

memorandum

DATE: April 10, 1980

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: B. J. Stiles *BJS*

SUBJECT:

TO: Participants in April 24th Meeting

We look forward to the meeting on April 24th to review the process used by the Division to evaluate and fund proposals from state humanities programs. The meeting will begin at 2:00 p.m. in Room 1023, and we expect to adjourn by 4:00 p.m.

The notebook attached contains all the materials which pertain to this meeting. I hope that you will be able to examine these documents rather carefully prior to the meeting itself.

We've invited two panelists to join us and offer their views and suggestions. They are Maxine van de Wetering, professor of Philosophy at the University of Montana, and Robert Roggeveen, Administrator of Corporate Contributions for Aetna Life and Casualty, who is a former member and chair of the Connecticut Humanities Council. They did not serve on the same panel.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this very useful review.

Enclosure

BJS/mae



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

The enclosed materials were provided to participants in
, on April 24, 1980,
a specially convened meeting/~~xx~~ of members of the National
Council on the Humanities, the Executive Committee of
the Federation of Public Programs in the Humanities, and
the staff of the Division of State Programs, NEH.

The meeting was a result of a resolution approved by
the member states of the Federation at their ~~xxxxxx~~ 1979
meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Participants included:

Nancy Davies, member, National Council
A.D. Frazier, member, National Council
B.J. Stiles, Director, Division of State Programs, NEH
Donald Gibson, Deputy Director, Division of State Programs
Betsy McCreight, President, Federations
Robert Vaughan, Federation
James Veninga, Federation
Steven Weiland, Federation
~~M~~axine Van de Wetering, former panelist for DSP.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. State Program Review Process
- II. National Council Comments
- III. Funding Options
- IV. NEH Staff Role in the Review Process
- V. Proposal Format
- VI. Lists of Panelists/Reviewers
February 78 - May 80
 - A. Panelists
 - B. Reviewers
 - C. Statistics
- VII. Form Letters to Panelists/Reviewers
- VIII. Enclosures to Panelists/Reviewers
 - A. Brief History
 - B. General Questions
- IX. Sample Review Schedule

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



The State Program Review Process

Following the award of state grants, the NEH liaison officer now writes to inform the committee in some detail of the reviewers' and panelists' comments about the committee's proposal. It seemed to us, in the light of this new procedure, that it might be helpful to all of the state committees to have a clear picture of the total review process for state proposals to the Endowment. A description of that process follows.

Proposals received from the states are each sent out for review by four to six persons, drawn from the disciplines of the humanities and from the general public. In addition to attempting to draw on a variety of disciplines, professions, institutions and organizations for reviewers and panelists, we also try to mix persons with some background in the state program, such as former committee members or project directors, with others who have had no previous contact with the state program. Reviewers are not asked to review a proposal from a state with which they have close contact, and we try to give them each no more than two proposals, in order to encourage careful and thorough analysis. A brief description of the state program and a short set of questions to guide reviewers supplement the often rather extensive telephone discussion of the history and nature of the program which accompanies our request to the reviewer to evaluate state proposals.

All of the pending proposals are sent to yet another group of "outside evaluators," a review panel which meets together at the Endowment for a full day to analyse and comment on the apparent state of the program generally as well as on particular proposals. Both the reviewers' comments and those of the panel are sent to the committee of the National Council on the Humanities which has particular oversight responsibilities for the state program. The Council committee has about three weeks to review the state committee's description of its program and plans for the future, along with the reviewer, panel and staff observations about the state program's operations. The National Council on the Humanities, composed of 26 individuals appointed by the President of the United States, meets quarterly to review applications. The National Council committee which has specific "state program" oversight usually meets with the State Program staff for a half day preceding the Council meeting in order to review the program as a whole, as well as each individual state application. The chairman of this committee reports to the full Council on its discussion and recommends levels of funding and any conditions it sees fit to place on the grant. The full Council votes on the proposals, and its vote is a recommendation to the Chairman of the NEH, who has the final authority to make or deny grant awards.

05/17/78

Question 1. Concisely describe the application review process used in your Division from the point of initial contact with the applicant to the notification to the applicant of the decision of the Chairman. If the review process varies among programs within the Division, please describe and explain the variances.

Answer: NEH makes available to each state committee a procedures manual with eleven components which describe legislative, administrative, and programmatic requirements or guidelines. A major component of that manual is a 31-page discussion of the proposal format and review process. Other components of the manual describe financial reporting requirements, quarterly reports, and the 12-month funding request.

In addition to making this manual available to each existing committee--and to any others who want to know how to submit a proposal to the Division of State Programs--the Division employs five professional staff who work with the state committees. Each staff member is assigned a liaison responsibility for ten states and one territory, and makes on the average two visits per year to each of these 11 programs. In addition, almost weekly contact is maintained through letters and phone calls between NEH program officers and the leadership of the state committees. These contacts provide the committees with numerous opportunities to understand and clarify NEH guidelines, priorities, and concerns.

Proposals received from the states are sent out for review by five or six persons, drawn from the disciplines of the humanities and from the general public. Each reviewer is asked to review two proposals. Following that review, a panel of outside evaluators meets at the NEH for a full day to analyze and comment on the individual proposals, as well as on the program as a whole. The panel is usually comprised of eight persons, representing both the academic disciplines in the humanities and the general public. Panels normally consider an average of 8-10 proposals.

A synopsis of the reviewers' and panelists' comments, along with staff comments and recommendations, are sent to the committee of the National Council on the Humanities which has particular oversight responsibilities for the state program. The Council committee receives, about three weeks in advance of each quarterly meeting, a workbook which includes descriptions of the program and future plans for each of the state proposals being considered, along with reviewer, panel and staff comments. The committee meets for about half-a-day to consider these proposals, and to determine recommendations on each application. The entire National Council, at its quarterly meeting, hears the report of the committee, and discusses and votes upon the Council committee's motion to fund, reject, fund with conditions, or to defer each application. The NEH Chairman has the final authority to make or deny grant awards.

Question 2. Describe the practice of the Division with respect to the solicitation of outside written evaluations of applications from independent reviewers.

a. How are reviewers selected? Who makes the selection? Reviewers are selected in several ways: -- State committees are invited to identify former members, former project directors, and persons within the state with particular interest in public humanities programs. (No reviewer evaluates a proposal from his or her own state.)

-- State committees and national/regional non-profit organizations, civic groups or cultural institutions which are important to public humanities programming (i.e. labor unions, the League of Women Voters, librarians or museum personnel, etc.) are asked to suggest names of potential reviewers.

-- Other programs in the Endowment are invited to nominate individuals whose expertise or interests would be especially relevant to the needs of state programs, (i.e. participants in Fellowships in the Professions).

-- An agency-wide computerized list of reviewers is available. The actual list was derived from minority and two-year institutions.

The staff participates in the selection of reviewers; the final selection is the responsibility of the Division Director.

b. How many reviews, on the average, are solicited for each application? Five or six reviewers are asked to read and evaluate each proposal.

c. Are written evaluations made available to panels? If not, why not? Panelists do not receive the reviewers' evaluations. The Division has found that it is useful to subject the proposals to these two independent review processes to help ensure that maximum objectivity and diversity prevail in responding to these diverse programs. Since the fundamental goal of using panelists and reviewers in this program is to enable state committees to benefit from the counsel and expertise of knowledgeable humanists and concerned members of the public, independent judgments of reviewers and panelists have proven beneficial.

d. Are staff summaries of written evaluations made available to panels? Staff summaries of written evaluations are not made available to panels.

Question 3. Describe the procedure used to prepare for and conduct a panel session.

a. Describe the criteria used for the selection of panelists.

- Either professional expertise in one of the disciplines of the humanities, or acknowledged leadership in one or more important public sectors - business, labor, civic organizations, media, etc.
- Broad geographic diversity, representing not only different parts of the country but communities of varying size and with differing cultural characteristics.
- A blend of persons with significant previous experience in state programs, and persons who are new to the concept and work of state humanities programs. No current member or staff of a committee may serve as either a reviewer or panelist.

b. What materials and instructions are sent to the panelists? Each panelist is sent: (1) a complete copy of each proposal (plus all appendices and attachments); (2) a short description of state programs; (3) the NEH program announcement; and (4) the suggested questions for proposal review (copy attached).

c. What materials, if any, are panelists asked to prepare? Panelists are asked to prepare written notes, which they use as the basis for the panel discussion and copies of which are kept with the NEH staff at the conclusions of the panel meeting. Panelists may be asked to prepare additional notes and comments in those instances in which the proposal receives serious and extensive criticism during the panel discussion.

d. What materials, if any, are panelists provided at the meeting? No additional materials are provided at the meeting.

e. Who chairs the panel meeting and what procedures are followed to conduct the meeting? The panel meeting is chaired by the Division Director, whose role is to ensure that the panel focuses in some depth on the major questions which the panelists are asked to consider in analyzing the proposals. He ensures that all panelists' views are heard and considered, and serves as moderator and clarifier of divergent views. Other staff are present in the panel room but do not participate in the discussion. Upon direct request, they may provide factual or clarifying information. NEH staff are expected to take a neutral stance. Each proposal is considered for up to an hour, generally following the questions with which the panelists had been provided.

f. What is the role and responsibility of the staff at panel meetings? The staff, with the exception of the Director, attend the panel meetings as observers and recorders, speaking only to clarify facts.

g. What specific criteria are used by panelists to assess applications? The criteria used to assess the proposals are embodied in the attached questions, which panelists are asked to focus on as they analyze the proposals. The proposals are not evaluated primarily against each other, but in relationship to the humanities resources and the particular geographical, economic, ethnic and cultural characteristics of that individual state. In that context, the goals, guidelines and procedures, the program development and the evaluation plans of each state proposal are evaluated independently.

h. By what means is the disposition of the panel concerning an application determined? The panel does not rank the applications, for the reasons cited above in "g". However, at the conclusion of the consideration of each proposal, a consensus is stated by a panelist or the chair. Should there be any dissent from that stated consensus, it is fully recorded and represented in the summary which is prepared.

i. Under what circumstances do panels propose "conditions" for applications being recommended for funding? Panelists do not propose "conditions" per se but do indicate which if serious in nature or extent, may serve as the basis for a condition being placed on the award. The staff drafts the recommendations for conditions, which are presented to the Council committee for consideration and action. Panelists tend to focus their concern on program goals and general directions and major objectives. When they sense that a proposal fails to show consistency between the needs and characteristics of a particular state and the funding/program guidelines which it proposes to use as bases for making grants, then panelists may urge NEH to withhold some portion of eligible funds pending greater clarity, assurance, or evidence that a state can reasonably and effectively accomplish its proposed plan. Panelists may also question the adequacy of a state's committee structure and balance, or ask for further evidence that the humanities will be central in the regrants funded by the committees. Most concerns raised by a panel which result in conditions will be substantive, not administrative or procedural.

j. Under what circumstances does the staff propose conditions for applications being recommended for funding? Those conditions proposed by staff generally are framed to express the concerns and criticisms raised by reviewers and panelists. Therefore, substantive conditions are based upon the core concerns identified in the questions previously referenced and attached. Any additional conditions are generally associated with staff or administrative matters and are supported by knowledge and judgments reached by NEH staff over time through site visits, extensive observation of a committee's activities and decisions, and public criticisms or suggestions for improving the humanities program in that state. (Only one condition has been placed on an award which was premised exclusively on staff judgment; all others have been outgrowths of reviewer and panelists concerns.)

4. Does the Division use consultants for the review of specific applications? If so, under what circumstances? Are the findings of consultants made available to panelists?

The Division of State Programs does not use consultants for the review of specific applications.

5. Does the Division consult other Federal agencies concerning specific applications? If so, under what circumstances? Does the Division have a formal consultation process with any other Federal agency to identify duplication or overlap of applications?

Since the possibility of duplication or overlap with other Federal agencies does not exist in the funding of state programs, this Division does not consult with other Federal agencies about specific applications.

6. Describe the conflict-of-interest policy of the Division concerning written independent reviews and panel discussions.

Independent written reviews on an application are done only by persons neither resident in the state with which the application is concerned nor with close ties to that state. The Division, as a matter of policy, draws its panelists from states not submitting proposals in the group being reviewed. Persons with significant ties to individuals or institutions in any of the states being considered are asked to withhold comment during panel discussion. Their written analyses and comments may be considered by staff or the National Council. No current member or staff of a state committee may serve as a reviewer or panelist.

7. Describe any procedures used by the staff to verify information provided in applications concerning the identification of consultants and advisory committees.

NEH staff are in frequent contact with state committees. Site visits to their policy and regranting meetings insure first-hand knowledge of the state committees and their staffs. Biographical information on each committee member and staff member is included in each state proposal. Consultants are seldom retained by state committees, but when they are, full advance information is normally part of the proposal. Very few committees have established any regular or frequent use of any advisory committees beyond the elected committee membership itself.

8. Describe the circumstances under which staff provides extended assistance to individual applicants.

The Division staff provides extensive and continuing support and assistance to each state committee through a variety of means. Each program officer in the Division is responsible for liaison with ten states and one territory. Program officers work closely with the committee and staff in each state to insure maximum coordination and flow of information between the NEH and state programs. Program officers make an average of two site visits per state per year. These contacts are augmented by an annual national meeting of state committees, regional orientation meetings for new committee members, and frequent mail and telephone contact. The procedures manual of the Division of State Programs provides extensive guidance to the committees on legislative requirements and NEH program guidelines, as well as formats for preparing reports and proposals to the Endowment.

9. Describe the general circumstances under which the staff would recommend an application for approval that had been recommended for disapproval by a panel.

This has not occurred in state programs. Since the proposal is a two-year contract between the Endowment and the state committee, it is conceivable that an operating program could undergo radical changes which would cause basic shifts in focus and responsibility. Given the frequent contacts between NEH and state programs, this seems virtually impossible. Should a panel fundamentally misunderstand a state's proposal, NEH staff would seek to correct or balance that misunderstanding or misrepresentation. In the unlikely event of such disparate responses to a state's proposal, the divergent views would be summarized and brought to the attention of the oversight committee of the National Council.

10. Describe the general circumstances under which the staff would recommend an application for disapproval that had been recommended for approval by a panel.

Again, this has not occurred thus far in the experience of state programs. Based on current guidelines, it is possible to speculate that the staff might recommend disapproval, contrary to a panel's favorable views, if:

- Staff knowledge about the financial management of the current program concluded that the proposal distorted or misrepresented the actual conditions within the state;
- The current state program was not in technical compliance with the requirements of our authorizing legislation, and had been reviewed by our general counsel and judged to be in non-compliance;
- If the existing committee and its program failed to satisfy the citizens of that state to such a degree that a competing application from a more responsible and broadly representative humanities entity might be evolving.

11. What percentage of staff recommendations differ from panel recommendations?

Since panels are asked to offer analyses, counsel and suggestions, and these are not structured as formal recommendations, we technically do not face this situation explicitly. As noted in an earlier answer, only one condition has thus far been placed on a grant which did not grow out of reviewer or panelist concerns.

In the last two panel reviews, such fundamental questions were raised about two proposals that staff transmitted these concerns to the states concerned, resulting in the request from those states to withdraw or defer their proposals pending substantial revision and resubmission. Staff concurred in both instances.

It is inevitable that staff impressions and judgments of some segments of a state program will differ from the dominant view of a panel, in that staff judgment derives from on-site, personal observation of programs and operations in contrast to reviewers and panelists who are asked to base their judgments solely on the proposal.

12. Does the staff encourage panels to discuss questions of policy?

Each panel is asked to comment on the state program overall and to discuss policy considerations. Panelists are provided with introductory overview material about state programs as part of the package of materials they are sent along with the proposals. Each panel is convened with an explicit invitation by the chair to raise for clarification or review any policy matters which are brought to the fore by a specific proposal or in the general discussion. Each panel concludes with at least a half hour's discussion of general impressions, and all panelists are invited to make further responses in writing to the Endowment at any time.

13. Does the staff provide the panels with guidance concerning current agency policy?

The staff provides panelists with introductory information in advance of the meeting.

Panel meetings are convened with an opportunity for panelists to raise any policy questions about which they are unclear or have concerns. If no questions are raised, the Division Director, as chair of the meeting, will provide any policy information that may be considered new or different from that which had been provided in advance of the meeting.

Since panelists are chosen to include both those who are very familiar with the program and those who are newcomers, it is not unusual for policy matters to come under discussion as proposals are discussed. Such discussions provide continuing opportunities for the staff to hear substantive responses to current policies, and to obtain reactions to changing or developing issues.

15. Describe the procedures used by the Council Committee to review applications.

The Council committee reads and analyzes the materials sent in advance of the meeting, along with any policy documents germane to the consideration of the proposals. At the committee meeting, the Council members consider the proposals individually. Staff may be asked for details on particular points, and may be asked to elaborate on reviewer and panelist comments. The committee discusses the recommended level of funding in some detail, and affirms, rejects, or revises any proposal conditions. The Council committee may add conditions or recommend a level of funding at variance with the staff recommendation.

14. Describe the package of materials provided by staff to the Council Committee.

The Council committee for state programs receives from the NEH a package of materials which includes the following:

- a. The abstract of the state application, which describes the state committee's current activities and future plans;
- b. A full list of committee members of each state program;
- c. A synopsis of the written reviewer evaluations;
- d. A synopsis of the panel's written evaluations and discussion;
- e. The staff's assessment of the proposals and staff recommendation;
and
- f. Comparative statistics on the number and cost of funded regrants, the average regrant size, the number of actual presentations of projects, the number of project sponsors, and a full funding history for each state.

16. Describe any conflict-of-interest policy used with respect to Council committee discussion and action on applications.

The National Council has an overall conflict of interest policy which applies during Council committee sessions. Council committee members typically refrain from comment on applications from their home state.

17. Describe the role and responsibility of staff and Council members in the discussion of policy issues and program guidelines.

The Endowment's authorizing legislation establishes that "the Chairman, with the advice of the National Council on the Humanities, is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, to establish and carry out a program of grant-in-aid in each of the several States in order to support not more than 50 per centum of the cost of existing activities which meet the standards enumerated in subsection (c) of this section, and in order to develop a program in the humanities in such a manner as will furnish adequate programs in the humanities in each of the several states. (Sec. 7. (20 U.S.C. 956, (a) f.(1).) (emphasis added.)

Toward this objective, the National Council has designated one of its committees to serve as an oversight committee for public and state programs. That subcommittee meets a minimum four times each year, and members of the subcommittee frequently participate in other meetings at which policy and program matters pertaining to state programs are reviewed and discussed.

For example, the February 1979 meeting of the subcommittee and the full Council included a review of the policy documents which currently guide the Division's administration of the program. That discussion concluded with a resolution reaffirming the policies as stated in two basic documents. (Copies of the resolution and both policy documents are attached.)

Division staff are responsible for preparing analyses and evaluations of the impact and consequences of current policies for review by the National Council and review and authorization by the Chairman. The normal ways in which this review occurs are through the preparation for and conduct of the quarterly meetings of the subcommittee and the National Council; the annual program review undertaken agency-wide as part of its zero-based budgeting requirements; the annual appropriations process; the periodic reauthorization requirements; and the intermittent responses to other Congressional inquiries (such as White House Conference hearings) and non-governmental studies and assessments of the needs in the humanities (such as the Rockefeller Commission on the Humanities).

Both the Council and NEH staff routinely engage in policy discussions in state, regional and national meetings which involve those responsible for state programs. Most states hold an annual evaluation and planning session at which NEH staff are available to discuss policy and program guidelines. Regional meetings are held periodically in which professional staff and committee chairman engage in policy discussions with NEH staff. An annual national meeting of the leadership in state programs requires that NEH staff, including the Chairman, and frequently members of the National Council, conduct workshops, deliver major addresses, and participate in seminars which center upon policy and program matters.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON STATE PROGRAMS
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES
FEBRUARY 23, 1979

Resolved, that the National Council on the Humanities Committee on State Programs hereby reaffirms the policies set forth in the following documents, it being understood that the references to FY 1977 and 1978 should be updated:

- (1) Comments of the National Council on the Humanities (February, 1977): The Endowment's Reauthorizing Legislation and the Programs of State Committees for the Humanities
- (2) "Four Principles," dated March 24, 1978.

Comments of the National Council on the
Humanities (February, 1977): The Endowment's Reauthorizing
Legislation and the Programs of State Committees for
the Humanities

The legislation in 1976 reauthorizing the National Endowment for the Humanities establishes formal legislative requirements for the Endowment's program in the states, and it provides new opportunities for the state-based humanities committees, which the Endowment has supported for the last five years without specific language in the authorizing legislation. The law now specifically requires the Chairman to "carry out a program of grants-in-aid in each of the several states..." and it further directs the Endowment to allocate at least 20 percent of its definite funds to this program.

In order to be eligible for assistance, the humanities committee in each state must submit a "plan" demonstrating that the committee operates with certain specific procedures such as a means for regular rotation of officers and members, an established system for reporting committee activities to the governor and to state agencies, and by-laws which invite the governor to appoint two members to the committee--or up to fifty percent of the membership if the state proposes to appropriate funds at the same level as the Federal government. The Chairman of the Endowment has informed each of the governors of the opportunities provided by the new law and, following the National Council's discussion in November, the Endowment has given advice to each state committee about the procedural requirements of the law.

The law maintains the concept of volunteer citizen committees as the means of carrying out a humanities program in the states. In addition, it gives each committee the opportunity to broaden its mission and aggressively to seek imaginative new means of service to the state. During discussion in the House-Senate conference, several members specifically called for expanded program efforts to reach a greater variety of citizens than those who characteristically involve themselves in programs on public policy issues. And the conference committee report makes these interests explicit by urging that the state program undertake activities which "will be addressed to a multiplicity and variety of worth-while projects."

The language is broad. But because the legislation requires the Council to perform its usual function of recommending to the Chairman action upon state committees' applications, it is proper now for the Council (and then the staff) to advise committees of its understanding of the legislation on the question of their mission, and to offer some suggestions

about the role state-based committees may want to consider, from the viewpoint of nation-wide priorities in the humanities.

More than 950 individuals now serve on the state committees. They include business and labor leaders, farmers, university presidents, members of minorities, judges, housewives, retired people, scholars, public librarians and many others. As members of volunteer committees interested in the humanities, they choose carefully how best to use their time and capacities, and how to spread their limited funds most resourcefully. What this has meant in program terms is that committees are accustomed to focusing their activities on carefully-defined objectives. Committees strive to reach the broadest possible public, and most have already identified a full range of groups and organizations in their state which are interested in mounting humanities programs.

The legislation presents the committees with new and important choices. Congress wishes them to move beyond an exclusive concentration on issues of public policy, and it encourages greater flexibility in the kinds of grant-making that the committees undertake. Yet a broader program mission will not be accompanied by a significantly expanded budget, and the committees will have to make informed, perceptive choices about the additional goals they set for their program. Their existing knowledge of organizations and institutions within their states will be helpful, as will the expansion of membership from the general public as part of their compliance with the new legislation.

It is important, then, that we express our understanding of how the state programs might most effectively meet the Congress' intent while at the same time suggesting ways that their mission helps get maximum impact out of limited Federal dollars. There is, for example, a budgetary limit in FY 1977 of \$77.5 million in definite funds for all of the Endowment purposes (including support of state-based programs). Federal resources for support of the humanities are severely strained and will continue so in FY 1978. Frugality will have to be the mother of invention and the mother of cooperation as well: even though the Endowment's programs are far more comprehensive in scope than those of the National Science Foundation, the budget for NSF in definite funds is \$832 million in FY 1977.

The new legislation, we believe, creates broad and useful opportunities for the state committees to extend their grant-making activities. The legislative history makes it clear that each committee must now make its own determination of how best to serve the humanities interests of the citizens of the state: the responsibility of the Endowment is to facilitate planning by the state committees, and to assist them in implementing their plans. The National Council may only advise committees of its own perceptions on opportunities for humanities endeavors throughout the nation, as a possible aid to their planning.

Stated most generally, we conclude that, apart from scholarly activity intended to enhance the nation's stock of knowledge and for the use primarily of other scholars (an activity which transcends local boundaries, for which considerable non-Federal funding is available, and for which national competition and review seems appropriate) and apart from curricular support within schools, colleges and universities (which is already funded at meaningful levels by existing state and local governmental appropriations), the committees will want to, and should be encouraged to, consider any and all programmatic means to increase what the law terms "public understanding and appreciation of the humanities." While the Endowment should encourage the committees to broaden citizen participation in humanities programming at the state level, its primary role will be to serve as a resource and guide to the committees as they enter their first year of operation under the new legislative mandate.

With this in mind, the Endowment should encourage the committees to develop plans---after careful assessment and consultation within the state---for expanded programming, moving toward the use of additional means to serve broadly the citizens of their state. They may discover additional subject matters of interest and concern to a large and diverse public, and expanded audiences for activities in the humanities. What follows, then, is meant to provide only the most preliminary sketch of ideas which state committees might explore. These are not new assignments or tasks, but simply illustrations of what the committees themselves may determine to be valuable. Some of the specifics may prove, on examination by the committees in consultation within their states, to be of less importance than others which are listed, or still others as yet undeveloped.

As means to reach and serve the state's citizens in the broadest way, the committees may wish to consider:

- local discussions and forums
- state-wide and local conferences
- radio and television productions of state and local interest

seminars, workshops, institutes
informal, non-traditional courses
exhibitions and displays
referral services
technical services
publication

The subject matter of committee regnants might include:

every discipline of the humanities
state and local history (including family history)
American history and culture as it gives a context
to the state's own heritage and identity
ethnic history related to the state or its localities
public policy concerns in the state
cultures other than those of the United States

Participating groups might include:

members of civic and social organizations
business and non-academic professionals
labor
the elderly
rural and small town populations
housewives
minority/ethnic groups
out-of-school youth
public officials
adult, non-degree students
college-educated adults

While these suggestions are not intended to be exclusive, they do stem from an interpretation of the relationship between the National Endowment's mission and the state committees' mission which consciously excludes some other alternatives. The conviction of the Council is that the public interest will not be wisely served by the creation of "mini-Endowments" in each state--programs which fully duplicate all of the functions and programs of the Endowment--because of the obvious danger of redundancy, inefficiency, and waste of limited resources. Nor, on the other hand, does there seem to be a coherent rationale to an approach which would "divide up the pie" in such a way that committees would make, for example, one type of fellowship award while the Endowment made others, or one kind of education grant while the Endowment made others.

It also seems clear, as noted earlier, that work in the humanities done by scholars for the primary use of other scholars lends itself to national, rather than local, review and support, since such activities almost always serve a scholarly community that transcends local boundaries. In the same vein, state committee grant-making for formal education would have limited impact, given the greater amounts already dedicated to this purpose from existing state and local agencies.

Each committee should be urged to consider the new opportunity provided by the legislation thoroughly as it selects the areas of service that it wishes to open or explore in its present grant (if that grant has a substantial period of time left to run) or in its next grant. A committee's plan for broadly serving its state, together with evidence of compliance with the procedural requirements of the legislation, should constitute the foundation of its future proposals to the Endowment.

The Council recognizes that the task of the committees in the next few years will not be easy. Each committee must consider existing and additional opportunities for service to the adult citizens of its state and decide upon appropriate grant-making priorities; each will have to prepare and disseminate guidelines to applicants, each should consider and implement modifications of committee procedures whenever necessary or advisable; and, finally, each committee will want to publicize a clear description of the scope of its programs throughout the state. The Endowment should assist in these efforts with the specific goal of helping the committees accomplish the programs they have established as appropriate for their state, allowing for continuing adjustment of their mission as they gain further experience.

11/19/76

COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES
REGARDING THE "PLAN" REQUIRED
OF STATE-BASED COMMITTEES BY
THE NEW LEGISLATION

Context for the Council Comments

The plan required of state-based committees by the new legislation includes at least six features: (1) a procedure providing for appointment of two committee members by an appropriate state officer or agency; (2) a membership policy designed to assure broad public representation; (3) a nomination process which assures wide access to interested groups and individuals; (4) a procedure for regular rotation of committee members and officers; (5) procedures which assure public access to information regarding committee activities; and (6) a procedure for regular reporting on committee activities to the governor and other officers and agencies of the state.

The legislation is clear in most cases as to intent, but it is not written so that implementation can proceed directly from the law. What, for example, does a procedure insuring "regular rotation of members" mean? Without intending to quibble, any membership policy that contains a stated term of membership--even ten or fifteen years--can be said to be a regular rotation policy, although such a lengthy term would be in clear violation of the intent of the legislation. Therefore, because the legislation is written in broad generalizations, and because the National

Council must recommend on all Endowment grants, the Council feels obliged to provide some specific indication of what it is prepared to interpret as conforming to the legislative intent.

Moreover, in terms of fairness and in terms of common sense, the basic features of acceptable plans should be comparable, if not uniform. Each committee should develop a plan that reflects its special circumstances while, at the same time, certain basic features should appear in all plans.

The pages that follow, therefore, have been provided by the National Council to offer basic guidance and, at the same time, to allow the greatest flexibility to committees as they take steps to bring their procedures into compliance. The National Council is prepared in each instance to consider alternative procedures when presented with a reasonable argument.

--G.M.

Council Comments

(1) The legislation states that the plan must establish a procedure which provides that two members of the committee will be appointed by "an appropriate officer or agency" of the state.

The legislation does not require that the two appointments be made by the governor, but the spirit of the legislation suggests that only in extraordinary circumstances should a committee's plan provide for appointments made by other state officials. The intent of this stipulation of the law is clear -- Congress wishes the state to have the opportunity to provide additional leadership to the committees.

Therefore, it is the Council's opinion that the plan should assure that committee by-laws provide for state appointment of two persons to the committee, preferably by appointment by the governor. It would seem advisable that the term of membership for gubernatorial appointees correspond to the term of office of the governor. The Council notes that, in several instances, committees already have state officials as members, and it would probably be advisable to alert the governors to this fact, leaving the governor free to designate these individuals as his appointees or to name other persons.

The Council notes that the Chairman of the Endowment is obliged to inform each of the governors of the provisions of the legislation and therefore advises the closest consultation between the Endowment and the individual state-based committees in planning contact with the governors on this important issue in order to assure coordination and clarity of effort.

(2) The legislation states that each plan must contain a membership policy "which is designed to assure broad public representation."

The emphasis on broad representation implies to the Council the need for a slightly expanded committee in some instances, since a few committees may be too small at present to be considered fully representative even though the state's population may be small in the same instances. Thus the Council suggests that the plan include a minimum committee size of, say, 19 members, excluding the two additional appointments by the governor. The Council will remain open to a reasonable case for a somewhat smaller committee.

The intent of the legislation is clearly to increase the representation on the committees of individuals from the public as contrasted with representatives from the scholarly and academic communities. Provision 3 (below) has a somewhat countervailing intent when it states that the nomination process should be certain to "include individuals who, by reason of their achievement, scholarship, or creativity in the humanities are especially qualified to serve."

The Council therefore believes that plans should provide that approximately half the members of each committee represent the general public and that the other half be composed of individuals who "by reason of their achievement, scholarship, or creativity in the humanities are especially qualified to serve." Thus, approximately half of a typical state-based committee would be made up of individuals from the humanities community, such as faculty in one of the disciplines of the humanities, administrators

of institutions of higher education, and professional writers and editors in one of the disciplines of the humanities. The other half of the committee would be constituted, as the public membership is at present, of a wide variety of individuals from business, labor, agriculture, the professions, minorities, and civic organizations.¹

(3) The legislation states that an acceptable plan should describe a nomination process "which assures opportunities for nomination to membership from various groups within the State ...and from a variety of segments of the population of such State, including individuals who by reason of their achievement, scholarship, or creativity in the humanities, are especially qualified to serve."

The Council notes that the state-based committees at present have extremely broad nomination processes and it appears that this clause in the legislation is intended to ratify present procedures and to strengthen those which may be weak. The Council suggests that the plan should describe

1

Although this matter is not explicit in the legislation, the Council notes that one aspect of a responsible membership policy, and one that is nearly universal in voluntary organizations and public agencies is a written conflict-of-interest policy--e.g., a proviso in committee by-laws prohibiting the payment of honoraria, salaries, stipends to members of the committee from grant funds, as well as clear procedures for committee consideration of applications from institutions or groups represented by members of the committee.

procedures which, at a minimum, include written solicitation of nominations from the state's cultural and educational institutions, from appropriate state agencies, from appropriate minority groups and organizations, from scholarly organizations, from civic organizations, from educational organizations, from business, labor, and professional organizations, and from other public interest groups.

(4) The legislation states that an acceptable plan must include a "membership rotation process which assures the regular rotation of the membership and officers" of each committee.

The intent of this stipulation is to insure a routine and continuous refreshment of the committee membership, thereby strengthening the opportunities for flexibility and imagination in committee actions and insuring ever-widening citizen involvement in the program. For these reasons, the Council suggests that the plan provide rotation schedules permitting both continuity and regular change. A reasonable and common pattern would have maximum terms of membership of four years, staggered, with at least one year between terms of any individual, and would establish maximum service of two years in any committee office. (Obviously, the plan would also contain such rudimentary procedures as election of officers by democratic processes, including a secret ballot.)

It is clear that the intention of the legislation is to insure that any group of individuals not maintain control of the committee, even inadvertently. Yet the Council notes, with real concern, that in some states the committee has retained the same chairman for several terms.

Therefore, the Council advises each committee to consider a rotation procedure for its officers which would insure that the committee would have a new chairman by May 12, 1977 (the date established for compliance) in all instances in which the present chairman will have served for more than two years on that date.

(5) The legislation states that each plan must contain procedures "to assure public access to information relating to (the) activities" of the committee.

The Council believes each committee will need to review the nature of its present publications--guidelines, brochures, newsletters, press releases--when considering this stipulation of the legislation. The Council assumes that the cornerstone of the plan in this connection would be the committee's "guidelines to applicants," since this document is the one most often read by the public and which therefore must, in its lucidity, completeness, and tone, reveal fully the intent and practices of the committee. The guidelines would usefully detail the procedures used to evaluate applications and award regrants.

The Council suggests that the plan include the preparation and dissemination of an annual report by the committee. This would contain such features as a description of the committee's activities and the grants it has made, committee membership, its deadlines for application, its methods of nomination to membership, and relevant procedures. Distribution of the annual report might include appropriate leadership of the state's educational and cultural institutions, civic organizations, foundations,

corporations, appropriate members of the legislative and judicial branches of the government, and other individuals and institutions upon request. Committees would want to detail intended distribution of the annual report in the plan in order to reveal the scope of public access that this distribution would provide.

Further means of public access might include public announcement of all favorable grant decisions (including press releases); public announcement of membership selections; and public announcement of the times, places, and agenda of committee meetings.

Finally, the plans would certainly include such basic procedures relevant to public accountability as a record of vote totals on all applications considered at each meeting, as well as policies for providing information, in response to public inquiries, about the reasons for funding a specific application and for informing disapproved applicants about the reasons for the Committee's action on their proposals.

(6) The legislation states that an acceptable plan should establish "reporting procedures which are designed to inform the chief executive officer of the state involved, and other appropriate officers and agencies, of the activities" of the state-based committee.

The Council suggests that submission of the state-based committee's annual report to the governor and other appropriate officers and agencies of state government would constitute a reasonable first step toward meeting this requirement. The Council also encourages establishment of

means of informal reporting to the governor as well, either in writing or through the governor's appointees to the committee.

DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS

FUNDING STATE HUMANITIES COMMITTEES

ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDING

To be eligible to submit a proposal for funding, a state humanities committee must have on file a plan found acceptable by the Chairman which meets the requirements summarized in the statute (§7(f)(2)). Sometimes referred to as the "Compliance Plan," these requirements include broad public representation in membership, the nomination process for membership, membership rotation, reporting procedures to the governor, and public access to information. All committees presently have on file a plan found to be acceptable.

FUNDING OPTIONS

Proposals from eligible committees are reviewed by outside reviewers and panelists and by the NEH staff, Chairman, and National Council, using criteria from §7(f)(1) and §7(f)(2), summarized in "General Questions for State Proposal Review."

I. Do not fund

A proposal may be denied funding if it fails to present a program which "will furnish adequate programs in the humanities" in the state, according to the statutory criteria.

Although the Chairman may not fund more than one entity in each state, there is no requirement that there must at all times be an active grant in every state and territory. If an application were denied in a particular state, the Chairman would meet his statutory obligation by inviting applications from other groups, by inviting interested citizens to a briefing meeting on the opportunities for application under the statute, or by consulting with and encouraging reapplication by the rejected applicant.

II. Fund without conditions

A. Fund at statutory minimum (FY79: \$296,000)

proposals which will furnish a minimally adequate program in the humanities, but whose overall effort is weak and in need of intensive work to improve the quality of the program should be funded at the level of the statutory minimum.

B. Fund at maximum

NEH has available discretionary funds which it makes available to states to supplement the basic grant provided in the statute. The maximum amount available from these discretionary funds is determined on a population basis, but should be awarded only for meeting high standards according to the criteria summarized in "General Questions."

C. Fund at an amount between statutory minimum and NEH maximum

Depending on merit, according to the standards summarized in "General Questions," committees may be funded at any amount between the statutory minimum and the NEH maximum.

III. Fund with conditions

A. Fund at an amount from statutory minimum to NEH maximum with an absolute condition

A committee may be awarded any amount from the statutory minimum to the NEH maximum, with a condition that all funds will be cut off after a certain date for failing to comply with a specified condition. The condition identifies a deficiency so serious that the program is only marginally adequate, as required by the statute.

B. Fund at an amount from statutory minimum to NEH maximum with a specific condition on the release of funds

A committee may be awarded any amount from the statutory minimum to the NEH maximum, with a certain amount of funds withheld pending compliance with a particular condition representing specific problems of program policy or operation which need to be addressed. Any amount of funds may be withheld, but committees should be allowed to have sufficient administrative funds to comply with the condition.

OTHER RESPONSES TO PROPOSALS

I. Award grant for only one year.

Committees are normally awarded a two-year grant, with funding being given for 12-month periods. By awarding a grant for only one year, full evaluation of the committee's

progress toward remedying serious deficiencies will occur through the review process after 12 months.

II. Defer application

An application can be deferred to allow further consultation and revision of serious problems.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



March 28, 1980

MEMORANDUM

TO : Patricia McFate

FROM : B. J. Stiles

SUBJECT: Staff Role in the Reveiw Process/Division of
State Programs

Background

The use of a full review process, i.e., outside reviewers and panel, is a relatively recent phenomenon in State Programs, occasioned by the activization of a program in each of the states by 1976 and, in the same year, the Congressional reauthorizing legislation. Until 1976, staff attention was focused primarily upon establishing new committees and acquainting fledgling groups with the basics of grant-making activities, program development techniques, and the principles of the program; that is, our task was institution building.

The 1976 reauthorizing legislation, acknowledging the existence and continuing need for state programs, placed in law specific accountability requirements and challenged the committees to expand and interpret their grant-making programs. Prior to 1976, outside reviewers were routinely consulted, but the first use of the panel process was not until January 1978. At roughly the same time, both a more detailed format for proposals and criteria for proposal review were issued. Early 1978, therefore, was considered to be the appropriate time to begin full use of the reviewer-panelist system long-established in all other grant programs of NEH.

Current Practice

Proposals are submitted to NEH by state committees, on a biennial basis. Each proposal is analyzed by four to six outside reviewers, drawn from the disciplines of the humanities and from the general public. In addition to attempting

Memorandum to Patricia McFate

to use reviewers from various disciplines, professions, institutions and organizations, the Division also solicits reviewers with direct experience in the state program, such as former committee members or project directors. Reviewers are not assigned a proposal from a state with which they have close contact. Normally, reviewers are asked to read only two proposals, in order to encourage careful and thorough analysis. A description of the state program, a brief history, set of questions to guide the analysis are mailed with the proposals. Review panels meet for one day at the Endowment for the purpose of analyzing and commenting on the particular proposals and the program in general. Panel meetings are chaired by the Division Director or the Deputy. Upon request, staff members may answer factual questions about the history of the individual program and provide other information gained during site visits. Panels are usually comprised of nine members, and all proposals being considered in that funding cycle are evaluated by all panelists.

Reviewer letters, written evaluated by panelists, and staff notes on the panel discussion comprise the written record maintained by NEH in response to each proposal. Staff summaries of the panel comments are presented to the National Council Committee, as well as a staff assessment of the individual state program. The staff assessment is prepared by the program officer assigned to that state, read and discussed by the entire Division, and finally approved by the Director or Deputy Director of the Division. The staff assessment is based upon information gathered during site visits, analysis of quarterly narrative reports, telephone and personal conversations, correspondence and review of printed materials.

State programs are assessed, therefore, primarily upon the basis of a written proposal. A committee is expected to analyze the state's needs and resources and to argue persuasively that it has devised funding guidelines and program development activities appropriate to the state. The questions, are of course, framed by NEH staff and the individual program officers provide advice to state committees on a continuing basis.

Memorandum to Patiricia McFate

In addition to the biennial proposal, state committees are expected to submit an annual request for funding, which consists principally of a fifteen page report analyzing the progress made toward the goals established in the proposal. This report is currently assessed by a panel operating under the procedures outlined above.

Recommendations

The emphasis upon a written proposal has, in the judgment of the Division, worked well, but the staff is aware that the quality of the evaluation would be enhanced by increased opportunities for site evaluation and review of the program in the field. The division proposes, therefore, to increase the role of the staff in the process, while preserving the integrity of the review process. The written proposal will continue to be assessed by reviewers and panelists, with minimal staff comment. We would also like to increase staff observation of regrant projects through extended visits to the states. This will be accomplished through the re-assignment of states on a quasi-regional basis, thus permitting program officers to visit adjacent states during a single trip. The National Council would continue to receive an independent review of the written proposal and, in addition, could assess a staff report based upon site visits.

Attachments

BJS/eka

Format for Proposals to the
Office of State Programs
National Endowment for the Humanities

Forward

The proposal from a state humanities committee serves two critical purposes: (1) the proposal is the committee's argument and justification for continued funding from the Endowment, and (2) once funded, the proposal is the central public document of record for the Endowment and its relationship to the committee. In other words, the proposal must be designed to be historical--serving as a record of committee activities and replacing the final narrative report normally required of all Endowment grantees. It must also be designed to be a plan for the future, setting forth the committee's intentions in terms of program development, evaluation, administration, and grant-making.

The format that follows, therefore, is structured in two basic sections. One section of the proposal sets out the historical record of committee activities since the time the last proposal was submitted. Another section sets out committee plans--what it intends to do with the money requested from the Endowment in the next grant period.

The proposal is also the committee's principal opportunity to explain its program to a national audience. On submission, the proposal is sent to individuals outside the Endowment for review. Subsequently, the proposal is critically considered by a panel of individuals who comment on all of the state committee proposals submitted for consideration by a meeting of the National Council on the Humanities. Finally, the proposal, together with reviewer and panelist comments, is considered by the National Council on the Humanities which is charged by law with the responsibility of recommending to the Chairman of the Endowment on all grant applications. Reviewers and panelists consider each proposal in terms of the program goals established by the committee and in terms of the opportunities for the program that are presented by the state's other humanities resources (institutional and human), its population and geography, and the accomplishments of other state humanities committees.

Reviewers and panelists are encouraged to make any observations about the proposals that they wish, but are asked to bear in mind these six general questions:

1. Does the proposal describe a humanities program?
2. Will the proposed program reach the citizens of the state?

3. Does the committee have program goals and objectives, and a plan to reach them?
4. Does the committee have a plan for evaluation?
5. Is the committee broadly representative of the state?
6. Is the proposed program interesting, exciting, imaginative, attractive?

Proposals from state committees seek grants in amounts that place them among the largest grants made by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Panelists and reviewers are typically individuals familiar with other public and scholarly programs of the Endowment. The Endowment and state committees have undertaken an experimental, innovative program of national significance--increasing public understanding and appreciation of the humanities. For these reasons and others, the state committee proposals are subject to increasingly critical examination. The original half-dozen state committees have been augmented to include every state and jurisdiction; the original \$600,000 budget is now tens of millions of dollars annually.

All of this suggests a context and an audience for state committee proposals. Every reader of the proposals can be presumed to have certain expectations. For instance, it is reasonable to assume that readers will look for the kind of

clarity, detail, and persuasiveness that would be found in a successful proposal from a college or university for this much money. Readers expect--in all Endowment proposals--prose of high quality, free of cliché, jargon, and immature flourishes of style.

Readers expect a document infused by tough-minded self-scrutiny; for example, a proposal in which the committee not only describes failed projects as well as successful ones, but also analyzes the failures, attempting to discover those features or causes that can help shape future decisions on applications. Readers expect judgment in terms of emphasis--eschewal of repetitive detail and unfocussed narrative, but concise exposition of every significant aspect of the committee's recent experience and immediate plans.

Finally, the proposal is understood to represent the expression of the state committee membership. The application to the Endowment is made by the Chairman of the committee on behalf of the members of the committee. No matter what procedure is actually followed by a committee in the composition of the proposal, it is read as a document reflecting the judgment, the plans, and the imagination of the committee membership.

General Facts

1. Each proposal should be held together in some fashion so that in shipping and in handling by readers no pages will be lost or misplaced.
2. Committees should submit 25 copies of the proposal.
3. Proposals are due at the Endowment on the date indicated.
4. Because proposals must go through the review process, late proposals cannot be accepted.
5. All pages, including attachments if possible, should be numbered consecutively.
6. Double-spaced proposals are easiest to read, and printing on both sides of a page is most economical.

Proposal Outline (Details on following pages)

- I. Abstract
- II. Table of Contents
- III. Review of Program Activity
 - A. Statistical Outline
 - 1. Grant-Making Activity
 - 2. Audience
 - 3. Humanities
 - B. Narrative Description and Assessment
 - 1. Description of Recent Program
 - 2. Assessment of Recent Program
- IV. Proposed Program
 - A. Description of Proposed Program
 - B. Description of Program Promotion and Development Plans
 - C. Description of Program Evaluation Plans
 - D. Committee
 - E. Staff
 - F. Budget
 - 1. Narrative
 - 2. Outline
- V. Attachments

Additional Details

I. Abstract

(The abstract should be a one-page, single-spaced statement. One paragraph should summarize committee achievements since submission of the last proposal, perhaps giving a brief summary of one outstanding project supported by a committee grant. Another paragraph should summarize committee plans for the coming grant, and the major means to be employed in pursuit of these plans.)

II. Table of Contents

(The Table of Contents should follow the Proposal Outline given on the preceeding page of these guidelines, adding the appropriate page references.)

III. Review of Program Activity

(The review should cover activities undertaken since submission of the last proposal.)

A. Statistical Outline

(Please observe the definitions provided below so that the meaning of the statistics that you provide will be clear, and so that there will be comparability with other state committee proposals.)

1. Grant-Making Activity

(Please provide the following information:)

- ✓ a. # proposals received--this means the number of proposals actually approved, denied, or given contingent approval by the full committee, the executive committee, or another decision process authorized by the committee. A committee decision to ask for resubmission should be treated as a rejection, with the resubmission counted as a new proposal. Mini-grants and planning grants should be listed separately.
- ✓ b. proposals approved--this includes those instances in which a committee makes an offer, but the applicant declines to carry out the project. Mini-grants and planning grants should be listed separately.
- c. high grant--i.e., largest award. If the award is a matching offer, please so indicate.
- d. low grant--smallest amount awarded.
- e. median grant--that is, when all grants are arranged in ascending or descending order by amount, that grant which falls in the

middle, with an equal number of grants above and below.

- f. # of towns and cities involved--this should indicate the number of towns and cities in which projects took place. No town or city should be counted twice. Please group the data as follows: populations of (1) 2,500 or less; (2) 2,500-50,000; (3) 50,000-500,000; (4) 500,000-. Please list, by name, town or cities in which multiple projects took place, and the number of projects involved.
- g. # project activities--this is a difficult figure to define accurately, but the committee should indicate, as accurately as possible, the number of activities--forums, discussions, workshops, etc., that have taken place since submission of the last proposal. A series (e.g., four discussions held every second Wednesday for two months) would be multiple activities (e.g., 4); a weekend workshop, held from noon Friday to Saturday evening would count as one activity.

- h. # of grant sponsors--this should provide a total of the number of organizations listed on the applications and in committee files as sponsors and co-sponsors of funded applications. If possible, this list should concentrate on organizations that had the responsibility for carrying out the substance of the regrant project, rather than on the fiscal agent for the project. Please use the format which follows. No organizations should be counted twice. Please list separately those organizations that have sponsored more than one project, and the number sponsored.

<u>Type of Institution</u>	<u># of Regrants</u>
Two-year colleges	
Four-year colleges/universities	
Libraries	
Museums/Historical Organizations	
State/County/Local Government	
Media organizations	
Religious Organizations	
Professional Organizations	
Ad Hoc Humanities Organizations	
Other	

2. Audience

(Indicate the approximate number of individuals attending projects in person. Indicate separately the approximate number of those who were the audience to electronic or print media projects, and the source of the number. Describe in a brief paragraph the nature of the "in person" audience--occupations, age, and so on--to the extent that this information is available.)

3. Humanities

(List the number of humanities scholars involved in planning, in implementation, and in evaluation by discipline. No individual should be counted twice. The committee may wish to describe separately some of the individuals who have been frequent participants in committee-sponsored projects. The committee may also want to describe in a few brief paragraphs the participation of humanities institutions in committee projects.)

B. Narrative Description and Assessment

(Readers will find it helpful if the narrative portions of the proposal make reference to specific committee regrants by the regrant number and the page number on which

that regrant appears in the appendix to the proposal.)

1. Description of Recent Program

(This is the occasion to describe committee activities since the last proposal. This section need not be limited to a description of grant-making, since committee and staff undertake other activities as well, particularly in terms of program promotion and evaluation. The section should include a description of at least four committee-sponsored projects, including one of the most and one of the least successful, together with whatever comment seems appropriate about the characteristics of these grants and what conclusions the committee may have drawn about them. The most effective descriptions for most readers appear to be those which give the reader an "eye-witness" account of what happened; directions taken in discussion, basic substance of major presentations, audience reaction, interesting consequences of the project, and whatever additional details will give a reader a lively sense of what took place in the project.)

2. Assessment of Recent Program

(This section provides an opportunity for the committee to describe its evaluation of recent programming. This section might also touch on such matters as program promotion and evaluation techniques, committee and staff accomplishments, problems, and dynamics. A committee might

wish to reiterate the goals it established in its last proposal, and assess how much progress has been made toward them. The committee may wish also to give special attention to the effects of new program areas, if any.)

IV. Proposed Program

(This should describe the committee's proposed program for a two-year period.)

A. Description of Proposed Program

(This section should set forth the substance of the committee's proposed program. It might include an indication of audiences to be reached, or special efforts to involve particular parts of the population or particular disciplines of the humanities. It should include a clear description of the kinds of proposals that will be entertained by the committee, and something about the criteria which will be used in judging the applications. It should describe the committee's rationale for the proposed program--the alternatives considered, expected advantages and disadvantages. This section, and IV. B and C, below, will form the background for quarterly narrative reports to the Endowment, as well as the report required for funding of the second 12 months of the grant period.)

B. Description of Program Promotion and Development Plans

(This section should describe the specific procedures that will be used to promote and implement the proposed program during the 24-month period, with special focus on new program areas, if applicable. The section might include some discussion of anticipated difficulties in implementation. This section should include a description of the committee's plans for continuing program development, with special emphasis on the way in which the proposed program for the next grant might be developed.)

C. Description of Program Evaluation Plans

(The discussion of committee plans for evaluation of the proposed program should include the specific methods that will be employed to collect information about the program and, subsequently, to evaluate it. Here, as elsewhere in the proposal, the term "program" is not limited to grant-making, but includes all committee and staff activities--program development, promotion, evaluation, and so on.)

D. Committee

(This section should begin with a list of the committee membership, in the following format:

Helen La Gree
Professor of History
Century University
Millenium, Mississippi 97064

John J. Apocryphal
President, Chamber of Commerce
Metro Center, Suite # 305
Middletown, Nebraska 73401

In addition, this section should describe the committee's goals for its own membership, and the methods employed to reach those goals. Included might be a discussion of planned committee size and make-up, design for solicitation of nominations for new members, the qualities brought to the committee by the current members, committee role with respect to staff, and role with respect to program development, promotion, evaluation. The "Compliance Plan" may be submitted as an attachment in lieu of a detailed description of procedures for selection and rotation of members and officers. However, if these procedures have been modified since the last submission of the compliance plan, such modifications should be reported here. This section should also include a description of sub-committee structure, if appropriate. This section might also include an assessment of the effectiveness of the committee, its structures, and its dynamics.)

E. Staff

(This section should begin with a list of the committee staff and their titles. A brief resume of each

should be part of the appendix. The section should include a brief description of the duties of each principal staff person and the methods used by the committee in staff evaluation.)

Budget

The Funding Guidelines for State Humanities Committees were announced to all committees, September 14, 1977. These guidelines state that each committee is to set forth in its proposal a program for a two-year period. Once a proposed program is accepted, the Endowment will fund the first twelve months of the proposed program. Before the start of the second year, a state committee will be asked to submit an interim progress report together with a request for a second twelve-month's funding. When the interim report is accepted, the Endowment will fund the second twelve-month period. The new guidelines also state that each committee will be informed, in advance, of the maximum award possible for each fiscal year. This amount is determined by combining the minimum level of support as established by law for each state with an additional amount based upon state population. The Office of State Programs has also established that each committee is allowed to use a maximum of either \$85,000 (for 12 months) or 20% of the definite funds awarded in its grant for purposes of administration. (\$3,000 for retired persons is in addition to the administrative amount, but included in the total award possible.)

Each state must submit two budgets for a 12-month period according to the attached outline. One budget should reflect no more than the maximum amount available under the funding guidelines, i.e., an administrative budget not to exceed \$85,000 or 20% of the definite funds, plus \$3,000 for retired persons. The balance of the budget is reserved for regrants. This budget informs the staff, the reviewers, and the National Council how the Endowment's definite funds are to be utilized. The second budget should reflect the committee's estimated budget for a 12-month period. It is fully understood this second budget is an estimate. However, it should realistically reflect the committee's intent of raising gifts, to be matched, for both administrative and regrant purposes. Private gifts which are matched become Federal funds and must be accounted for in the same way as the definite funds awarded to the committee. Therefore, before gifts and matching funds can be released, a financial plan accounting for these funds must be on file with the Endowment. If this plan is on file at the beginning of the grant period, the committee will not have to submit a revised budget each time the grant is amended because of gifts and matching.

The attached budget outline must be used. It should coincide with the committee's narrative description of its program plans and thus reflect the committee's intent to allocate its funds accordingly. In all probability, after the grant award is made,

the committee will combine many of the line items for internal accounting. Also, all grants to state committees must be administered under the provisions of Circular A-110 of the Office of Management and Budget. As outlined April 5, 1977, in a memo to all executive directors, A-110 radically simplifies and standardizes the grants management process. As stated in that memo, once a fully detailed budget has been approved, revisions in the administrative budget can occur more easily than in the past, and in some instances committees may make substantial financial changes in response to committee needs without advance approval from the Endowment.

The committee will be required to report expenditures in only three categories--administration, retired persons, and regrants.

In order for the National Council to make a judgment on the award to each state, a detailed financial plan, outlining the relationship between the administration of each state program and its program of grant-making, must be an integral part of each proposal. The financial plan consists of two parts: (1) an outline, with specific dollar amounts as detailed in the following pages, preceded by (2) a narrative in which the major features of the budget are discussed, together with an exposition of the way in which this budget will serve the committee's plans for developing, conducting, and evaluating its grant-making program.

MAXIMUM AWARD REQUESTED OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

I. Operational Expenses*

\$ _____

A. Salaries

\$

1. Executive Director \$

(Annual salary \$)

2. Assistant Director \$

(Annual salary \$)

3. Secretary \$

(Annual salary \$)

4. Part-time assistance \$

(hourly wage/hours week)

5. Retired Person(s) \$

(no. of persons; hourly wage or
daily fee; no. of hours/days/weeks/
months working for the committee)

6. Other

B. Fringe Benefits \$

1. Executive Director (includes...) \$
2. Assistant Director \$
3. Secretary \$
4. Part-time assistance \$
5. Workman's compensation \$
6. (or % of all salaries and coverage)

C. Travel \$

1. Staff (indicate basis for amounts listed) \$
2. Committee \$

D. Office Space \$

Monthly rent/sq. ft. of space \$

E. Fiscal Agent Fee \$

F. Telephone \$

1. Monthly rate \$
2. Long distance \$

G. Supplies \$

H. Printing \$

1. Newsletter (est. no. issues/copies of
each) \$

2. Brochures \$

3. Stationery \$

4. Other \$

I. Duplication \$

J. Committee meetings \$

K. Equipment \$

1. Rented items \$

a. \$

b. \$

c. \$

2. Items to be purchased \$

a. \$

b. \$

c. \$

L. Audit Expenses \$

M. Other \$

(Provide detailed breakdown)

*Administrative expenses related to the cost of doing the routine management of the program, such as maintaining an office, keeping records, handling correspondence, conducting committee meetings and so on.

II. Program Promotion and Development Expenses **

\$ _____

(Follow breakdown format of section I)

- | | |
|--|----|
| A. <u>Salaries</u> (other than those of I.A) | \$ |
| B. <u>Consultants</u> | \$ |
| C. <u>Travel</u> | \$ |
| D. <u>Supplies</u> | \$ |
| E. <u>Printing/Duplication</u> | \$ |
| F. <u>Meal costs</u> | \$ |
| G. <u>Conference #1</u> | \$ |
| 1. Salaries (other than I.A. or II.A) | \$ |
| 2. Consultants (other than...) | \$ |
| 3. Travel Costs | \$ |
| 4. Printing/Duplication | \$ |
| 5. Meal costs | \$ |
| 6. Facilities rental | \$ |
| 7. Other (provide details) | \$ |

H. Conference #2

S

(Follow format above)

**Administrative costs associated with increasing public awareness and access to the state program. This category includes various activities to encourage new applicants and reach specific constituencies, and would also include keeping a large public continually informed by means of a newsletter, other publications and media promotion.

III. Program Evaluation Expenses ***

\$ _____

(Follow breakdown format of section I)

- A. Salaries (other than those listed previously)
- B. Consultants (other than those listed previously)
- C. Travel \$
- D. Supplies \$
- E. Printing/Duplication \$
- F. Conference #1 \$
1. Salaries \$
2. Consultants \$
3. Travel costs \$
4. Printing/
Duplication \$
5. Facilities rental \$
6. Other \$
- G. Conference #2 \$

(Follow format above)

- IV. Funds for Retired Persons \$3,000
- V. Total Administrative Budget (Operational, Promotion, Evaluation, Retired Persons) (Not to exceed \$85,000 or 20% of definite funds, plus \$3,000 for retired persons)
- VI. Regrants (Balance of funds after subtracting administrative budget from the maximum award)
- VII. (Sabbatical-if eligible and to be used during this 12-month period. Not to exceed 3 months salary and fringe benefits of executive director. Funds allocated for the sabbatical are in addition to the maximum award. A brief description of how the committee will use these funds should be part of the narrative financial plan.)
- VIII. TOTAL BUDGET (12 months-definite funds) \$ _____
- IX. Request for Gifts and Matching Authorization (12 months) \$ _____
- (If the request is for a \$50,000 authorization, this means the committee is proposing to raise \$25,000 in private gifts. The committee must provide a narrative assessment of why this particular amount is being requested.)

***Administrative costs associated with overall program and individual aspects of evaluation. This would include travel, stipends for evaluation, evaluation meetings and conferences.

Budget II - (should also be for a 12 month period and follow the same format as the budget presented for the maximum award, but including increases in administrative and regrant costs as the result of gifts and matching).

X. Appendix

(Please include at least the following items as appendices):

1. A map showing the location of projects funded during the grant period. In lieu of this, a map showing the location of each presentation may be provided.
2. A map showing the location of each committee member by address provided in Section IV.D.
3. Brief biographies of each committee and staff member.
4. A copy of each of the committee's printed materials, including brochures, guidelines, a sample newsletter, application forms, etc.
5. The committee's by-laws and articles of incorporation.
6. The committee's travel reimbursement policy.
7. A description and evaluation of each project funded.
Use the attached format, "Catalogue of Projects."
8. Examples of evaluation techniques used by the committee in assessing regrants and committee program generally.
9. Additional items, as desired:
news clippings; effective project publicity; letters or evaluations of individual projects, and any other

materials which you think help to demonstrate
the character of your state program.

CATALOGUE OF PROJECTS (Use one form per project)

Committee project identification number _____.

Committee funds awarded _____ (outright)

_____ (Gifts and Matching)

Project Title _____.

Grant Recipient _____

Co-sponsors _____

_____.

Project Dates _____

Location of presentations _____.

Number of humanists involved and disciplines of each _____

Fields/disciplines of other key participants _____

Number attending _____ Media audience _____

Educational, social, economic background of attendees _____

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

FORMAT FOR QUARTERLY AND ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORTS

OFFICE OF STATE PROGRAMS NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

Foreword

The Quarterly Narrative Report is the basis of all reports by state committees to the Endowment and to the public. It is both a chronicle of activities undertaken to fulfill the goals set forth in the committee's proposal for funding and an interpretative analysis of progress toward those goals. Both the biennial proposal and the annual report (request for continued funding) will build directly upon, and be coordinated with, the quarterly reports. As noted below, the quarterly reports constitute a significant proportion of the other two reports.

The data collection procedures currently being designed for regrant projects will, within a few months, significantly reduce the amount of statistical information currently requested. The new procedures will also alter the catalogue of regrant projects.

The following are key facts about the Reports.

I. The Reports are Public Documents

State humanities committees, though not governmental agencies are recognized in the law and are accountable to the citizens of the state, to the National Endowment for the Humanities and to the U. S. Congress. The narrative reports are documents of record and reflect the committee's sense of public accountability and provide a record of its use of public funds. In addition, the reports, as well as the proposal, are subject to access by the public under the provisions of The Freedom of Information Act.

II. The Reports are an Analysis of Performance in Comparison with Established Goals and Plans

In its proposal to the Endowment each committee articulates its goals and its plans to achieve them for the ensuing two-year period. The Quarterly and Annual Reports provide the committee with an opportunity to describe its progress toward those goals and to analyze its success in implementing the plans. It is also an opportunity to review the primary lessons of successful

and unsuccessful regrants, and to describe consequent committee changes in procedures or policies.

General Requirements

- I. Quarterly Reports are due in the Office of State Programs no later than 15 days following the end of each quarter of the grant period.
- II. The Request for a second twelve-month of funding for a 2 year grant is due no later than 30 days following the end of the third quarter. Since the request will be reviewed by the National Council on the Humanities, it may be necessary for some committees to submit the Report slightly in advance of the above schedule. Committees should consult with the OSP regarding their specific schedule.
- III. The committee should submit 3 copies of each report.
- IV. The NEH grant number should be clearly indicated on the front page of each report.

OUTLINE FOR ANNUAL REPORT (REQUEST FOR CONTINUED FUNDING)

I. Statistics

Observe the description contained in the proposal outline, pages 7-11.

II. A copy of each of the first 3 quarterly reports for the grant period.

III. An analytical essay of committee progress during the grant period and plans for the following year.

IV. A budget for the remaining 12-month period.

Use the format contained in the proposal outline.

NEW PANELIST

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



Date

Inside Address

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a panelist for the Division of State Programs. We will meet in Room II at the Endowment at time + date. Please make your own travel arrangements (hotel list is enclosed).

The state programs are at an important junction in their development. Until the passage of the NEH reauthorizing legislation in 1976, the committees were restricted to funding humanities projects on public policy issues for the out-of-school adult public. The legislation broadened committees' options for funding humanities projects which fit the special circumstances and resources of the state. This broadened opportunity has presented the committees with complex new program options and responsibilities. Most committees have chosen to go slowly and carefully before setting new policy guidelines. The proposals you are to review reflect the committees' plans in light of these new options.

The state committees are all engaged in an effort to relate the humanities to the general public in their states. As you know, the State Programs are unlike other Endowment programs in that the states do not compete with each other in the way that two scholars compete for a fellowship.

We would like the panel to consider each request separately, for clarity of program purpose, record of accomplishment, plans for the coming twelve-month period (including evaluation) and understanding of the opportunities and special character of the state. The enclosed list of questions indicates some of the issues and concerns you will want to evaluate in your reading of these proposals, and through panel discussion.

The proposals consist of two parts. One part describes the committee's activities during the past twelve months; another part describes the committee's plans for the future. Although the formats differ, each proposal includes some account of all of the grants made by the state committee during the preceding year. These "regrants" illustrate the state program's strengths and weaknesses.

You should have a total of 11 proposals enclosed. The final proposal from Pennsylvania will be mailed out February 22. We apologize for this delay but hope you will find time to review it as well.

We are grateful for your willingness to undertake this task and look forward to seeing you in March. If you have any questions or problems with this material, please call (202) 724-0286 (collect).

Sincerely,

B. J. Stiles
Director
Division of State Programs

Enclosures

BJS/mlj

Division of State Programs

Panel - February 1978 Council

William Bennett
Executive Director
National Humanities Center
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina

Peggy D. Glover
Central Library, OWA/YA
Free Library of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, PA

Justin Kaplan
Author
Cambridge, MA

Daniel Mayers
English Department
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY

Sandra Metcalf
Past President
Arizona League of Women Voters
La Mesa, CA

Peter Osnos
Foreign Editor
Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

Theodore Voorhees
Dean, Catholic University Law School
Washington, D.C.

Panel - May 1978 Council

Gerald George
Managing Editor
American Association for State and
Local History
Nashville, TN

Gloria Hull
Department of English
University of Delaware
Newark, DE

Sally Kohlstedt
History Department
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY

Jean Lloyd-Jones
Past President
League of Women Voters
Member, Iowa House of Representatives
Iowa City, IA

Stow Persons
Department of History
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA

Robert Rohlf
Director
Hennepin County Library System
Edina, MN

**Paul Rosenblatt
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

* Past state humanities committee member

** Past state humanities committee chairman

Panel - August 1978 Council

Maclyn Burg
Director
Eisenhower Library
Abilene, KS

Ronald Gottesman
University of S. California Center
for the Humanities
University Park
Los Angeles, CA

The Honorable Patsy Mink
Washington, D.C.

Anne Morgan
Author

(b) (6)
Norman, OK

**Paul Rosenblatt
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

*George Schurr
Hampden-Sydney College
Hampden-Sydney, VA

Catherine Stimson
Bernard College
New York, NY

*Maxine Van de Wetering
University of Montana
Department of Philosophy
Missoula, MT

Panel - November 1978 Council

Lynne Iglitzen
Associate Director
Office of Undergraduate Studies
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Sally Kohlstedt
Dept. of History
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY

*Anna Sanchez
Account Executive
Marketing Division
Illinois Bell Company
Chicago, IL

David Beim
Vice President
Banker's Trust Company
New York, NY

George Griffin
Curator of Kansas Collection
Spencer Research Library
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

*Judith Austin
Research Historian and Archivist
Idaho Historical Society
Boise, ID

Terry Moore
President
Omaha Central Labor Union
Omaha, NE

*Thomas Flynn
Chairman
Department of Philosophy & Religion
University of Mississippi
University, MS

Panel - February 1979 Council

Robert McKenzie
Director of Research
Center for Public Law & Services
University of Alabama
University, AL

Gerald George
Director, American Assoc. for
State and Local History
Nashville, TN

*Maxine Van de Wetering
University of Montana
Department of Philosophy
Missoula, MT

**Carolyn Bowe
(b) (6)
Fargo, ND

**Abbott A. Leban
Senior Vice President
Colonial Penn Group, Inc.
Philadelphia, PA

Bernice Reagon
Smithsonian Institution
Division of Performing Arts
Washington, D.C.

*Cynthia Smith
English Department
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Panel - May 1979 Council

**George E. Bair
Director of Educational Television
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

Pablo Calderon
Librarian
El Paso, TX

Jane Crater
Former Executive Director,
Tennessee Committee for the
Humanities
Ocean Springs, MS

*William Havard
Political Science Department
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN

*James Kirby
Dean, Theological School
Drew University
Madison, NJ

Terry L. Moore
President
Omaha Central Labor Union
Omaha, NE

Brenda Nixon
Executive Director
Association for Renewal in Education
Washington, D.C.

Pat Shanks
Former Executive Director, Colorado
Humanities Program
Heller, Ehrman, White, McAulisse
44 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA

*Anita Silvers
Department of Philosophy
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA

Panel - August 1979 Council

Jane Crater
Former Executive Director
Tennessee Committee for the
Humanities
Ocean Springs, MS

Ronald Gottesman
Director, Center for the
Humanities
University of S. California
Los Angeles, CA

Brenda Nixon
Executive Director
Association for Renewal in
Education
Washington, D.C.

**Paul Rosenblatt
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ

*Aurelia Young
Professor of Music Theory, Emeritus
Jackson State University
Jackson, MS

Panel - November 1979 Council

Vivian Joynes
Director Social Services
Cuyohoga Metropolitan
Housing Authority
Cleveland, OH

Markos J. Mamalakis
Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, WI

Thadious M. Davis
Department of English
University of NC-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

Joyce Mobley
(b) (6)
Hingham, MA

Larry E. Tise
Director, N. Carolina Archives
and History
Durham, NC

*Maxine Van de Wetering
Dept. of Philosophy
University of Montana
Missoula, MT

Clayborne Carson
Dept of History
Stanford University
Stanford, CA

Maclyn Burg
Director, Eisenhower Library
Abilene, KS

Proposal Panel - February 1980 Council

Roberta Gladowski
Executive Director
American Studies Association
Philadelphia, PA

Lynne Iglitzin
Department of Undergraduate
Studies
Seattle, WA

Robert McKenzie
University of Alabama
University, AL

Margot Norris
Director, Women's Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Carolynn Reid Wallace
(b) (6)
Washington, D.C.

Nelson E. Weiss
Attorney
Burke, Haber and Berick
Cleveland, OH

Judith Wellman, Associate Professor
History Department
State University of New York
Oswego, NY

*Rene D. Zentner
Manager of Corporate Studies
Shell Oil Company
Houston, TX

Annual Request Panel, February 1980 Council

Charles Mike Nobles
President
Retail Clerks Union Local No. 73
Tulsa, OK

Charles Trout
History Department
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, MA

**Jean Calhoun
Assistant Vice President
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH

Suzan Shown Harjo
Native American Rights Fund
Washington, D.C.

**Carolyn Bowe
Telecommunications
Fargo, ND

Proposal Panel - May 1980 Council

Mary H. Curtin
Executive Secretary/Treasurer
Central Labor Council AFL-CIO
Riverside, CA

Ronald L. Goldfarb
Goldfarb, Singer & Austern
Washington, D.C.

Rayna Green
Visiting Professor of Native
American Studies
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH

Kaye Howe
Program in Comparative Literature
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO

Vivian Joynes
Director of Social Services
Cyahoga Metropolitan Housing
Authority
Cleveland, OH

Bruce B. Owen
Vice President of Instructional
Affairs
South Oklahoma City Junior College
Oklahoma City, OK

Robert H. Roggeveen
Administrator, Corporate Contributions
Aetna Life & Casualty
Hartford, CT

Annual Request Panel - May 1980 Council

Patsy Cashmore
Editorial Assistant
Milwaukee Labor Press
Milwaukee, WI

Thadious Davis
Department of English
UNC - Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC

**Dale Gleason
English Department
Hutchinson Community College
Hutchinson, KS

*William Havard
Political Science Department
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN

Maria Heyssel
Former Executive Director
Maryland Committee for the Humanities
Baltimore, MD

DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS

PANELIST INFORMATION

<u>FY 1978</u>	<u>Total Panelists</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Blacks</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>American Indian</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>Cumulative Total Women and Minorities</u>
Actual	22	40% (9)	9% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4% (1)	45%
					Academic: 11	Public: 11	
<u>FY 1979</u>							
Target		47%	16%	6%	3%	3%	
Actual	25	52% (13)	16% (4)	8% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	64%
					Academic: 10	Public: 15	
<u>FY 1980</u>							
Target		52%	16%	6%	3%	3%	
Actual (to-date)	34	55% (19)	20% (7)	0% (0)	5% (2)	0% (0)	
					Academic: 17	Public: 16	

DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS
REVIEWERS 1978-May 1980

Professor Edna Acosta-Belen
SUNY - Albany
English Department
Albany, NY

Sydney Ahlstrom, Professor
American Studies Program
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Loy Aho
Rock Springs, Wyoming

Michelle Aldrich
Research Assistant
American Association for the Advancement
of Science
Washington, D.C.

Thomas G. Alexander
Charles Redd Center for Western Studies
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

Olga R. Arciniega
Social Service Coordinator, City of El Paso
El Paso, Texas

Homer Babbidge, President
Hartford Graduate Center
Hartford, CT

Minnie Bailey
Dept. of History
Grambling State University
Grambling, LA

David Baldus
College of Law
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA

Debbie Baldwin
Editor Environmental Action
Washington, D.C.

Jennis Bapst
President
Hibbing Community College
Hibbing, MN

Mark Beach
Scholar
Portland, OR

Mary F. Bednarowski
Civic Leader
Edina, MN

David Beim
Senior Vice-President
Bankers Trust
New York, NY

Robert Berkhofer, Jr.
Dept. of History
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Keith W. Betten, Records Analyst
New Jersey State Library
Moorestown, NJ

Ray A. Billington
The Huntington Library
San Marino, CA

Thomas Bishop, Chairman
Dept. of French and Italian
New York University
New York, NY

Keith Blackledge, Editor
North Platte Telegraph
North Platte, NE

Herman Bleibtreu, Director
Museum of Northern Arizona
Flagstaff, AZ

William L. Blizek
Dept. of Philosophy
University of Nebraska
Omaha, NE

Margaret Bogue
Dept. of History
University of Wisconsin Extension
Madison, WI

John Boles
History Dept.
Rice University
Houston, TX

Nila M. Bowden
Professor of English
Morgan State University
Randalstown, MD

Carolyn Bowe, Businesswoman
Telecommunications
Fargo, ND

Rose Bowman
State Board of Education
Boise, ID

Marilyn Bradt
State Board, League of Women Voters
Lawrence, KS

James Brown
Siler City, NC

Claudia Buckner
Office of Planning & Research
State of California
Sacramento, CA

Maclyn Burg
Eisenhower Library
Abilene, KS

John D. Butler, Dean
University of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Loretta J. Carney, Supervisor of Secondary Education
State Department of Education
Albany, NY

Professor Clayborne Carson, Professor of History
Stanford University
Stanford, CA

William Chaze, Journalist
U.S. News & World Report
Washington, D.C.

Barbara Cicardo, Professor
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, LA

T.C. Cochran
Eleutherian Mills - Hagley Foundation
Radnor, PA

Hugh T. Compton, Assistant Dean
College of Humanities
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC

Jane Crater
Public
Ocean Springs, MS

E. David Cronon
Dean of Letters and Sciences
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI

Devra Davis
Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, EPA
Washington, D.C.

Thadious M. Davis, Professor
Dept. of English
University of N. Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC

Richard T. DeGeorge
Dept. of Philosophy
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS

Joseph Del Tufo
Dept. of English
Delaware State College
Dover, DE

Alice Dieter
Bosie Cascade Corporation
Boise, ID

Frank Dilley, Chairman
Philosophy Dept.
University of Delaware
Newark, DE

Karin Eisele
American Field Service
New York, NY

Rob Elder
Editor, Editorial Pages
San Jose Mercury News
San Jose, CA

Herbert Ellison, Professor
School of International Studies
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Donald L. Engle, President
Engle Arts Management
Wayzata, MN

Thomas Flynn, Chairman
Dept. of Philosophy and Religion
University of Mississippi
University, MS

Gloria Jean Gayles
Scholar
Talladega, AL

Gerald George, Director
American Association for State and Local History
Nashville, TN

Jean Gillies
Associate Professor of Art
Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago, IL

Robert Gladowski, Executive Director
American Studies Association
Philadelphia, PA

Dale Gleason
English Dept.
Hutchinson Community College
Hutchinson, KS

Peggy D. Glover, Coordinator
Central Library, OWA/YA
Free Library of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, PA

Harvey J. Graff, NEH Fellow
The Newberry Library
Chicago, IL

Professor Otis Graham
Dept. of History
UC-Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA

Winifred Green
American Friends Service Committee
Jackson, MS

Cletus Grosdidier
Dairy Farmer
Eudora, KS

Ted Harris, Chairman
Division of Social Studies
Waycross Junior College
Waycross, GA

Peter Harstead, Director
Iowa Historical Society
Iowa City, IA

Thomas K. Hearn, Jr.
University College
University of Alabama
Birmingham, AL

Alexa Henderson, Professor of History
Clarke College
Atlanta, GA

Frederick A. Hetzel, Director
University of Pittsburgh Press
Pittsburgh, PA

Thomas Higgs
Regional Administrator
Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare
Kansas City, MO

Cleo S. Higgins
Scholar
Pomona Park, FL

Diane L. Hoeveler
Dept. of English
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY

Edward N. Howard
Director, Vigo County Public Library
Terre Haute, ID

Nancy Howard, Curator of Education
The Museums at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY

John Hudson, Librarian
University of Texas-Arlington
Arlington, TX

Harold Hyman, Professor
History Dept.
Rice University
Houston, TX

Lynne Iglitzin, Professor
Dept. of Undergraduate Studies
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Douglas D. Irving, Program Evaluator
Arizona Guidance Center - NCGC
Flagstaff, AZ

Sylvia Jacobs, Professor
Dept. of History
N. Carolina Central University
Durham, NC

Gordon Jensen
Chairman, History Dept.
University of Hartford
W. Hartford, CT

G. Wesley Johnson, Director
Graduate Program in Public Historical Studies
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA

Kathryn Kallal
Wilmington, DE

Elizabeth Kennan
President
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, MA

Larry Kenney
Director of Research
Washington State Labor Council
Seattle, WA

Sally Kohlstedt, Professor
History Dept.
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY

Daniel Krieger
Assistant Professor of History
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA

Joan La France
United Indians of All Tribes Foundation
Seattle, WA

Mary Land
Dept. of English
Washington State University
Pullman, WA

Philip Levine
 Dean, Division of Humanities
 UCLA
 Los Angeles, CA

W. McNeil Lowry, Vice President
 The Ford Foundation
 New York, NY

Robert McKenzie, Professor
 University of Alabama
 University, AL

Richard Maass, President
 American Jewish Conference
 White Plains, NY

Dan Maccoby
 Jewish Community Group Liaison
 B'nai B'rith National Headquarters
 Washington, D.C.

Anthony Macro
 Chairman, Classics Dept.
 Trinity College
 Hartford, CT

Brigham Madsen
 Dept. of History
 University of Utah
 Salt Lake City, UT

C. Peter Magrath, President
 University of Minnesota
 Minneapolis, MN

Beryl York Malawsky
 Scholar
 Upper Montclair, NJ

David H. Malone, Professor
 University of S. California
 Los Angeles, CA

David Markes, English teacher
 High School
 Waukomis, OK

Cassandra Hoffman Mason
 Columbus, OH

Bettie J. Matthews,
 Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
 Williamsburg, VA

Daniel Mayers
English Dept.
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, NY

Charles J. Merdinger
Retired, Deputy Director
Scripps Institute of Oceanography
Lake Tahoe, NV

Jake C. Miller
Professor Political Science
Bethune - Cookman College
Daytona Beach, FL

The Honorable Patsy Mink
Former member, U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Kathryn J. Mohrman, Editor
Forum for Liberal Education
Association of American Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Lynn Munro, Dept. of English
Kendall College
Evanston, IL

Susan Nelson
Los Angeles, CA

Gwen Neville
Dept. of Anthropology
Emory University
Atlanta, GA

James Noel
GWU-Tidewater Center
Hampton, VA

Margot Norris
Director of Women's Studies
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI

Frank Nye, Editor
Cedar Rapids Gazette
Cedar Rapids, IA

George Oser
Houston, TX

Bruce Owen
Vice President
South Oklahoma City Jr. College
Oklahoma City, OK

Hardev S. Palta
Senior Management Analyst
Bureau of Budget & Management Research
Baltimore, MD

Judith L. Peiser, Executive Director
Center for Southern Folklore
Memphis, TN

David Peterson
Office of Public Information
Minnesota State Senate
Golden Valley, MN

Sarah Pomeroy, Professor
Hunter College
New York, NY

Robert Puckett
Dept. of Political Science
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, ID

Howard Radest, Professor
Dept. of Philosophy
Ramapo College
Mahway, NJ

Sam Ragan
Editor, The Pilot
Southern Pines, NC

Robert Ramsey
Former Secretary of Education
State of Virginia
Richmond, VA

Carolyn Raney
Musicologist
East Stroudsburg State College
East Stroudsburg, PA

Helen Reeve
Russian Dept.
Connecticut College
New London, CT

Harriet Rice
Editor and Publisher, Pacific Search
Seattle, WA

Mitchell F. Rice
Austin, TX

Ross Rieder
Washington State Labor Council
Seattle, WA

Jerome Sachs
President Emeritus
Northeastern Illinois University
Chicago, IL

R. C. Salinas
Principal
Ringgold Junior High School
Rio Grande City, TX

Anna Sanchez
Account Executive
Marketing Division
Illinois Bell Company
Chicago, IL

Laura Polla Scanlon
NYC Community College
Brooklyn NY

Don Schlichting, Editor
Durango Herald
Durango, CO

Richard W. Schmelzer, Retired
College Administrator and English Professor
Clearwater Beach, FL

Alan R. Shucard
Humanities Division
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
Wood Road
Kenosha, WI

Carl Schulz
Lawyer
Davenport, IA

Chris Scott
Division of Policy Development
Dept. of Administration
Raleigh, NC

Ruth O. Selig
Dept. of Anthropology
Natural History Museum
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C.

Jack Siegman
Dept. of Sociology
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE

Marty Spear
Dept. of History and Philosophy
Community College of Philadelphia
Philadelphia, PA

Louis Charles Stagg
Dept. of English
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN

Walter Straley
Former Senior Vice President
John Deere & Company
Borrego Springs, CA

Brit Storey
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
National Park Service
Denver, CO

William Teague, Chairman
Social Sciences Dept.
Texas College
Tyler, TX

Charles Trout, Professor
Dept. of History
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, MA

Robert Trullinger
Dept. of History
University of North Carolina
Asheville, NC

Louis L. Tucker
Executive Director
Massachusetts Historical Society
Cambridge, MA

Jerome Tweton
History Dept.
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, ND

Maxine Van De Wetering
Dept. of Philosophy
University of Montana
Missoula, MT

Richard Van Iten
Chairman, Philosophy Dept.
Iowa State University
Ames, IA

Dave Varner
Publisher - Pilot Tribune
Powell, WY

Tom Vaughan
Director
Oregon Historical Society
Portland, OR

Fred R. Von Der Mehden
Dept. of Political Science
Rice University
Houston, TX

Lee Wade
Civic Leader
Spokane, WA

Homer Wadsworth
Director, The Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, OH

Joan Wagnon
Civic Leader
Topeka, KS

Joseph Walt
Dept. of History
Simpson College
Indianola, IA

Nelson E. Weiss, Esq.
Burke, Haber and Berick
Cleveland, OH

Judy Wellman
History Dept.
SUNY-Oswego
Oswego, NY

Jean Wente
Wente Brother Wines
Livermore, CA

Hanna Weston
Dept. of History
Kirkwood Community College
Iowa City, IA

Lee White
Communications Workers of America
AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Jack Wickstrom
Dept. of History
Kalamazoo College
Kalamazoo, MI

Margot Willett-Getsinger
Arts Extension Service
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA

Stuart Wilson
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, LA

Donald Woods
Associate Dean
Continuing Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Robert Woodward
Director, Bangor Public Library
Bangor, ME

Jack Worley
Dept. of Philosophy
Grinnell College
Grinnell, IA

Edmund Worthy
Asst. to the Executive Director
American Historical Association
Washington, D.C.

Gayle Graham Yates
Director of Women's Studies
University of Minnesota
New Brighton, MN

H. Wilson Yates, Rev.
United Theological Seminary
New Brighton, MN

Aurelia Young
Musicologist
Jackson, MS

Rene' D. Zentner
Manager of Corporate Studies
Shell Oil Company
Houston, TX

REPEAT PANELIST

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



Date

Inside Address

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to serve, once again, as a panelist for the State Program. We will be meeting on date. at time to give you the # annual requests and the rest of the day we will leave free for reading. We will meet again at time the next day to discuss the annual requests.

Each committee submits a two-year plan and request for first-year funding. To help you prepare for evaluating the second-year requests, we have enclosed summaries of the two-year plans. The requests will be distributed to you day morning. We would like the panel to consider each request separately, for clarity of program purpose, record of accomplishment, plans for the coming 12 months (including evaluation) and understanding of the opportunities and special character of the state. The enclosed list of questions indicates some of the issues and concerns you will want to evaluate.

We are very much looking forward to having you with us again. If you have any questions or problems with this material, please call (202) 724-0286.

Sincerely,

B. J. Stiles Director
Division of State Programs

Enclosures

LMH/mlj

NEW PANELIST LETTER - ANNUAL REQUEST

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



Date

Inside Address

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a panelist for the Division of State Programs. We will meet in Room # of the Endowment (806 15th Street, NW) at time on date for introductions. The rest of the day will be for reading the # Annual Requests. Discussion will begin day morning. Please make your own travel arrangements (hotel list is enclosed).

The state programs are at an important junction in their development. Until the passage of the NEH reauthorizing legislation in 1976, the committees were restricted to funding humanities projects on public policy issues for the out-of-school adult public. The legislation broadened committees' options for funding humanities projects which fit the special circumstances and resources of the state. This broadened opportunity presented the committees with complex new program options and responsibilities. Most committees have chosen to go slowly and carefully before setting new policy guidelines. The requests you are to review reflect the committees' plans in light of these options.

The state committees are all engaged in an effort to relate the humanities to the general public in their states. As you know, the State Programs are unlike other Endowment programs in that the states do not compete with each other in the way that two scholars compete for a fellowship.

Each committee submits a two-year plan and request for first year funding. To help you prepare for evaluating the second-year requests, we have enclosed summaries of the two-year plans. The requests will be distributed to you day morning. We would like the panel to consider each request separately, for clarity of program purpose, record of accomplishment, plans for the coming 12 months (including evaluation) and understanding of the opportunities and special character of the state. The enclosed list of questions indicates some of the issues and concerns you will want to evaluate.

We are grateful for your willingness to undertake this task and look forward to seeing you in months. If you have any questions or problems with this material, please call (202) 724-0286 (collect).

Sincerely,

B. J. Stiles
Director
Division of State Programs

Enclosures
LMH/mlj

REVIEWER

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506



Date

Inside Address

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for proposals which have been submitted to our Division. Your evaluation of these proposed programs for state humanities groups is an integral part of our review and decision process.

To help you in reviewing the proposals, we have prepared a brief list of general questions which pertain to the guidelines for these programs. Also, there is a brief description of the program. You are, of course, encouraged to inquire, probe, and analyze well beyond these general suggestions.

In order for your comments to be considered, please put them in the mail by March 7, 1980. You need not return the proposal itself. We would appreciate receiving separate written comments on each proposal. Should any unexpected circumstances make it impossible for you to complete this task, please notify us at once. If you have questions or problems, please call us collect (202-724-0826).

Again, thank you for being willing to undertake this helpful and important task.

Sincerely,

B. J. Stiles
Director
Division of State Programs

Enclosures

BJS/mlj



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE STATE HUMANITIES PROGRAM

The National Endowment for the Humanities, established by Congress in 1965, makes over 2,000 grants a year in support of research, education, fellowships and stipends, and public activities in the humanities. One of the Endowment's six operating divisions is the Division of State Programs.

NEH's State Program emerged out of the Congressional charge to the Endowment to promote projects in the humanities which (a) foster increased public understanding and use of the humanities; and (b) relate the humanities to current conditions of national life. This program makes funds available to a humanities entity in each state, and that entity in turn makes grants to existing organizations, institutions, and agencies to support activities, projects, and programs in the humanities.

The program was initiated in 1970 on an experimental basis. From the beginning, the state program involved volunteers, who would be enlisted in the effort to bring the humanities to a wider public. The first six committees were constituted in three ways: two grants were made to state arts councils to develop a humanities program as a part of their program (Oklahoma and Maine); two were made through the cooperation of university continuing education or extension divisions (Missouri and Georgia); two were made to committees created de novo, as subsequently became the standard practice (Oregon and Wyoming.)*

*The committees that had been created as part of state arts councils (Maine and Oklahoma) asked, independently, to be severed from the parent arts council when it became clear to both parties that the humanities program was so distinct from the primary goals of the arts council that a formal relationship was no longer helpful. Both committees then became independent volunteer committees following the national model. The two committees formed through the help of university continuing education (Missouri and Georgia) did not have a formal tie to the parent institution, and evolved into independent volunteer committees.

The Endowment chose to assist these new, volunteer committees for several reasons: every state had a number of tax-supported and private agencies with a partial interest in the humanities, and nearly equal claims to be selected as the agency for an Endowment program in the state. These included the state historical societies, state archives, various museums, state and private libraries, universities, state arts and humanities councils. The existing groups, however, were designed to support only one or a few of the disciplines of the humanities, or were designed for more than one purpose (e.g., a library or a state arts council). A new organization was a way to give many of these groups a voice and at the same time address all of the humanities.

In addition, a new organization could focus on the single task of increasing public understanding and appreciation of the humanities. That focus could be emphasized by using a particularly American phenomenon--volunteerism. By engaging citizens who were united through a common sense of purpose and dedication to the humanities, the Endowment expected that significant public programs in the humanities could be accomplished without putting in place a costly delivery system normative to most federal initiatives.

The basic principles of the state program were, for the most part, in place from the beginning, and were formally endorsed by the National Council of NEH in February 1972. Six principles formed the backbone of the program in each of the states. Those principles were:

1. The humanities should be central to all aspects of the committee's program.
2. Scholars in the humanities should be involved centrally in each project funded by the state committee.
3. All grants of a state committee should support projects dealing with public policy issues.
4. The committee should have a carefully chosen state theme, and the theme should be central to each project.
5. Projects should involve the adult, out-of-school public.
6. The committee objectives should be achieved by making grants.

Each state committee used its grant from the Endowment to: (1) hire a small staff (typically an executive director and a secretary in the first years), and (2) make grants (called "regrants" by the committees and the Endowment) to non-profit groups and organizations within the state in response to applications successfully submitted against criteria listed above.

From FY 1971 through FY 1976, the staff at the Endowment, i.e., the staff of the state-based program within the Division of Public Programs, helped to sustain the committees in operation, and to develop committees in additional states.

The process used to help create a state committee was the same in each instance (after the first six grants). NEH staff would conduct preliminary research to identify the resources and humanistic institutions of the state under consideration, would prepare a list of names of individuals to be contacted, often totaling well over 100 persons. An NEH program officer would then initiate extensive telephone calls to these on the list, describing the state-based program, seeking advice about who might be particularly capable of taking part in the creation of such a program, and asking for advice about special concerns, opportunities, and issues that should be taken into account in launching a state program.

Following these calls, NEH staff would recommend the names of individuals who might form the planning committee. The Chairman would invite about 6 persons to come to Washington for a day and a half of more intense discussion of the program. Following this meeting, the participants would be encouraged to return to their state, expand their numbers, apply to the Endowment for a planning grant, and begin the process of shaping a program for their state.

Apart from these catalyst groups, the Endowment has had no role in selecting individuals for membership in the state committees. From 1971 until late 1976, the Endowment's stipulations were that committees should be broadly representative of their state, and consist of three groupings of equal size: one-third were administrators of cultural and educational institutions (who might be expected to help the committee administer Federal grants); one-third who were scholars in the humanities (who might be expected to be sensitive to the substance of the humanities); and one-third who represented the general public (who were expected to be concerned about the public viability of suggested programs).

During the planning period, the catalyst group would: (1) conduct a series of meetings throughout the state to which were invited organizations, groups, and individuals to discuss the program, determine what might be a successful state theme, and create preliminary interest in making applications to the committee; (2) employ a temporary staff; (3) expand its membership from the original group to one of about 20 members. When the process of planning and consultation was complete, the committee would apply to the Endowment for operational funds. The planning period ranged from 6 months to a year or more, with the average being 8 to 9 months. Although many committees began their operations

The submission of a compliance plan for purposes of eligibility meant, for most states, a recodification of its by-laws and policies. The intent of this portion of the law is to insure mechanisms of accountability and responsiveness in each committee. The budgetary implications of the law are not profound, because the Endowment had obligated at least 20 percent of its definite budget to the program each year, beginning in FY 1975.

The effects of the law were: to insure some forms of committee accountability to the citizens of its state; to provide assurance that the program and each committee within it would receive a certain amount of funding each year; to give each committee the responsibility for determining the humanities program it wished to provide for the state; and to give state governments at least two methods of participating in the activities of the state committees.

State programs are now operational in fifty states and Puerto Rico. A group of citizens in the District of Columbia is currently planning a program and is expected to receive an operational grant in November. The program is of growing interest to Congress, to universities and colleges, to state and local historical societies and museums, to libraries, to educational television stations, to academic humanists concerned about public service, to many local organizations and institutions, and to various segments of the general public. Most committees, in response to the 1976 legislation, consulted with citizens throughout the state to determine what sorts of program activities would best serve the special needs and particular resources of that state. The new programs share many characteristics. More than half of the current programming in state programs relate the humanities to public policy issues and contemporary concerns--the role of the family, minority and women's issues, problems of biomedical ethics, problems of land use, the future of energy use, etc. Almost without exception, the guidelines adopted by state committees require that programs be for the adult public.

DG/kg
DSP
07/12/79

General Questions for State Proposal Review

The questions below are those which the staff feels address the fundamental concerns of the NEH and of Congressional intent in establishing the state programs. They are not the only questions which may be asked, nor should you feel constrained to answer each of them as you assess the proposals. It is appropriate, for example, to comment on the organization and style of the proposal itself, as well as the clarity and thoroughness of the committee's evaluation of its efforts.

1. Does the proposal describe a humanities program? Is it clear what contribution scholars in the humanities have made to the program and to individual projects? Of what quality does that contribution appear to be? Are there plans to broaden or improve the participation of scholars and the humanities content?

2. Has the program reached citizens of the state broadly? Do the committee's plans include appropriate methods to reach different groups and areas?

3. Are the committee's overall program goals and objectives clearly defined? Are they adequately explained in terms of the humanities and of the character and resources of the state?

4. Has the committee's evaluation of its past program provided useful information for planning and in designing new program directions and committee and staff procedures? Does the committee's proposed plan for evaluation appear adequate for assessing its overall program goals as well as committee and staff program administration, guidelines, and individual regrant projects?

5. Would you please comment on the committee's funding guidelines regarding:

- a. appropriateness of the guidelines in view of resources and staff time available;
- b. adequacy of review procedures to insure fair and consistent judgments on proposals;
- c. consistency of guidelines with the committee's stated program goals and objectives.
- d. clarity of the guidelines to potential applicants.

6. Please comment on the functions of the staff and the committee. Does the division of responsibilities appear to be clearly defined and appropriate in view of the committee's goals and the nature of the program? Does it permit and encourage an effective and vigorous program?

7. Is the committee itself broadly representative of the state and does the committee appear to be sensitive and committed to developing a responsive and (publicly?) accountable program.

8. Finally, is the proposed program interesting, exciting, imaginative, attractive?

DIVISION OF STATE PROGRAMS

May Council Review Schedule

February

- 1 Proposals due
- 4-8 Recruit reviewers/panelists
- 11-14 Mail proposals to reviewers/panelists
- 27 Staff comments due on proposals
- 29 Pre-panel staff review

March

- 4-14 Abstracts & committee lists written, edited and typed
- 10 Proposal panel
- 13 Post-panel staff review
- 21-28 Additional information written and edited
- 31 Annual reports due

April

- 4 Additional information typed
- 8 Annual Report staff comments written
- 9-11 Annual Report abstracts written, edited and typed
- 10-11 Annual Report panel
- 14-15 Staff working days for additional information
- 18 Committee book to printer
- 22 Committee book mailed

(1980)