probably somewhat along the lines of last year's funding about overall across the Endowment about one out of every four applications. Is there any question about the material presented to you or remarks I've just made? If not, we can go on to the next item, Mr. Chairman.

Permitt
Go ahead.

dash
In the brown folder which awaited you today, there is one sheet bringing you up-to-date on the status of our gifts and matching funds. I won't spend much time with this, instead I would like to draw a comparison with the previous year's situation. Once again, some material that we didn't have time to complete and type up for you. This past year, because of the up and down nature of our budget prospects, we had a particularly difficult time in planning and making gifts and matching offers. At various times during the past year it seemed we were quite frightened that we were greatly overextended in the offers, and as a result of that, we began to take a number of steps including instituting a more careful tracking system and tightening up on our matching offers, closing out offers when they terminated, rather than indefinitely extending them, which had been the quite accepted traditional practice of the agency. As a result of that tightening, as you will see on that sheet, there is about 14.5 million dollars worth of matching offers which we have opened this year. Last year we had about 20 million dollars in offers and the previous year had been running 18, 19, 20 million dollars. Now the reduction in the matching offers, those accompanied by another factor, which is that while tightening up the offers the effect of this is, the offers that we have outstanding are much more likely to result in gifts than under the old system.

Although the total offer level has reduced we would anticipate no problem in receiving gifts to release the full treasury appropriation and once again this year we will be using we anticipate anywhere between 3 and 5 million dollars out of definite funds in order to match those gifts.

1. Excuse me Armond, the 21 million dollar figure is for the same time last year?

That's right. With the appropriation request for 1983 of about 9 million dollars, it seems that we probably are now about at the right grant offer-making level. So I don't think there is any need to tighten further on the offers that we make. Any questions about that material?

Bennett

You're on a roll, keep going.

Jack

After a long, hectic year on the budget front the battle seems to be over with the Congressional appropriation which was made in December and signed by the President in that month. The results of that process are summarized under Tab D in the Council Agenda book. A few comments about it - the final appropriation as shown on the table there is 130.5 million dollars as contrasted with the Presidents's request last March of 85 million, is contrasted with President Carter's original request of almost 170 million last January. With the signing of the appropriation there was still a question as to whether or not there might be a recision sought by the administration for this Endowment as well other accounts in the Department of Interior-related agency appropriation bill. We were very pleased to learn that no recision is planned and therefore we were able to recede to make the allocations of this 130 million dollars and to plan accordingly. There is one particular aspect of the appropriation action this year which is quite significant. Summarized briefly in the memo but I thought that I should highlight it here. For the first time the Congress dipped much more down into our appropriation budget structure to earmark funds sometimes a very specific programs. Usually they have earmarked funds at the division level but not gone below that. The reasons for the earmarking seem to be several, I don't think that there is any one reason. I would invite Channing to add to my remarks about this. As we understand it, there were several factors involved. One has to do with the number of categories which comprised our budget requests as contrasted with the arts endowment budget

requests. The arts endowment has about 15 to 20 quite distinct, separate programs and if you look just at our divisional structure, we have about 7 or 8 of them. So one of the purposes of the earmarking was to establish a little bit more control for this agency analogous to control over the arts endowment's program levels. The second point here is that the Congress did seem intent on assuring a certain distribution among the major program areas of the agency and within a particular division, say the Public Programs Division, especially the programs there are quite distinct from one another. Therefore, each of those programs had a separate earmarking. While in the research division, although we may see here each activity as being quite distinct I think that's less clear, the Congress and therefore they allowed us to have more flexibility within the research program structure. Now the effect of this is that the agency will have much less flexibility this year in moving funds rapidly or easily from one program to another program. Because of that, we did appeal to the Congress to restore the old reprogramming, as we called it the old reprogramming structure or base. That appeal was denied and, therefore, if we wish to move funds from the earmarked, from one earmarked program to another earmarked program, we have to seek and receive Congressional approval. The amount of movement is something like \$250,000. We can move up to \$250,000 among those lines. But anything over \$250,000 would have to go to the Congress and it has a veto over that movement. The combination of the new reprogramming base and the decrease in applications, which I mentioned previously, led to a new situation in that we normally would wait and could wait and would have to wait until August before we began planning any major shifts among our programs. Much earlier than previously, though, we see now that we are quite confident that because of the application decrease that there are quite likely to be surpluses in a number of programs. Because of the time needed to plan reallocations and to seek the Congressional approval for those, the Chairman has asked the divisions to review your projections and to invite applications from divisions which feel that they will have additional requirements either because of the reviewer recommendations in their programs or for certain new kinds of activities which they have been wanting to undertake. We would anticipate that unless some reallocations were made somewhere, 5, 6, 7 million would be surplus. The response to the Chairman's invitation for applications for that money amounted to 10 to 12 million dollars. We will be hearing shortly as the committees make their reports, some committee views

4665

as to their views about what might merit priority for any surplus funds. On the 1982 appropriations specifically, the allocation levels are provided under Tab E where we discussed the 1982 budget. A couple of comments about specific programs. With the 130 million dollar level, we have been able to reinstitute some funding for the professions program in order to support the two journalism programs at Stanford and Michigan and to provide some money for special projects. Those two programs, as well as the residential fellowship program, had been marked for complete elimination. Also very significantly the 20.7 million dollars for the challenge grant program will enable us to cover all of the 1982 commitments in that program. As you may recall we had plans to cover only half of them this year, thus creating quite a commitment for the next few years. So we will be able to cover all the 1982 commitments and there will be even a slight overage which will help us to begin to cover part of the 1983 commitments.

Are there any questions about the 1982 appropriation or about the program allocations?

Yes, Armond, I have a question. Maybe it's best directed at Channing. Do we think that in the future the Congress making these allocations, at the program level rather than at the division level, do we think that is going to continue in the future, so that after FY82 we're also going to have to deal with this same program of reprogramming \$250,000?

It does not set a precedent?

No, it doesn't.

Because, I might just add though, that that kind of earmarking has been very common in other federal agencies and actually we have been very lucky up until now to have as much flexibility as we have had. So, I think anything can happen. Are there other comments or questions? Shall we go on to the next item - 1983 Appropriation Requests. It is under Tab E.

The President presented the administration's budget for 1983 to the Congress last week and we followed that by presentation of our detailed budget justifications to our appropriation committee last Friday. You have in the brown

folder the full text of our detailed appropriation request. We also have in that folder right on top of the text a summary of the budget. The summary includes some actual excerpts from the introduction, a short description of what the 1983 budget will buy and then the budget tables at the end. The material which is under Tab E gives just a very quick overview of the budget and I should mention that immediately after my memorandum there is a table which shows the agency's original appropriation request to OMB, the Arts Endowment Appropriation Request to OMB, and then the Congressional request. That table is Confidential, it is an internal executive branch document, so that particular table ought not to be distributed beyond the staff and council. The other material which is under that tab, specific budget tables, are quite public information. I think that I should just very briefly recap how this particular request relates to the various planning levels which the council considered throughout last year. As you may recall, in the August council and previous to that with the July Budget Committee meeting, the staff presented a budget based upon five planning levels. Those ultimately became six, including an additional level six A as it turned. Level 2 was essentially the same overall level that President Reagan had approved in March for 1982. In other words, no overall increase from 1982, from the then planned 1982 to 1983. That totaled about 85 million dollars. The final appropriation request that the President has included for this agency is 96 million dollars. The difference between 85 and 86 is made up in the challenge and treasury area, so that the levels that you now see in the 1983 budget submission are essentially the same as the levels which were presented to you as "Level 2" in the July/August sessions. The one item that I should highlight here is once again challenge grants. The 1983 request will permit us to reinstitute new challenge grants. We will have about 7, 8, 9 million dollars in order to make new grants. The treasury funds also received a slight increase as part of the administration's policy of attempting to increase non-federal funding for the humanities. There is a brief note accompanying the transmittal memorandum about our personnel situation, and that is that the overall personnel ceiling of the agency will be reduced next year further. There will be a variety of Congressional hearings this year on the administration's request. The House Authorizing Committee is noted in the transmittal memorandum to have scheduled hearings on March 4, that's about two weeks off. The House and the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee plan to have public sessions to which members of the public field

representatives will be called to testify about the impact of the administration's request on their activities. We will, of course, also have the usual House and Senate Appropriation Hearings involving the agency testimony. These will be held later than usual - late April for the House and mid-March for the Senate. There is a great deal of material, information, numbers and all of material that we have presented to you in your brown folder. Once again, we invite and hope that you will read the full text of this submission and any comments that you have in terms of language, the tone, the argumentation, format, will be greatly appreciated. With that I invite comment and questions.

Rome
Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what difference there is with the materials that are in the brown folder and those that were sent to us previously that we went through carefully on our agenda before we came here. I'm a little confused as to whether this is simply detailed information that spells out what is in the yellow agenda book, and since I haven't seen it until just this morning, I feel incapable of either commenting or in some respects following completely all of the material that you so kindly gave us.

Just
The budget tables are the same; in other words, the specific funding foreseen for each program is included in the yellow council agenda book. The material that you are getting this morning is a description of what specifically those levels will be buying and the justification for them. The agencies, priorities, I don't think that the material that you are getting today would be very familiar to you based upon the many budget discussions that we've had during the past year.

Rome
Thank you for that, because I do feel as though I'm out in a vacuum. On the other hand I understand that I'm going to be voting on making some grants today and I didn't know how much I would be guided by these things.

Newman
Two minor comments on presentation. First of all, if you could indicate percentages of this and that along with the numbers, it would be quite educational. For instance, where you have got three years of budget requests, if we could have a percentage of the decline or the increase I think we could understand them more rapidly. Secondly, I'm glad that Mrs. Rome raised the question that she did because virtually/^{at} every public council meeting when you

*

walk in this room, you're inundated with paper. There's no way that we can absorb all of this or even any of this as we sit here hearing people talk. I would like to suggest that just as at our committee meetings in many divisions we have been able to persuade the staff to give us material in advance of our arrival in Washington so even the budget material should go out complete. At least two weeks before we come here so that we can absorb it. You refer to things which while you're talking about them I have to try to find and gradually surrender the effort. I think that that could be made a more crisp and interesting part of the meetings, if we were given these things entirely in advance, without any further continuation of the practice, which is well established now, of about a foot of materials on the desk as we come in.



Jack I believe you're right on that, Jack. As explanation not defense, let me say that we were not able to complete that material. Normally, we have provided the full text of the budget to the council in advance. That has been our normal practice. This is really a deviation from that practice, and I regret that.

Now I had a substance of question of which I would like to offer to the Chairman. As is clear, the 1983 request represents a substantial shift in the policy of the Endowment as to its priorities and I think a considerable part of the shift has taken place since December 21st. It seems to me worth hearing from the Chairman the policies which he has instituted to explain the rather substantial changes in the budget with which the council was familiar.

If I could just start . . .

Bonetti

Let me just ask . . . a fair amount of this was inherited so let me ask Jeff to talk about the legacy and then I'll comment after he's done.

Marshall

Great. I would just review the fact that as Armond pointed out a minute ago, the base from which the administration has built its request to Congress, that we have represented before us now, was in fact in the materials in August and before that as one of the levels of our work, and in fact, also represents a very close patterning. In fact, I think in most cases it's identical. Armond could correct me. For the submission which we were required to make when our

request for this year has been 85 million. For example, the percentages among divisions and the proportions among divisions are unchanged from the documents which we submitted for the first time to Congress in March 1981, so there is no shift, just technically there is no shift in proportions on program side whatsoever, and the only change that is represented on the sheet is in the challenge grants and treasury which came at the request of the administration.

Just as a kind of background for the paper . . .

Do you have a specific question, Jack? I mean less money overall will mean no less money.

Numen No, no, I just wanted to hear that part of the budget which has responded to a change in administration, and just to be educated as to where we have new ideas to contend with. "Contend with" wasn't quite the right word choice.

I think that again because it is not really the stamp of the Chairman of the Endowment marked in the 1983 request at all, the changes are pretty much as Armond described them. They represent in the increase and request over 85 million interest of the administration large in increasing private support and, therefore, challenge grants and treasury are the increase that are represented here.

Barnett Well, sure, it is my budget submission again, this is one I had to sign or at least make in my name. Smaller budget overall means that we have to make cuts, where do we make cuts? We make cuts on the basis of the judgments about the relative priorities the competition. Obviously these are the key questions, the competition for funds that comes. These are the application process; therefore, one makes a judgment. We can talk about any one of those specifically, through those everything is down. Public is down, fairly dramatically as you see, and so is Solar Special. A number of factors center in here. Jeff can speak for them as well. There were things obviously in the mind of Joe Duffy about this. My own sense of it is that one looks to in times a smaller budget where support might be found elsewhere than from the National Endowment for particular kinds of projects. Again, always bearing in mind, the competition, the key always being the proposals that come in. The fact of

what Armond reported about surpluses is in some ways telling that we have surpluses in some budgets, that we have smaller applications or that staff, panel, reviewers, and council all in turn decide that not enough proposals are coming in in a particular area which merit funding which gives us additional money there. That does not constitute an argument for increasing funding. In other places, let's take research, the load is enormous. Quality overall continues to be very high, in a high number of expensive range or enough expensive requests that one is compelled in looking at that budget to try to recognize that fact. Otherwise, I think we have to get into more specifics.

Well, so one general policy that you've articulated would be where outside support seems likely we will be doing less in the future.

Bennett

Well, I think that has to be one of the factors. We know we can't do everything. We know that we regard certain things as very important to be done that should be done for the humanities, if we don't do them what are the chances that someone else will?

What would be some other general policies that would run across the board which would guide council committees, for example? Besides the one you just gave, are there other ones that have been in mind as yet?

Again I'd like to say that's two. I would hope I wouldn't have to say that the second thing I mentioned is a new policy. But, the argument it seems to me for how much always depends upon what the applications look like. We should be prepared to shift our budget around, to ask for reprogramming authority. If the applications that come in make a compelling case, that we simply have allocated too little money.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question for clarification? Armond, is this not very reflective of the meetings that the council has starting with our budget committee and in fact this is information that we have had all along and the priorities, in effect, have been set by us? Except for the challenge, I mean basically.

The discussions beginning last February which required detailed and painful in the committees as well as the full council and proceeding through May and then the Council Budget Meeting in July, Full Council in August, further discussion in November. I thought had arrived at a certain point and therefore, we hadn't gone into much detail in the summary memorandum because, frankly, I felt that the material was so familiar and that the levels were so familiar and the justifications so familiar, but that's perhaps we are engrossed in this day in and day out. I do invite though comments or questions, because sometimes it may come as a surprise to people who haven't been that engrossed as we are and may see it afresh.

Jack . . .

Hansen
I'm a little reluctant to take for granted we're right to say that we'll respond where applications are going up and neglect areas where applications are few.

Bonick
That's not what I said. Numbers is one thing. The case is made by the argument; that is, the quality of the applications, not just the numbers.

The point I wanted to make, however, was that the Endowment has had, in some areas, a formative effect in materially improving cultural activity and the applications weren't there because no one ever thought of it. One powerful incidence which we reviewed yesterday the creation effectively by the Endowment of a professional group of archivists in this country. Prior to the formation of the Endowment, it was not even amateurish as we are able to understand. It was a decision made within the Endowment to develop such a corps of first rate archivists which many years later results in heavy scheduling of applications. So, I would regret it if the exercise of taste and judgment were not part of the policies.

That is what I meant by determination of quality.

But, it's not just quality, It's area of need. It's using our imagination to think of things that we can do, that no one has ever thought of before. I know it's hard in Washington.

I think it's hard to come up with things that no one has thought of before anywhere; even in Providence (laughter). That may be because I'm a student of the humanities and one of the things that you find in the world is that what people call discoveries usually are not. No, I think if we have good ideas about what should be done, if we have some sense of critical needs in the humanities, though I think we must become much more responsible about our use of that term. If you look over that budget request; well you will not see that it was crossed out about thirty times. The problem is we can't call everything critical needs. But I think that if we can identify such things as this has been done in the past, and we've served the cause of the humanities that's fine. But, for the most part, I take it that this is a principal of this agency, but for the most part we respond. We do not lay down our judgment or our standards, but respond to what the community of scholars, institutions tell us. What their needs are, their priorities - we then make a judgment about that. But we are primarily here to react to other agendas, not to set agendas for research, fellowships, and other areas. Is that our statement of policy? I wouldn't want to go down on record on that if that's not correct; that's my understanding. That we basically receive. With the actions we take we no doubt teach and say what we think is important. But, that basically we are here to listen and respond to the proposals, be they for large new areas of research or investigation or specific ones, then to initiate them ourselves.

Yeah, I think the other point that is being made and this is a correct one, too, the two aren't in conflict. The legislation requires us to do certain things and some of the things that was required us to do weren't there in nature. They required action on our part and I think that's your point. Once we've instituted those and I presume we'll continue to do that because we'll continue to learn from whatever sources we can of things that we ought to be doing which will require changes in what we've done before in the institution of new programs. I think that's right. Once that program is set up then I think these two things work together, these two principals work together.

Brown Let me just add; the key for me by the time I got here and figured out what this big number means, is to figure out what all these little numbers mean and that's what I'm still doing. Someone said to me the second day I was here, fellowship thirteen million or fourteen million? But what does one say to

that question? But, one gets a better grasp on this in time and I expect I'll have a lot more to say about these breakdowns as we go along. Thank you for bringing up the point.

Other questions or comments? Thank you.

H. Technical assistance and minority access, that's me. Let me mention I should say something about time, I know the coffee break is after this. Our agenda is set to conclude at 3, I've got to leave at 3:30, I'm sure other members of the council have plans, too. I just mentioned that before we get to other items about which we want to have discussion. We're moving along fine, we're on schedule so we can if we have time. I received when I got here the resolution of the National Council on the Humanities and minority access and equity, and read it several times. I have wrote to the council let me just remind you of what I said. I know you have a lot of paper with you, let me just read that part of that memo to you of February 2. "The policy passed by the council in November called for plans from each division of the Endowment in February. I am firmly committed to meeting the obligation of the Endowment to make its programs available to every eligible individual and institution regardless of race, color, or creed. Further, I am committed to disseminating our information to, and encouraging applications from, those scholars and institutions that have hesitated, whatever the reason, to approach this Endowment for support. In this regard, and right now for example, President Reagan's recent Executive Order regarding historically black colleges and universities places an obligation upon us to develop plans for this group's potential applicants. Towards these ends, I have asked the divisions to begin planning for or to continue activities that increase access to the Endowment's programs for all qualified persons and institutions." As the first order of business I've asked that they focus on plans developed for your consideration at this meeting on access and in accord with the President's order for historically black colleges and universities. We can discuss broader plans, or this resolution in general today or in May or both times if you'd like. In any case I wanted to remind you of my response to your resolution. Comments or discussion?

6316

I think we're assuming, too, that we'll have a chance to hear from each of the committees after the break in the discussion of how that discussion went in each of the sessions.

Okay? Coffee break? It seems indecent. I'll remember that George, I've got an empty cup! Just kidding!


I'll get you a cup of coffee, George.

No I don't think so! This is an old Chapel Hill thing, it's alright.


Committee reports on policy and general matters. Public programs, Ms. Zimmerman.

We had a very rare opportunity yesterday. We had almost no grant business whatever on which we had to act. So, we took the opportunity since as well we were a newly constituted committee with new members to spend a day in which we reviewed, first of all, historically the development of all the programs in our division. It's been my personal belief that it's very instructive either for a new council member or for a person coming newly to a committee to be brought up to a certain common level of information, background, historical knowledge, about how that particular division conducts its business, how its review process works and so on. That basically reflects the agenda that we covered in the morning. We began first with staff presentations on the history and evolution of the museum and historical organizations, media and library programs, and we reviewed the principal objective and achievement of each area. The committee then reviewed current program guidelines and approved proposed provisions and program priorities for Fiscal 1983. Briefly I'd like to read those changes and guidelines and priorities to you. All of the program guidelines in our division are being revised to reflect a generic agency changes and procedures in some policies, clear a language about application, and an updating of more recent program-related grant provisions and policies. In addition, the Museum and Historical Organization Guidelines will describe as its priorities: emphasis on permanent and traveling exhibitions and collection sharing. Encouraging attention to a broader range of humanities resources and subject matter and a continued interest in strengthening interpretive skills and methods at museums and historical organizations. The library guidelines will place its emphasis on projects which involve state and regional

library systems, further efforts to join libraries and colleges and other cultural organizations in cooperative activities and on those projects which have clear signs of being reproducible. The media guidelines for a special insert and public distribution will publish particular interest in proposals in broader areas of history, philosophy and jurisprudence. This emphasis will not preclude attention to quality applications in any area of the humanities; it will, however, help to identify several major areas of scholarship where little has been proposed to the program and even less has been communicated to the public. Following that the committee considered staff plans for continuing its work with historically black colleges and universities. The plan calls for a series of statewide or regional workshops for the faculty and other professional staff of these institutions that would focus upon the uses of the humanities resources for the public, various modes of interpretation and collaboration between scholars and other cultural institutions, and understanding the application and review process. The staff proposes that these workshops be undertaken as a collaborative effort by the divisions of public, state and special programs to broaden their usefulness and contain costs. The committee passed a motion recommending this plan to the chairman. In the afternoon, the committee continued its discussion with the staffs of both the divisions of public and state programs. First, we looked very carefully at the applications review process including its purpose, how it works, the role of panelists and reviewers, how they are selected, the staff role and the use of grant conditions. I'd like to comment, that for me this understanding and proper application of the review process is the fundamental thing in our work, because it is through that work that we express to the public our commitment to certain standards of excellence that, I believe, are implicit in the work we do, and most effectively respond to the mandate of the law. I feel that it is terribly important that each council member understand clearly how that process takes place and we discussed the advisability, for example, of council members attending panel meetings so that they understand how that works, of reading full grant proposals if they need to, and we also spent some time discussing the differences in the review process between, for example, public programs and state programs and how the law causes certain differences and how we work within those differences - which is a very important thing for council members to understand whether or not they sit on the committee which deals with state programs, since each one of us I believe really represents all



those 52 states and the taxpayers they're in. Finally, in the afternoon we engaged in a general discussion, which is really a rare opportunity. We philosophized, if you will, about policy. We had created - Steve, Don and I - some questions simply to provoke a more philosophical, broader discussion than we have ever been able to have in this committee about the purpose, nature and function of public humanities programs, the ways in which they are practiced and the program's obligations to the Endowment mandate to the humanities and the public. We have the question in case anybody would like to look at them, I will not bore you with the recitation. We started off with a sort of an artificial construct, if you will, where we looked at the fact that on the one hand the argument has been made that the proper way to "do" the humanities is to practice traditional disciplines in the humanities by traditional ways by traditional groups. And that, on the other hand, there is an argument that can be made for more non-traditional practice of those disciplines by more non-traditional groups in more non-traditional ways. Whether or not, we discussed whether or not and in so doing those rigorous standards which we would wish to apply to all the projects in this Endowment which suffer in any way or, in fact, rather be enhanced. This provoked a very interesting discussion. I ask that this discussion completely be open and that the staff participate fully and I'd like to comment in my opinion that the staff more than justified my insistence in their participation. It was really quite a marvelous discussion as far as I'm concerned. I think the whole committee enjoyed it. I don't know that we came to any profound conclusions. I said that I hoped that this discussion would be an open-ended one. That it would be something that we would continue to do, that at any time that anyone felt that there was further things that should be brought up in this kind of a discussion, that they would do so. That hopefully whatever we didn't finish yesterday we would go on to do in May and August and everytime we met. If we came to any kind of a conclusion I suppose I could say maybe that we concluded that perhaps our role in our division was to bring Socrates to the marketplace which would place public programs firmly in the mainstream of a great humanities tradition. I would now like to ask the other members of the committee if they have any comments they'd like to make on the session.



I have no specific comment to make, I think it was one of the most provocative and one of the most interesting sessions ever attended. One of the reasons

261

for it was that I had heard about the review processes in both the public and the state program. But it was the first time we ever got down to the details of really what went on. I would highly recommend that for all future members of the council they be exposed to this kind of discussion. I'm comparatively a new kid on the block. I tried to get my hands dirty before I came on the council to try and understand what was going on but never did I understand it as I do today after having listened to the discussion of yesterday. I highly recommend, Bill, I highly recommend, that for all new members of the council to be exposed to this kind of a discussion with the staff. To have a complete understanding of what the processes are because normally what happens is we just get the final product. We don't know what went on before. It's terribly important for us, in making an evaluation of the various programs, various problems, various requests that we have in front of us, have some idea of what went on before. It is one of the things I urge you to do as the new chairman. To be sure of that first.

Mr. Chairman . . .

You want to speak beforehand?

I would like to complete the invitation to other members of the committee. My agent is very pleasant to take Philo I again. And that's what we did. We got back to the very fundamentals in the rationale for this established organization. It's good to do some hard thinking about the relationship between the very private pursuit of a scholarship and the very public mechanism of television and radio. Rather than to figure out how we can bridge the gap between them - what is the possible relationship between learning and its transmittal by way of an entertainment media. We kept uncovering paradoxes and contradictions which we really have to face in making almost every decision we make in this council. There are the hidden choices that underly all of the specific requests. As I confessed at our meeting, I have some dark moments. What I do think is the gap between of what I call the "lonely pursuit of scholarship" and the feeling that we want to get as broad a base in our audience as possible. There's a gap that at times cannot possibly be bridged. But, that was a challenge to the other members of the council to show me that it can be done which I was glad to see. The review process, I think Harry was

0594

right, is at the very heart of what we do and I express some concern with the transmission of judgments on one level as among the individual reviewers and judgments on the next level, the panel and judgment on the third level, the committee of the council that gets all of this. I think there are some faults there, some gaps. I would very often like to know what the reviewers have said and I discovered that this is not a uniform process among the Woodland Committee. That in some cases there is such transmittal of communication. In the end, I think, what we're talking and it emerged in our discussion yesterday we're concerned with two different interpretations of the word "humanities". One obviously is what we mean in terms of disciplines in the universe. These are no less important, they're not better or worse. They're on one level. The other, which is addressed in the founding legislation of this organization, implies the humanities as a quality of life, of public life. Not as a learning discipline. I was happy to see that we confronted this separation of functions and I think Harry is absolutely right that they're ought to be a beginner's course, I don't care whether it's an hour or half a day. We're all newcomers to the board, and I would say that when you begin to invite the oldtimers too, so that we can all begin at the same point.

Have a refresher course.

That's always refreshing.

Sam . . .

Kennedy

It's really on this point that I wanted to speak. It's a general matter that applies to all of the committees. I think that some planning should go into orientation for new council members, I suspect that has not been unthought of already. My specific proposal would be that we would plan to have if possible a three-day council meeting at the time new council members join us. Either beginning on the Wednesday or continuing onto the Saturday. At the last class, which I was a member joined, there was an advanced meeting for new council members which was rather ill-attended. There was some social orientation which was pleasant at the first meeting, but what I had in mind was a discussion like that which seems to have occurred on your committee which considered both the review process, what the committees actually do and also

1796
the question of evolution over a period of time of our understanding of the humanities and the functions of the agency. And, I agree that those of us who are already on the council would benefit from this and, of course, from full staff participation.

Any other comments on this report? Well, George after what you said about your preference for work rather than drink I guess we should just continue. We have a report on state programs.

With limited public business the committee asked the staff to review the history of the state program and its current status. This program is, at one time, the Endowment's most simple and most complex undertaking. We see only 52 grant applications a year, but we are dealing with 52 institutions which are attempting to respond to the interests and the needs of the individual states. These councils fund approximately 5,000 projects a year involving more than 15,000 scholars and more than 25,000 separate project activities or presentations. The program was started as an experiment in response to the Congressional charge to increase public understanding and use of the humanities and it remains a laboratory for testing the best means of developing high quality humanities programs for the general non-academic audience. We can learn an awful lot from the program and the staff is currently working on a series of special studies and reports which should be of use to us in the coming months. Then we reviewed several specific reports from the staff. One: The Governor's response to the 1980 Authorizing Legislation. In response to the 1980 Authorizing Legislation, which encouraged greater cooperation between state, government and state humanities councils, the Endowment informed all governors of their opportunities with the new legislation. In effect, the Governor could convert the existing council into a state agency if the legislature appropriated approximately \$100,000 and certain other conditions were met. As another option, the Governor could appoint up to 4 members to the existing humanities council. As of today, only one Governor, the Governor of Puerto Rico, has indicated an interest in establishing a state agency. A number of governors wrote to express their enthusiasm for current programs most of which had just decided to appoint additional members. It is our suspicion that with the new federalism, the states and their governors have sufficient on their minds that it is unlikely that they will be looking

for additional expense. And, therefore, we rather assume that things will go on as they have with the state humanities council. I can report to you my own knowledge that that is exactly the condition in the state of Georgia and even the Arts Council is having a great deal of difficulty getting their funding bill through the legislature at this moment. So, now the question of the U.S. territories. The state program, as required by Congress, must also be established in the United States territories: Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Marianas. There was a lot of fighting on the staff as a matter of fact on who was going to make the trips. (Laughter.) The committee recommends that the staff initiate planning activities in two of those territories during this fiscal year. Due to the preliminary work already conducted by the staff the committee suggested that planning grants be awarded to groups in Guam and the Virgin Islands with the anticipation that planning activities could begin in the other two territories next year. Orientation conferences: The committee also recommends that the division conduct, again, the orientation conferences for new members of state humanities councils. These conferences, highly successful in the past, provide new members with an understanding of the history of the program, information about other Endowment programs and a sense of the role of state programs within the overall Endowment mission or purpose. The proposed conferences would be expanded to include all new members limited to three per state in the past, and would also feature sessions on model or exemplary projects as part of our continuing efforts to emphasize quality programs. Historically Black Colleges and Universities: In response to the Presidential Executive Order regarding historically black colleges and universities, the division staff conducted a study of state council grant-making activities related to those institutions. Based upon the available data, 53% of those institutions have received awards from state councils. Historically black colleges and universities account for 4.4% of all colleges and universities in the nation and have received 4.8% of all state grants awarded to such institutions. The committee approved the division's plans to further analyze program development activities by state councils and to share successful concepts and ideas with all councils.

Thank you. Any comment?

News

Yeah, I don't know the report on the state agency status of the committees is not terribly heartening to people who thought that was an issue worth debating one way or the other. You have, Mrs. Zimmerman, and I and others remember much blood that was spilled over that issue. Is it your judgment that this is not an important initiative or is it your judgment (the question is both to the committee and the chairman) that it is worth pursuing the matter? Because I know it is important that the Senate . . .

Bonetti

Yes, I was going to add that at least on the issue of the composition of the councils and how the councils connect to the state government. I have been asked, there is Congressional interest, I have been asked directly on two occasions what I think of the merits of this proposal and what I intend to recommend or to approve. And, I will respond to that request. Specifically for one Senator who wants to know and who has a right to know what I think. I've asked Don Gibson and his colleagues in the division to marshal all the arguments on all sides of this question for me so I can review them and to propose their recommendation of a draft response but with the backup materials. I do intend to respond to this. I won't say on this question, there is a familiar phrase "I'm doing my homework". I promised I'd never say that again after December 21. But it's not true. I'm still doing homework and I want to review that and I do want to respond.

It is true that you knew where Zimbabwe was? (Laughter.) The other thing is that I missed the detail on the . . . I missed this initiative toward the Central Pacific. Could you just clarify, was this in legislation?


Yes.

So we kind of have to do it. Do we at some point later, not have to do it?

Could I speak to that? The point in issue here is that the legislation affecting us defines state. There's an asterisk in the bill as including the territories. It's been there, I believe, since the first adoption of the language on state programs in the bill. The Arts Endowment has the experience already of setting up committees and I don't think we ever have had any sign that it's likely to be modified. There is discussion of this, however, as you might

94.76

expect in Congress from time to time because any law - this particularly affects both the Department of Interior and Health and Human Services - whenever a law speaks to something provided in a basic way to states (and there's that little asterisk) frequently it produces what some could argue is a very disproportionate affect on very small territories - small population territories. So the issue continually comes up but I don't think we've ever seen a sign that it is likely to be modified. It's been there for some years now.

Bill, when you make a response to this question on the state program would you be good enough to send copies to those of us on the council who are involved in the program? I would very much like to see it. 

Of course.

May I just ask one further question for clarification on this issue? With the addition that would be three, four more, eventually four more councils but the mandate or the legislation also says 20% of the budget, which means that all of the other councils would be proportionately reduced or that's another issue that we would have to address, the distribution of funds?

That's correct. That is the addition of claimants to the basic amount has an affect on that amount. The issue, if I could, of the formula Don could probably address this too. The formula written in the law probably did not fully imagine a circumstance where the total budget of the Endowment was decreasing rather than staying steady or raising. There are some complexities in that formula which probably will in the next authorizing legislation, if not before, Congress will want to speak to and we will be asked to comment and provide them with an illustration of just the kind you're describing where there are complexities in the law where there are two forces at work against one another a little bit - or they could be imagined that way.

With regard to the matter of state agency, in the report from the task force, there was a sentence with regard to state agencies, I'm not sure. That is all that the President received. Is that correct? There was no further explanatory information as to what the intention or what the real thoughts of the task force was on that?

3851

The task force I don't think it grasped the issue of state agencies status for state humanities councils.

Well my recollection is that the one sentence that addressed state committees says something like they ought to explore the model of the arts councils, state agency status. As I recall that was the language.

I think that's right.

I wasn't sure if there was any further communication of attitude.

We probably ought to look at this during the break at one time or another. What I recall the emphasis was on was increasing the or examining the relationship between federal programs and the state programs. Don, is that more in line?

That is my understanding.

So let's look. We'll look specifically to see what it says because I don't think the issue of status was addressed by the report itself. It was part of the background paper, however, that task force members did receive papers from their staff describing the two forms . . .

I know there was a great deal of discussion but I wasn't sure what the final attitude was.

I believe the final report speaks primarily to a reexamination of the relationship between the federal enterprise and that of the states . . irrespective of structure.

In any case because this is the mandated program to the agency so it will have some important budgetary implications.

Sure, sure.

Any other comments on state programs?

Mr. Chairman, we also reviewed the review process as it is involved with approving applications from the state and there is some very exciting and complicated considerations there because I think there is a mandated amount for the states to receive and then the question arises well if it's mandated why review? There was some enlightening explanations of what the function of review is in that case. I don't mind. I had the question of what happens if the total appropriation shrinks. Where does that impact on the mandated amount, on the additional amounts that are given as a result of review, indeed on some of the withholding if a state doesn't muster up the standards that are set. These are some areas that we will have to examine in some greater detail as we go. The synchronizement movements of the budget.

Sure. Shall we do one more item. Okay. Fellowship Programs - Charles Hamult.

Hamult

After that philosophy course, boy! We couldn't do that really because we have 1 college president and 3 college professors on our committee who probably wouldn't agree on who was to teach that course. (Laughter.) At the outset of fellowships it was noted that the committee to use the word had just applauded the decision to reinstitute support for summer seminars overseas. There was rather extensive discussion on a proposal for summer seminars for high school teachers. It's accurate to say that there were reasonably strong differences of opinion on this subject on the committee. On the one hand, there was concern that this program might not justify the projected cost in relation to other programs and the relatively perceived new people who would be reached each year. The impact might be too minimal in terms of cost benefit calculations. This view was not shared unanimously, of course. It was not the unanimous view of the committee. We had an extensive discussion on that matter. In addition, the question was raised whether the fellowships division as opposed to the education division was the most appropriate place for this type of program. This was explored, we discussed it. After rather I would think considerable discussion in the committee it was unanimously agreed two things: first, that the Endowment should be involved in something in the understanding of the humanities on the part of high school teachers - that was a general consensus (and we sought consensus yesterday). Secondly, the Endowment should put-together what we thought of as a profile of what it does in

9826

the area of high school programs. This should perhaps form the basis for further discussion and decision about how the Endowment might best proceed in this particular area of summer seminars for high school teachers. I'm sure my colleagues, because this was something that we did get involved in, my colleagues might want to add something. In addition, we discussed and supported a memo presented on reprogramming possibilities for fiscal year 1982. The committee indicated its own priorities as between various programs. Finally, we reviewed and endorsed the staff's plans for increasing access of historically black colleges, a central emphasis clearly has been on technical assistance and this activity will support it and is encouraged by the committee. That is my summary of our activities and my colleagues might want to add to this. I only took about four minutes.

Yeah Anita.

I'm not a member of this committee. Perhaps the members of the committee would like to comment first.

George . . .

It's always fun to hear what you say then we can answer everything all at once.

I wonder whether we could, the full council, could have a somewhat longer discussion of the proposal to do seminars for high school teachers. As I understand the proposal, the notion was to bring high school teachers in and allow them to act as scholars for some time. And I thought that was an imaginative and useful idea. I think that on the basis of having a good deal of experience in K through 12 work or with K through 12 work and with the preparation of high school students for college. I think this is very important thing to do and I am not clear that it doesn't belong in fellowship division. I am also not clear on what the committee is or is not recommending but I really would like to have a fuller discussion of the merits of that proposal.

Okay, I'll be happy to speak at any point, I guess you all know this was my idea.

Then why don't you.

But if the committee wants to give me the answers before I respond Jack, well the idea for this was simple. That is, what goes on in the schools matters. If what goes on in the schools doesn't matter, if what goes on in the schools isn't good, isn't sound, work in the humanities at the college level, graduate level and alike may all be damaged. Second, my experience in the schools, too, which is extensive, I don't know more or less than yours Anita, but a fair amount of experience in the schools, suggests to me that our teachers are invited to be consumers and users of every gimmick and fad and trick that comes down the pike. They are the victims of first resort by hustlers of all sorts. They are treated as if they will be simulators and facilitators, they are rarely treated as if they have minds. I thought the National Endowment for the Humanities ought to invite high school teachers to come to summer seminars and treat them as if they had minds. There are not a lot of opportunities for secondary school, junior high school teachers in this regard. The idea is really modeled on what seems to be the obvious successes and virtues of the summer seminars for the college teachers which everyone seems to support. We would be talking about roughly the same number of people in a seminar, roughly the same amount of time, maybe a shorter period of time. Summer for high school teachers and as long summer for university or college teachers.

But that's the basic idea.

I am very enthusiastic about the program. The fellowship division staff had put together a picture of how it might be done as a pilot project and it seemed to me highly desirable to go ahead as rapidly as we could with such a pilot, labeling it as such and learning from the experience. But what I see most specifically as being done is to give high school teachers an opportunity to read some of the books that have been written since they graduated from college that they know of their existence but have not found time to do it and to do it in a framework in which they can discuss these books and write about them and deepen their own understanding of the humanities which they will then take back into the schools. The proposal from the staff suggested using English and History as the two subjects that represent the largest pool of

1793

clientele for this program. I strongly urged that at least one of the seminars be in one of the foreign languages. We have had the Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and Area study and efforts in the Congress to increase study of foreign languages and I think we ought to participate in that as much as possible. But I hope we'll go ahead with it as soon as some funding is available. I am not against some kind of coordination with other work in the schools. I think we ought to be informed about it and be able to tell the public what our total program is. But I don't think we have any need to wait when we have a well-outlined program from which we can learn and practice. Yes.

The point of difference to which our Chairman eluded, was that which is now can be expressed as that the outline we received was one page. It clearly under the best of circumstances had to be drawn together rapidly and contained a lot of attention to detail of administration of a program which was scarcely outlined. There were a great many questions that were raised that we were unable to answer at that time through no fault of the staff. So I would say that we did not yet have an adequate presentation of what we were supposed to go into and the relative benefits and losses in terms of the use of these funds proportionate to other funds. These were all questions that await study. There is after all a difference between knowing where we want to go and how we want to get there. We have spent a lot of money, for instance, on the National Humanities Faculty and every year for a few years (at any rate) I kept asking well what did they do and how does it work and the staff kept coming back and saying it's great, it's great and now we have a new proposal which I thought deals with an area in which we worked. Whether well or not I don't know. There was a concrete suggestion which I would like to see considered by the Chairman and the staff and perhaps implemented immediately. And that is to open our present summer seminars to qualified high school teachers at the AP, Advanced Placement, level of high school teachers, many of whom are doing those things that you referred to Ms. Silver and could benefit immediately. All that is required at that point is a change in the regulation as to who may apply. So I thought that we could consider that separate from the question of instituting a whole new seminar program. Finally, I thought that the inadequacy of the materials we had derived from the fact that they came not out of the education division which has perspective on the whole range of things we do

and other Federal agencies do. Where the proposal was strong is where the fellowship division is strong which is on the administration of a program. But if you had to think through the programs to be administered, then you should go to the people who know what is required. In this case, the education division.

Lots of comments. I think Leon in this row.

As a non-professional in the field of education I frequently concerned where in the educational process you begin to insinuate the humanities. You have begun to push them back into the high school and I applaud this effort. I am not going to make the facetious suggestion that we next consider grade school teachers. Not that they are unrelated to this process. I am concerned about teacher training institutions and to what extent young people who are preparing to go into a teaching career (even in the grade school level) get some appreciation of how they can, and I use the word insinuate purposely, bring in the values that we wrap up with this one word "humanities" so that because I know of no chronological point at which you can say now give them humanities. It begins somewhere vaguely and smoothly like a plane taking off from the ground. I don't know even what I am trying to assign to anyone if there is such a thing. But we ought to consider humanities in terms of the entire educational process.

Sure. Thank you Ms. Rome.

I don't get very excited when we get into decisions about precise implementation as to which goes to which committee. I realize we do this from an administrative standpoint and unfortunately I am engaged in that a good deal of my time. I do get excited when I have a creative notion when I come in here that is expanding the value and worth of the Endowment in which we do currently work. The notion of the high school teacher is an important one because of the differences in the training that goes into the college teacher and the high school teacher. The high school teacher to be certified at basic levels is involved in a great deal of methodology. How to teach with very little comparison on what to teach, and so therefore they do go into the teaching program limited in this area. That makes the difference between the college

8472

teacher who is accepted because of the research, of the knowledge and expertise that they have developed in their field, therefore they start at a different level than the high school does. I can tell you that in my courses (and I teach the graduate courses in Shakespeare at Indiana University) and I can tell you that those people who come into my courses who are English teachers in the high school come hungry for getting this kind of information knowing that their expanse and the amount of knowledge they currently have in their field is limited. From a standpoint of moving from one level of our education to the fellowship department which as my colleague has suggested, I can tell you that philosophy exists at all levels and one of the interesting projects that we had yesterday in our education 1 was a proposal to develop a course of philosophy for children from grades 4 through 10.

Yes, Louise.

I am very enthusiastic about this proposal. I would like to add to George's comments that I think that philosophy perhaps ought to be considered as one of the seminar topics. But I would also like to make a concrete proposal. I would like this notion to be adopted. But I would like to make a concrete proposal which perhaps might reduce expenses and increase our constituency at the connections of our constituencies. Because of the Rockefeller Commission Report and because of our universal concern about education, state committees have been trying to address this need. And it would seem to me that it would probably be appropriate or we might very well expect the teachers would be coming together on a regional rather than a national basis which might reduce their costs at least if not ours. And make it possible for more of them to attend and therefore it would seem to me that this program might very well operate at least loosely or informally with the state program division and on a regional basis so that, for example, there might be grants made to interstate consortia or whatever for dissemination of information about the programs for recruitment and so on.

Good idea. Good. I would like to comment on that one when we get other comments. Anita and then George and Maribeth.

Well, I would like to support Mr. Kennedy's proposal about including languages with some information about a very successful experiment. UCSD got together with high school teachers in English and modern languages and asked them what that department could do for them that they would want done on a regular Saturday basis. The faculty at UCSD thought that what they would ask for would be curricular proposals. They didn't want that. They wanted a series of Saturday lectures on what is happening new and current in the field and particularly in modern languages. They wanted to know what was happening in German literature and German lit crit. They wanted to know what was happening in French literature and French lit crit. and it wasn't only the teachers of those languages who wanted to know, it was the teachers of English literature who also wanted to know. And I really think that you are going to find that the distinguished scholars will apply to give these seminars.

George.

I would like to oppose Jack's suggestion of us being the summer seminar for college teachers to secondary school teachers, especially the advanced placement teachers. I think that it would tend to skew the good effects of that program to start with. I think these are two different groups with very different needs. The present program has a research orientation which I think would not be attractive to some secondary school teachers or it would be intimidating to them. They need a much broader approach to the humanities. Furthermore, I think it would be peculiarly inappropriate to open it to the advanced placement teachers, probably the group that least needs it in the first place. And in the second place a group which reaches a rather elitest student body. The advanced placement program, though a very good program, is very spotty around the country and it is strong in rich, private secondary schools and weak in schools in poorer areas. So I hope that we will not do that.

I will at this point give a preview of my report or give the portion of my report from the education division discussion yesterday on this issue of the fellowship for high school teachers proposal since we did talk about it as well in our committee. There has been, I want to assure the rest of the council, that there have been extensive discussions between the staff of the

9226

fellowship division and the staff of the education division on the issue of the proposed seminars for high school teachers. Based on our discussion yesterday, both the council committee and the staff of the education division are very pleased that the fellowship division might very well become involved in high school teacher training or at least intellectual stimulation. We believe that it is not necessary that any program that reaches high schools or high school teachers be located in the education division and are happy to see that the fellowship division might very well become involved in this issue, but are obviously we do have experience in running programs for high school teachers on both the regional and the national level and are sharing that at this point with the people from the fellowship division who are engaged in planning for the proposals. So I think that as far as the education division is concerned, we felt in our committee yesterday that we were being consulted and that we were offering whatever expertise we could and that the general attitude was that it was a great idea.

Yes.

But at present all we have is a good idea and I think that no one has to be against it to feel or to think that matters have not yet reached the point where we can intelligently discuss the institution of a new program. I would like to repeat the question I raised earlier to which perhaps I didn't phrase it as clearly as I should have. Why is this a more effective program than the National Humanities Faculty in which we have spent millions of dollars?

Let me respond to your first question. I don't agree with your first point that is we need to wait much longer and decide all these questions before we go ahead. I just don't think it's that difficult an idea. With the expertise that we have on the staff, shared information, collaboration of the sort of Maribeth has been talking about I think we can put this into effect quickly. You are also talking about an experimental program, small program, not a large number of people. Go ahead, you want to say something?

Well, you call it a small program, but it's one-third of what we spend on fellowships for college teachers and one-third of what we spend - its somewhat

9225

under \$900,000 - we used as our round number 800,000 and our budget for fellowships for teachers is 2.6 million and our fellowship for budgets for scholars is 2.6 million. So that is not my conception of a small program.

Okay. Is that the right budget?

I think it's a big program. It's twice what we are spending to take a program, it's twice, excuse me, four times what we are spending on our publications program under one of our budgets. It's two times and a half what we are supposed to spend on our conferences program, so I don't see how you can call it small. To me a small program is \$50,000.

Okay. It's a big program.

So wait, wait!

But it's a good program and what more can you . . . ?

Nobody doubts that it's a good program. My doubt is that it has been thought through that we know why we are doing it and that we have a clear notion of the input for instance of present people who really know about high school education as no one on this council does.

That's just not true.

Do you?

Careful.

No. The problem is that we do not have the expert knowledge, the materials that came to the council committee consisted of one page of which one paragraph of about eight lines was relevant to the proposal under discussion. Everything else was implementation on which if I recall there was no substantial disagreement at all. The issue was . . .

The Declaration of Independence really only had one paragraph of principles and then a list of implementation.

Look, if you want to rush into it now, then I think you may find out a year from now we have done something that affected 94 people out of 3/4 of a million high school teachers in the country. I don't think the Endowment can do things that way. I don't think, with all due respect for errors that we have made in the past, we have not rushed into programs without adequate analysis of what we were doing. I am not talking about bureaucracy. I'm talking about the exercise of taste and management.

Well, what . . . ?

Are we rushing Mr. Chairman?

I don't think we are rushing. I think we are moving with dispatch is the way I would put it. But I don't see the significance of the number 94. You are talking about the same number of people proportionately per dollar as you are talking about for college teachers. Now unless one wants to make the argument that one begins with the assumption that these are less important people or that this activity is less important for them I don't see the dollar per teacher argument is precise.

We are talking about, again to use round numbers, something like 8/10's of 1 percent of the entire Endowment budgets.

Yeah.

To me, that is a meaningful percentage. I think that, unless, well let me put it differently. Are we talking about a summer 1983 program?

Yes.

So we got plenty of time. There is no argument between you and me.

Okay. Fine. As far as towards the National Humanities Faculty I guess I am not in a conflict position here because we are not talking about a grant. I was a trustee of the NHF and I think I was most traveled college professor two years in a row to the schools for the NHF. I know the NHF work well. I think some of the NHF work here can function as a model for us. But I don't think we want to say that because the NHF is working this area that, therefore, we shouldn't do more. I think the argument is a judgment call. But it depends upon one's reaction to what one believes is the condition of the teaching of the humanities in the schools. I think there is more out there than NHF and its best programs can respond to and that we ought to respond to it. But I assure you, before we go ahead, we will get all our facts, take advantage of all the knowledge in this Endowment. We certainly, if we do locate it in fellowships, we will not use that as an excuse for not talking to anybody on this staff or outside of the staff who can be helpful. I think, in fact, the initial conversation I had with Jim and Gwen Grice, do correct if I am wrong, we talked about assembling very soon a small group of people who are quite expert in this area to carry on. We will have our ducks in a row.

Any other comments. I just want to make two additional ones. Louise, I couldn't agree more about the point you are making about regional workshops possibly and involvement of the state committees. We spoke about this, didn't we Don, the other day at lunch with the staff and I think it was Carol Watson who ordered at North Carolina, I think just by coincidence, had come up with this idea themselves. I think that is fine. If we do have say 15 workshops, if may be difficult for some people to travel far to leave family and so on. I see no reason why this program couldn't be a model if it's done well for state programs to imitate if they wish. We could have . . .

Part of the problem is that particularly under the new circumstances they may not be able to afford it, and therefore the cooperative effort becomes all the more critical.

Exactly. I mean, I think the sorts of things we are just beginning to talk about is supposing there is a regional conference and the roster's filled and a couple of people dropped out and maybe the state committee would be willing to underwrite a couple of teachers going up there for that conference because

80470

they wouldn't have to start a whole new program. That is, again, this kind of close kind of collaboration, in principle, I am entirely in agreement with. The only other thing, I don't know if this is a principle disagreement or just a quibble with George - I don't think we should focus necessarily on books that have been written since these people got out of school. I think we should, I am not one of these people who doesn't believe there have been no good books since 1900, but I think we should also pay attention to those books which the teachers invoke all the time, which they wave at the students but which they themselves have not read. And I think that is also a good target of . . .

I wasn't thinking of primary sources.

Oh. Okay, thanks George. Should we get some coffee? Thank you.

Can we resume?

We are at point D under Roman numeral, excuse me, under letter I. It is time for the report from planning and assessment studies. Ms. Silvers.

Silvers

In the open session, the staff of the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment reported on ongoing and proposed studies to obtain information relevant to the humanities. Most of the discussion centered upon the work of OPPA's evaluation and assessment studies branch. This unit is comparable to research and analysis units in other federal, state, and municipal agencies, and in most corporations and trade associations. I would like to try to explain in my own words what at least one of the missions of this unit is. There is a prevalent ontology for which necessary conditions of existing is being the subject of statistical studies or aggregations of data. (Laughter) The motto of this view, I am sorry, Armond, that I rewrote this a little bit. The motto of this view might be to be is to be sampled. One of the OPPA's special missions and I am being serious now, is to strengthen the humanities hold on this mode of reality. Humanists are not inclined to gather such information about themselves or characterize themselves statistically. One of OPPA's missions is to strengthen the tenuous hold of the humanities by doing in-house studies by commissioning studies and by insuring existing studies of academic statistics include the

3987
~~3987~~

humanities. Now, in discussing the budget situation, we are reminded that the figures being discussed refer to funds used to support a variety of studies. Some of these studies were funded through the usual competitive grant-making processes. Some were funded by contracts, and the figures we discussed excluded monies for evaluation studies. We ask whether some of these studies could be funded or supplemented through the challenge mechanism and staff told us that it was possible but that no such proposal has surfaced thus far. The budget situation is tight for this year. OPPA, sorry, the planning and assessment branch expended nearly \$1 million in FY 1981. It has \$730,000 this year, and next year's Presidential budget requests asks for \$500,000. I have written here that the staff anticipate full expenditure with no surplus of the \$730,000 this year. Most of this \$600,000 will be used for the three on-going data collection projects. That is the annual National Academy of Sciences survey of all earned doctorates, a bi-annual survey of the sample of PhD's, and the higher education panel at NCE which is a device used by NEH and NSF and NIH to perform relatively rapid response surveys of issues in higher education. That's for part of the \$600,000, the other part will be used by proposals which this council will consider in May. The remainder of the \$130,000 is being set aside for a special competition. Staff already is at work in organizing a competition to support between 6 and 10 studies designed to develop models for using existing data for further research conclusions and for institutional planning. The competition is designed to encourage new uses of the extraordinary data files of the National Academy of Sciences of data that this Endowment has and of other existing data. It is expected that applicants will come from at least three different sectors, individual investigators, professional or learned societies, and academic institutions seeking more information for institutional planning. Staff expects that NEH support will be provided through small contracts and that the NEH support would be just one part of the support for these projects. Staff is considering substantial cost-sharing and matching requirements. The committee believes these solicited studies are an important new NEH initiative useful in increasing the visibility of humanities as a whole and useful in making the humanities for humanists more attractive subjects for research by individuals who heretofore have desired to examine scientists, social scientists, and other persons who are not humanists. Concerning the budget for fiscal 1983, the staff could say no more than it was weighing a number of alternatives and trying to maintain existing activities,

~~7428~~
0497

meet anticipated demands and follow through on adventures which required on-going support and to do all this with a reduced budget of \$500,000. Now, we had a report on current projects. The first of the current projects study of private foundations. We were given a progress report on a staff study of over 34,000 grant records from 218 private foundations. This study is being hanchloed by Jeff Thomas. The study uses the foundation center's grant indexed data base and the study is examining trends and foundations given to the humanities in recent years. It should be noted that the study is being done completely in-house and will be stored in NEH's own computer and analysis will be done at least initially by the branch staff. Second, we were given a progress report on a study of funding of humanities activities at colleges and universities. We looked at copies of the latest draft questionnaire for this study which will be done under the supervision of the American Council on Education and which will use the aforementioned ACE Hep Handle. Staff said that preliminary results should be available by late summer, early fall of this year and that a publication should be available several months later. Third, we heard about a study on the status of women in the humanities. This is the I believe it was an RFP that was granted to PERS at Welsey. We learned from the staff that the project which was the branch's first competition study is now well underway and a report should be available on schedule by August of this year. We learned that when the contract had been negotiated staff asked that some additional persons be added to the advisory board including a token male and we were enlightened as to how that person was selected - what his salient characteristics were. (Laughter) I will let everybody give you their own stories about that. We did ask staff to share with us copies of the progress reports, which are being filed as each stage of this study is completed. Finally, we learned about the Congressionally-mandated study of gifts and matching, that is treasury funds. The study is just now being designed. It will have to be moved along quite expeditiously because the report is due to the U.S. Congress in December. We asked the staff if it envisioned a role for the committee and council for reviewing the report before it went to the Congress? The staff said it was not sure but would check this matter out with the Chairman. We did ask whether the study would include case studies of particular institutions. Committee members were concerned that the study address black colleges and we also encourage staff to consider using a reasonable distribution of projects by type of institution, by size of grants, and

~~8357~~
7478

by region. Staff said it would keep these questions in mind while preparing the design. We learned that the evaluation of challenge grants program had to be put on hold. The Chairman is not sure that the broad scale \$250,000 study outlined by staff needs to be done at this time. We heard about some new studies being planned. You have at your places, reports on the faculty characteristics of faculty in three disciplines: English, foreign language and history. These reports resulted from funding by the planning and assessment program and much work was done by staff who designed and oversaw the study which was conducted by ACE. There is a fourth report in the works. The fourth report is on philosophers. There were some problems with it and it is not ready yet. It will be mailed to you. I hoped that the problems had to do with the fact that it is very, very difficult to study philosophers because some problem like indeterminacy, they weren't sure whether they were waves or particles. But it turned out that the problems were much less interesting. Second, we can expect more reports on humanities PhD's in subsequent months. Particularly there is going to be one on the problems recent recipients of the doctorate are having in locating appropriate employment. For surveys, we asked staff, we looked to some surveys of various disciplines and noted that after things like English, History, etc., there was a category marked "Other" and we asked what goes into the category marked Other and learned that this was the place where emerging disciplines tended to turn up. We did ask staff if they would share with us the breakouts of the individuals who identified themselves under Other. We were given some proposals about studies that could be made if OPPA had some surplus funds should these exist. The staff presented three areas for consideration and the committee added one additional area. Staff gave the highest priority to a study on corporate support of the humanities and some of you will recall this is a study Dick Lieman often urged the Endowment to do. We know very little about corporate support for the humanities. There is considerable public interest and concern with this topic. Let me say right now that we did not rank these proposals. We think that many of them are very useful but we are not able at this time to say which would be the most important. Second, we heard about a proposal to do a study on ^{scholarly} Scarly communication. This is a very interesting proposal because it would be able to put in place this year what I understand would be an on-going effort to provide information about the state of Scarly communication. It might become very, very important for this Endowment to know what is happening

4

~~4457~~
8357

in the humanities in respect to those modes we use in order to preserve and disseminate the results of humanistic scholarship. Finally, there is a proposed study on development of evaluation tools. I think the committee is split right down the middle (which wasn't hard because there are only two of us) on whether this ought to be done. We both thought that this was very important but some of us, one of us, that this was frought with dangerments than one of the others felt. Finally, we recommended consideration of one additional study and that is the study of the current personnel practices of academic institutions in respect to recognizing the public humanities as opposed to the traditional scholarly work of faculty. That concludes my report on OPPA. Before I move to special programs, I wonder if I might make a brief report on a committee discussion that occurred in the interstices and throughout our work with both OPPA and special programs. Our committee discussions of methods recommended by staff to provide historically black colleges with access to the division's programs, reflected a collective unease with a unilateral assessment and determination of the needs of those institutions. We suspected that other divisions faced a similar dilemma. Thus, although we did consider and will tentatively make a recommendation in the special programs report, we believe a discussion of the question of how to assess the needs of black colleges warrants time on this agenda and we would like to make a proposal which addresses the issue. We and the staff are aware that there are, within the Endowment, limited data from and about these institutions. At the same time, because we believe implementation of the President's mandate and of the Chairman's request should begin as soon as possible. We agree that a full-scale needs assessment of historically black colleges would impose an unwarranted delay. Still, we think that there are many reasons which make it imperative to gather information from beyond the Endowment staff before we address the problem, or what we are going to do about historically black colleges. We recommend that as soon as possible after this council meeting, a group of advisors knowledgeable about historically black colleges including both about their faculties and about institutional needs be convened to comment upon the recommendations adopted by the council, the recommendations proposed by the various divisions. It is our expectation that such a group of advisors would: 1) assess the relevance of the Endowment's recommendations given the actual needs of these institutions; 2) comment on the feasibility of their implementing the various proposals, because if they can't implement what we

~~8677~~
4757

propose to give them there is no point in our making these proposals; and 3) provide an early opportunity for disseminating information throughout the target communities about the programs which the Endowment will undertake. Now, this advisory group would help serve our immediate goals in a timely way should at the same time be supplemented by a larger study which would aid us in long range planning and implementation of the aforementioned resolution which is addressed to all of our underserved constituents. The advisory group in the long range study would enable us to maintain divisional integrity while at the same time assuring Endowment-wide cohesiveness in the fulfillment of the mandate. Finally, it is our understanding that the Presidential order itself assumes a cooperative approach to determining the needs of historically black colleges. Mr. Chair would it be possible for me to switch places with somebody else and do special programs a bit later because I am out of breath.

Thank you.

Heaven
Yes. Okay. I would like to address the OPPA part of the report just very briefly. I have the impression that we are generating an awful lot of reports and information and there is almost no limit to what we could continue to do in this area and I have always wondered if anyone reads these and what impact they have and I was curious if you could advise us whether, in the course of your first six weeks, which of these reports has struck you as worth the money we have spent on them? Is that, maybe that is not a fair question? I have another part of it.

Bonny
No, it isn't. I had I guess I brought if not a prejudiced something of a squint toward these things and I think I was pretty candid with Armond and Stan about this. A little bit like I'm a philosopher, too. A little bit like Anita's beginning there in the encology of being studied, essays, assemblary, whatever it is. Yeah, but I don't know. I asked at a brief meeting about studies, just what we could count on, how valuable are they? I said that I had heard in one of these million things you hear before you get here - that studies can be very valuable because you can come up with any figures you want to justify whatever policy you want to follow. That is not what is going on here. I was assured and I am now confident. It seems to me that we have to have a reason for a study. That's why I said that I didn't see right now the

~~7304~~
8677

reason for the challenge grant study. It, like summer seminars for college teachers, seems to be one of these things that everyone applauds and thinks is a good idea. So, I think we're still discussing that, we're not going ahead with that study right now. But, these are the kinds of questions we are going to ask. I do think, for example though, to try to make some assessment of private corporate support for the humanities is very important. I think it's very important to this administration, it's very important for us, so we can best know our place and proper function at least in financial terms.

The other half was whether you thought we could use OPPA more extensively in assessing the effectiveness of programs that we have sustained for five to fifteen years. We have never, in my judgment, found a proper mechanism for assessing whether what we do makes much difference. The formerly named SPE, Special Project Evaluation, were special and were project but rarely contained evaluation. There's no other mechanism (that I know of) so it occurred to me that we could generate fewer facts and more hard judgments out of the capacities of OPPA.

I'm sure we could. Again, one relies (as I think one should) on the judgment and intelligence of the people there. They of course want guidance from me and from the council, the other members of the council. Yes, let's just stick with the principle which is that we will really try to discuss and set down the reasons for any particular study at any particular time. Armond and I have begun to talk a little bit about things we can find out in terms of evaluation. All I can promise you is that we'll continue on that front. Armond, do you want to add anything?

Yes. I just wanted to say, Jack, I'm sure the staff would be quite happy to provide the use specifically, but maybe other council members too, of some very specific information about the use of these various things. There are three principal audiences for these reports: one is my own office in the work that we do in the long range, short range planning, budget preparation, budget defense. The second audience is the staff of the agency itself so that reports like these on faculty, specifically, have been supported by us and designed more than supported, designed by us using outside people in order to develop information which say the fellowship division staff have been wanting to have

7304
SOT

about the actual numbers of faculties and certain characteristics around whom they then plan their summer seminar programs and fellowship programs. The third and actually the greatest audience in terms of the usage is the field itself. We have, for example, at the National Academy of Science through the annual records survey and the biannual survey, we get from them regularly listings of people, institutions throughout the country, who are asking for this data and the uses to which they put that. So that I think we have quite an extensive record that we can point to. I want to endorse, as I guess I must, the Chairman's statement.

(Long pause in tape 3 here)

We are very, very selective and sensitive and have actually been, I believe, extremely cautious and conservative in undertaking these studies. We have not supported any, we are not designing any, unless we ourselves have been persuaded by others or because of specific uses that we would need the data for, before we would undertake these. So, I'm quite confident that we will be able to provide you with quite compelling evidence, I hope.

I wonder if I can have Anita read the last sentence of her report again. I don't think I've quite got it. It has something to do with the non-academic aspects of the work in the universities?

I think I can explain that, Leon. Traditionally, those of us who are in the university setting are routinized, given tenure and promoted on the basis of a number of things. Teaching is one we hope. Second is scholarly activity as defined by publishing journals, etc. The notion is that over the past few years there has been greater and greater recognition, at least in some institutions, of the academic's obligation to bring our work to the wider community. And that's true particularly for many of us who are in publicly supported institutions. Now, what's proposed is to attempt to find out to what extent we're humanists. This sort of activity is being recognized in personnel decisions. There are virtues in doing this, there are problems in doing this, it may be just as well to let the rumor mill going on this is to find that fact.

5098
~~17710~~

Thank you.

A couple of comments on the OPPA report and then I wanted to return to the interstices. First I think in response to the question, I'm a new member and apparently it's become traditional to have two people so that we actually were pretty good. We only had a few disagreements. But, I had to be oriented. I'm new to the committee and I was impressed by the adolescence of the group in the sense that this division, like any other division, does question itself. I think that they work very hard and it was pleasing to me and I think pleasing to them to see that, finally, the information that is being generated is being requested by, for example, the MLA for their own self-study, for their own purposes, and the NHA and so on. So, the value of it they begin to see and that they will begin to utilize in some way. I think that that's one of the responses but that's a long process. I think that we are in a transitional state with that. I'd also like to comment on the recommendations that were made to us for the proposed funds. Our feeling in both committees and both divisions that we dealt with was that it was difficult to rank them partly because we had no idea what the monies were that we were talking about overall. We had no idea what the recommendations were going to be from other committees and we had hoped that at some point there would be sort of a larger discussion about the proposals in general with some council input as to how to rank the various proposals that are going to be made. And how the redistribution or requests for redistribution of funds would be made. Finally, I would like to get some sense of the council to our interim report about the responses to the needs of historically black colleges.

I see. I'm Louise. I'm not sure that this is the appropriate time to do it because what we really are encouraging a general discussion looking at it and we haven't heard half the division's reports yet.

I guess what I'm asking is does the council feel that there is a need for a general discussion? That's what I'm asking. For time on the agenda for discussion.

Of what, I'm sorry?

56276
1746

Louise, I don't know what it is you're searching for. We all discussed this in our individual committees as to what we were going to do and how we were going to take a look at it.

The question that we were addressing was that we were, the committee, the staff, that came to us was rather unsure as to whether or not they were really addressing the needs of historically black colleges. We were uneasy about that as well. That, in fact, we felt we were defining those needs rather than responding to them. The question that we're raising is whether or not we need to make this a cooperative effort with the recipients of our programs. The three points that were raised that might be addressed by the convening of a panel, would be that that panel would 1) take a look at the recommendations that we've made and say this is relevant, and say this is not relevant. We could do this, this is what we need, this is what we can't need or rather we can't do.

I'd like to speak to that a second because the point is, in fact, larger than the Endowment. It's the one that we have had a couple of exchanges. Channing has talked to the White House about this a few times. If you multiply the endeavor that we're going through times the number of Federal agencies that have an effect on historically black colleges and universities and then turn the circumstance around to think of yourself as a president of one of those institutions you suddenly realize that you are confronted with an increased energy and demand, in fact, for proposals from every agency of Federal Government with which you have impact. We have 32 programs at the Endowment within the six divisions. That's a minor feature of a total landscape. So I'm not responding for council to your question but I would point out that the Endowment itself has spoken to the White House about the need to do this perhaps also on a larger scale so as not to be, in fact, a burden on the very institutions which this initiative is designed to effect. There is a question, for example, would it be helpful to consolidate programs?

That's really the essence of the proposal because my reading of the Presidential Order (which I don't have with me and I may have also misread that) was that, in fact, that's part of the order. That the order in some indirect way says

56276
497386

that the plans that are prepared should be reviewed at least if not be planned together.

much larger percentage of the funds going to institutions of higher learning. Therefore, no special programs were proposed to increase access in these programs beyond current practice. The staff proposed special initiatives in the area of challenge grants. It acknowledged that we need a better understanding of the special characteristics and needs of these institutions in understanding about how useful challenge grant support might be in fulfilling any portion of these needs and this is where the notion of trying to find out from the possible recipients whether this is a mechanism that can use before we try to thrust it upon them came up. We agreed with the staff that we need to know better what is feasible for these institutions, what their needs really are and what the agency as a whole can do to address these needs effectively. There apparently is a body of knowledge and experience to be pulled together but we need to know what our experience has been, what has failed and succeeded, and we need to access that in a somewhat systematic but brief way before proceeding too far. We suggested that well, we've done all that. The challenge grant plan has the following elements: recruitment of an IPA from higher education administration with knowledge of these institutions; the publication of a booklet was based on the experience of panel review that will summarize the basic strengths and weaknesses of proposals; a consultant grant service to help applicants with real merit without the resources of larger and more developed institutions; and special mailing to program deadlines to encourage active participation of minority institutions. We wish to emphasize again our sense of the need for coordinated effort agency-wide. Second, we hope that this is only the first step in addressing the need for increased access to the NEH, currently under represented scholars and humanities institutions. Next, we discussed two plans from the special programs division staff for special deadlines. One of which involves the reprogramming of funds within the division during this fiscal year. The first, which does not represent involved reprogramming, is an effort through special projects to encourage a few major projects in connection with the bicentennial of the American Constitution. A limited number of planning grants not to exceed about 25,000 would be offered to organizations and institutions to plan activities for a broad audience. The committee was very supportive of this activity and we discussed ways of ensuring that.

497386
~~6679~~
497

That's correct. But I think that the way that that is worded exactly is that it is that the Federal Plan will be reviewed. It's not that the individual agency plans will be reviewed or within that the smaller unit. I'm just trying to state those circumstances as accurately as possible. We have been at least raising the questions (I think other agencies, too) of whether there is an intermediate stage to present a Federal Plan full-blown, however long that is, for review at that stage might be cumbersome or too late in the process. So, I guess what I'm saying is I have some reservations myself and I think the staff might about our starting a planning process at any age only to have that echoed throughout the Federal Government leading to a pyramid which has an echo above it and so on up the process. There seems to be some . . .

Even what we were saying was that even within divisions it was already suggested that there are some plans that will need to be coordinated. But in what way? It seems to me that it would just be politic if not nice to have them be part of the process.

Anita, you still want to finish the other half?

This is the Special Programs Report. During the policy session devoted to special programs, a number of substantial issues were addressed. First the Chairman asked us to give him some guidance on the handling of requests for support from Jefferson Lecturers for additional work related to the lecture. The committee thought that assuming such requests do not become a routine procedure following every Jefferson Lecture, the Chairman should handle them on a case-by-case basis using the Chairman's grant mechanism and I remarked yesterday that it's one of the rare cases in which a committee says "we don't want to see anything". At some point though we thought that it would be useful to raise the question about whether there are mechanisms for getting greater mileage out of the Jefferson Lectures. That might be a general council discussion. Secondly, the committee had a sustained discussion of the division's plan related to historically black colleges. Staff report to the committee noted that about 10% of program development funds for the past fiscal year and about 3% of the youth projects funds had been awarded to historically black colleges for projects. Because colleges are only one portion of the applicant

universe for either of these two programs, the figures represent a broad impact for diverse groups of the population. The second effort involves reprogramming of funds from program development youth projects. The proposal is for incentive awards for humanities programming in children's radio and television and a special deadline in youth programs this year. This idea was enthusiastically endorsed and staff was urged to investigate certain questions further and report back to the Chairman. Council committee members were particularly concerned that potential size of grant amounts be carefully investigated and that involvement with projects currently partially funded, or in developed proposal stage, be explored. Council committee members were most interested in an additional idea. Occasionally we have to add some things to the agenda. We would like to investigate establishing a network of past youth grantees, those are recipients of youth grants. Keeping up with their activities and careers through some type of association and/or newsletter. We think this can be done fairly easily given our existing resources. We urge the staff to develop this idea further and to report back. The committee members felt very strongly that former youth grantees represent a promising group of young scholars and humanists, and that we ought to nurture them beyond the completion of the project for which they have been funded. We did have some talk about the science, technology and human values program but we did that in the closed session and I guess we'll report on it in the closed session.

Thank you. Any discussion? Okay, Research Programs, Mr. Hammond.

Yes, the committee discussed the document reprogramming possibilities for 1982 and we endorse that memo. That was not a point for discussion. But, with the allocation of funds within the division for the proposed 1983 budget, there was quite substantial concern about some of the decisions regarding certain programs. The committee noted that the figures did not particularly reflect the earlier discussion of the division committee February of last year. There was concern about how the decisions were made and I assume that in the council's budget committee it was felt that such decisions should reflect the consideration of the divisions of various programs given by the division committee. But, we were particularly concerned that the council committee's discussion and I think recommendation from last February specifically with the resolution to reduce programs across the board in that division (as I recall) that was

512989
61684

not the case as reflected in the 1983 proposed budget figures. Now, presumably, each division will have an opportunity for us to present its judgment to the budget committee, for the executive committee or whichever is appropriate, whatever it is to be named, for purposes of deciding allocation of funds among the various division programs. We discussed as all of you have a document on plans for increasing access of historically black colleges. The discussion focused on what was considered the appropriate things for the research division to do. We had four rather specific suggested practices. Three were quite easily endorsed. There was some concern about a fourth. For instance, a survey of research tool needs in this area could be undertaken by the appropriate scholarly association; the staff would assist in the preparation of such an application as has been the case in such fields as 18th century studies, philosophy of classics. Another suggestion would be an archival assistance grant to the United Negro College Fund to support archival consultancies for member institutions. Well, let me go on. Third, a survey of Afro-American source materials like the women's history sources survey. The fourth of which engaged some discussion in the committee, more than the others. I'll just read, "Since the division's activities are to a major extent geared to the scholarly book production, we could ensure that the libraries of these institutions receive three copies of volumes whose production had been supported through the publications program". There was some hesitancy in the committee (not everyone) about the utility or blank - and you'll have to fill in the blank. But it formed the basis of the useful discussion in this area. But, as I say, there was certainly more overall enthusiasm for the other three proposals. That, pretty much, sums what we discussed here.

Thank you..

I think they want to add some things here.

Okay, I just wanted to say that it's news to me about recommendations in February, about reductions and then that being reflected in the 1983 budget. If they are not reflected in the 1983 budget, it's because, as I said, it's news to me. You certainly should not take this as a rebuke of that advice. I simply am not aware of that advice.

Bonwith

I think we're going to have to go back and review that ourselves. I was surprised too to hear that and I do not recall that recommendation in that form. We may very well have departed from advice and I just need to find out what it is we did. I'm surprised too.

Josh

Perhaps I could clarify this a little bit. The committee, at the time, was asked to consider whether any particular category within the division could take a deeper cut than any other. The decision was no, they were of equal value, they didn't want to see anything lost. But, at the same time, that any reduction could be evenly applied. There was no council given to the Chairman at that time that any deeper cut would come up. What we have in the 1983 budget, of three instances where the cuts aren't that deeper and that is state, local and regional studies, translation, the publications and that is the point where that came up.

Since I was chair of the committee at that point I was going to say that, Harold, you have expressed my recollection. That we said that there should not be any deeper cuts in any individual programs necessarily, that all the individual programs of the divisions were important. But, that given difficult circumstances we would in fact use criteria such as national significance and reaching the largest number of people as a way of cutting it. That is, indeed, what I see reflected in the decisions to cut state, local, regional translations and publications somewhat more severely than the other areas.

Thank you. Leon, yes?

I'd like to raise the point about sending books to the traditionally black colleges. Among all the surveys that we have done, has there ever been a survey of the libraries in these institutions? How would they compare with similar non-divisional black colleges? What is their basic need, if there is such a thing? Perhaps that might clarify the intentions of the part of the divisions of this council.


Fine. Armond?

648T
2176

I just wanted to speak on this point about the 1983 levels. Two points: first, the council's discussion last February had to do with the reduced 1982 appropriation request and after that February discussion the chairman, taking into consideration the various comments which were made, did make decisions about that reduced request. In those levels that followed, he did not make proportional cuts, he did not make proportional cuts at that time. These were then reviewed in May in subsequent councils and I did not hear any discussion like this. Secondly, as regards the 1983 budget, specifically, the levels that you're looking at once again were specifically presented to the budget committee in July and then the full council and the research committee in August in which case they reviewed these as to what the distribution of the funds would be at level 2. Those were reincorporated into the full OMB budget request which was made in November which was reviewed again by the council and the individual division committees. So, once again, I'm surprised that these figures should come as a surprise to certain members of the research committee.

That was covered yesterday at the discussion, that sequence of events. I think what there has not been, however, is a discussion of what constitutes national priority. I don't think we've got that.

Meribeth's recollection of the discussion of last February and my own are the same but we had three criteria which we worked out. One was national significance, number 2 are there any others who can do this thing or if the NEH does not do it, will it not be done, and number 3 was breadth of audience. However, at no point were state and local programs treated as enjoying a lower priority on account of these criteria. At no point was the translation program or the publication program or the conference program - all of which were cut from two-thirds to fifty percent which are very heavy cuts for programs of this size - subjected to this kind of discussion and so, I believe I speak for the others who were present yesterday, I think it was the consensus of the committee that cuts of such a drastic order in already exceedingly modest programs, called into question the very viability of some of the programs, particularly publications and translation, as to state and local studies. We were going from \$1,000,000 to \$300,000. That seems a rather Draconian cut on a program of considerable substance as distinct from what everybody else does.



9481
~~506~~

Okay, I got it. Let me try to track this down and report back. Education programs, Meribeth Thorton.

X

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to report that the novice education committee was treated well by the staff. The members of the education committee are, like the members of many other committees here, entirely new to the committee. Several of us came in on Wednesday afternoon for a kind of preliminary review with the staff. I think all of us had a very positive reaction and we were very thankful to the staff and very appreciative of their willingness to meet with us on Wednesday afternoon. To give us a very general overview of the work of the division, the historical development of the different programs in the division and the way in which everything operates. We also had an opportunity Wednesday afternoon to meet a number of staff people, which we continued, in fact, at our meeting on Thursday morning. In the policy discussion on Thursday morning, we considered our three major topics, one of which I've already talked about so I will not repeat it, and that was the issue of the fellowships for high school teachers - that is, the seminars for high school teachers in the fellowship division. Second, we looked at the budget figures and the reprogramming possibilities. The education division I think is very popular in the Endowment, since it looks like we will have a surplus that could go to another division chiefly arising through a great fall-off in applications in the elementary and secondary programs, which we attribute to the reports that we were going to be drastically cut. And so, it does look like we will be giving money to some other divisions although we still wish to insist that we still might want to use it. We are only tentative, we may be giving it with one hand and taking it away with the other. With respect to our discussion of the draft memo on minority access for historically black colleges, we were given figures which showed interestingly enough that 50 of the approximately 110 historically black colleges have already received some form of grant assistance from the education division. We were quite pleased with that. Furthermore, the division director had done some research on the approximately 60 or so historically black colleges who had not received assistance from the division and discovered that most of them were really very small institutions usually with under 500 students. We did see that we were already reaching some of this target group under the Executive Order. The staff of the division felt quite strongly and the committee agreed with the fact that we should

not have any kind of specific set-aside program within the division budget for historically black colleges. The staff proposed, and the committee endorsed, two different strategies for increasing our contacts with historically black colleges and both of them build on successful conferences that the, or strategies for conferences, that the education division has held in the past. The first type would be regional humanities conferences to which representatives of the historically black colleges would be invited. These conferences would be hosted by historically black colleges that have been successful in our grant programs. These would not be grantsmanship conferences of the sort that the division has held but would rather be conferences on general humanities programming and what can be accomplished with NEH funds in such colleges. The division would, in effect, solicit certain successful institutions - that are historically black colleges - would ask them to host such conferences and would send division staff to them. They would have presentations, not only by the host institution, but also by other historically black colleges in the region that had been successful grantees from the education division. The second strategy would be connected with specific humanities disciplines rather than these general conferences. The division proposes to hold conferences in specific divisions, probably or perhaps, though this has not been worked out that carefully, in conjunction with regional professional association meetings. One example that was used yesterday was the possibility of perhaps having a two-day conference for historically black colleges in the area of history the two days before the three-day Southern Historical Association Meetings, which would give the people from the colleges travel money to attend the professional meetings as well as giving them an opportunity to come together and talk about upgrading the curriculum in their institutions in the particular discipline that was an issue. The staff proposal centered on the idea of integrating black studies materials into the general curriculum of the colleges. That is, for example, integrating the study of black history into general American history courses, or whatever. The committee encouraged the staff to define the curricular aims of these disciplinary conferences somewhat more flexibly so as to include not just the integration of black study materials into the general curriculum, but also other ideas for improving humanities curriculum at those colleges and including the possibilities of working on black studies programs among other things. Nevertheless, we did endorse both ideas very heartily and think that both of them are very possible and since they do build

6516
QH2

on successful models that the division has used before, they do address the needs of these historically black colleges and that such proposals could be very successful. We then concluded our meeting with a general briefing from the division director on the review methods and procedures of the division, which again, since all of us were novices to the committee, we very much needed and that's the end of my report, Mr. Chairman and if any one else on the committee wishes to add to it I would be willing to do so at this time.

Schaefer

I've enjoyed this morning immensely getting to know the new Chairman and being impressed with its commitment not only to education also to helping the historically black colleges. And also in light with what you said, Meribeth, about regional conferences, I know that a lot of people in Washington look for any opportunity to get out of Washington. I think credibility could be given to these regional conferences and so much accomplished if the new chairman at the appropriate time would consider attending some of these regional conferences around the country and I'm sure the members around this table can help step these conferences up. The purpose of that would not only to be give credibility and access to the black colleges but to talk about a whole host of other things and now for the chairman to meet his constituency and go out to the communities and reinforce that the National Endowment for the Humanities is really here to stay. We're talking about an age of volunteerism. You can also broaden the conference. We can help to include opinion-makers, to include corporate leaders and to really reinforce the perception of the NEH. I think that this really is very important, too, and also of course a lot of people in my community ask who the new chairman is and I assure them that the new chairman is the one who likes Abraham Lincoln and not the one who is putting forth the theory that Lincoln died of natural causes. I just think it would be an opportunity for the chairman to go out and meet the constituency, go out and promote the idea of volunteerism, go out and maintain the perception of what the NEH is, that we're here to stay and also reiterate the support and commitment to historically black institutions.

Any other comments on the education? George.

I'd like to make one small point just because I haven't heard it made. I trust it is implicit. Surely ninety-odd percent of the work that goes on in

historically black colleges is not necessarily directly concerned with black studies, American studies, or anything else. It is concerned with the humanities. My understanding, and I trust everybody's understanding, is the access to the faculty and libraries and the students at these institutions to the humanities, including black studies. That's just a small part of the area.

That was precisely the committee's point yesterday, George. So I mean as I say we encourage the staff to be somewhat more flexible in their definitions of what the discipline conferences would. They define it broadly, in fact.

It's proposals like these or interpretations of proposals like this that made our committee suggest that there be some attempt before any thing is locked in place, to ensure that the targets or recipients of these efforts want what we're proposing. Because I, like George, immediately raised the question "Do these 110 institutions want of all things that they want to do in the humanities, to increase their black studies curriculum". There are other things that we can't imagine they want, which they would consider much more important and we might.

Sure. Okay, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen at this point in our meeting in the agenda the meeting of the National Council on the Humanities is closed to the public so we can begin the consideration in the first instance of the selection of the 1983 Jefferson Lecturer and then consideration of proposals. I wonder if we can just take one second. I don't mean to break the meeting but to just take a moment to allow the public members to leave, but also for the council members to locate the Jefferson Lecture book before them and we can begin the discussion. Mr. Dille will lead the discussion on behalf of the Jefferson Lecture Committee.