

Trinity College

## Trinity College Digital Repository

---

Resist Board Meeting Minutes

Resist Collection

---

6-27-1989

### Resist Board Meeting, June 27, 1989

Resist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/minutes>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Resist, "Resist Board Meeting, June 27, 1989" (1989). *Resist Board Meeting Minutes*. 194.  
<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/minutes/194>

Minutes  
Board Windfall Subcommittee  
June 27, 1989  
Louis Kampf's house

Present: Pam Chamberlain, Oscar Hernandez, Nancy Moniz, Nancy Wechsler

We went over the questions from the last board meeting, one by one, and made the following recommendations:

- NW  
more info for  
Sept 10 mtg.*
1. Where to invest the money? For now we will put it in our Working Assets account, and also check into whether or not there are socially responsible CD's with a higher rate of interest.
- formula to  
\$350  
for 3 mtgs.*
2. Should we keep the \$600 limit or raise it? Keep our \$250 formula or raise it? Forget the formula and just decide to give out up to \$600 per group? We decided to keep the \$600 limit. We propose raising the formula to \$300 for the next three meetings, and then re-evaluate if that's working. (The feeling was that if we didn't use the formula we might be too free with saying yes to groups. We also felt it was good to start out conservative.)
- Y ✓*
3. Should we put \$10,000 (or some other sum) into our revolving prospecting fund? We decided to take \$5000 during the second year and add it to the prospecting mail fund, and another \$5000 during the third year and add it to the prospecting mail fund. That would bring that fund up to \$35,000. This helps protect us against rising costs, etc.
- N ✓*
4. Should we increase our revolving loan fund? Since we don't get many requests for loans we felt it was not necessary at this time to increase the loan fund. We can re-evaluate this in the future.
- N ✓*
5. Should we increase the amount of an emergency grant? We decided not to increase the amount of an emergency grant largely because the process was not as strict as a regular grant and therefore there should be a big difference in the amount a group would get.
- N ✓*
6. Should we set aside a specific amount for outreach/advertising or just leave it up to the staff? We decided to leave it up to the staff to decide on advertising/outreach on a case by case basis.
- Y ✓*
7. Should we raise staff salaries, and/or add more paid vacation time? We decided to raise Nancy Wechsler and Tatiana Schreiber's hourly wage to equal Nancy Moniz's. We also agreed to add one more week of paid vacation. Tatiana had raised the possibility that it would be hard for her to take an additional week because of the need to continue getting out the newsletter. We agreed that if she couldn't take the week, and didn't want to roll it

over to the next year, she could get paid for that week of untaken leave at the end of the year (much as would happen if someone were leaving and still had unused vacation leave).

- ✓  
N 8. Should we set aside a specific amount for staff training? People felt we didn't need to set aside specific money. We thought some allotment existed in personnel policy. (But in fact the personnel policy says we should just bring up needs at board meeting.) The committee recommends that staff should come to board with requests for training.
- ✓  
N 9. Should we produce a guide to media funding? We decided it wasn't a priority (at this time) for Resist to hire a consultant to do a media resource list. We will discuss it again in the future.
- Y ✓ 10. Should we take on a short term project and develop resource/info sheets on funding sources for a number of issue areas? We decided to do a generic pamphlet of where to start looking for grants. Nancy Moniz will put together resources. Resist will pay for printing costs. We should check into getting an intern to do more in-depth reports.
- ✓  
OK 11. Should we make this major donation public? For now we wont make it public. Maybe at the end of second or third year we can say we received this money--it allowed us to give out such and such amount more money and make these other changes--and now we need your help to continue what we have been able to achieve.

## A LITTLE BIT OF ANALYSIS & EXTRAPOLATION ON GRANTS FOR 1989

So far in 1989, we've had 3 board meetings  
given 64 grants  
for a total of \$25,100  
average of \$392/grant

The total amount for those meetings that was requested by  
the groups to which we gave grants was:  
\$34,710  
average/group of \$542

This averages out to \$150/group less than asked for.

Last year, we had 8 board meetings  
gave 126 grants  
for a total of \$51,500 (approx.)  
average of \$410/grant

On the present schedule, we'll have 8 meetings this year and  
give approximately 171 grants (all of the above doesn't count  
emergency grants).

If we decide to give full grants requested, this will mean  
approximately \$25,650 more in funds given.

One thing to note on the above is that we had an  
unusually large amount of requests in March (48) and had to have  
another and interim meeting in March (I've counted both March  
meetings as one meeting above). We may not reach the guessed at  
171 grants in 1989 but give closer to 150 grants. In that case,  
full grants funding increase would be closer to \$22,000.

If we decide to increase our maximum grant (which I'm not  
proposing) to \$800, this would mean an increase of approx.  
\$59,850 over a whole year based on possible 171 grants or \$52,500  
for 150 grants.

Even though I've done a survey of the actual grants given to  
this date, all of the figures are a little hard to determine  
because we have no way of knowing what groups will ask for in the  
coming months. We also have no way of telling if we will give  
more, less or the same number of grants as last year but at least  
the above figures give us something to work with.

This analysis is just to give board members some idea of the  
possible maximum figures involved in deciding to give full  
grants. This is probably an over-estimation but, personally, I'd  
rather know the high figure than be caught short.

  
Nancy Mohiz  
Resist staff



Nancy:

Charley MacMartin called while I was still here in the office. He's the one who wrote the grant for the student central america network. He called to talk to me about possibly giving Resist a large amount of money from some inherited wealth. (He's behind the new Vermont "Green Mountain Fund." I'm meeting him Monday morning. I mentioned we had just discussed his proposal, and what our issues are about student groups. I said you were writing him a letter. I suggested he put together a letter to us to explain what they had done to get funding, and why they still needed money from Resist. He will probably give me that letter monday. So...when you write him, make it a friendly letter!

When I see him I will ask him why he doesn't do a donor directed grant to the group. Maybe he hasn't thought of that, or didn't know it was possible to do it and be anonymous. I will explore this with him.

If you have any questions, call me at New Words from 2pm-9pm thursday (876-5310) or I'll be here friday.

Wouldn't it be nice if he gave us a bunch of money? He says he's worked with Haymarket, but wants to give the money to us. This is exciting.

see you friday,

wechsler

June 15

Dear Resist,

I want to register my opinions on some of the questions raised for the subcommittee to consider about our windfall gift, since I won't be around when you discuss it.

1. Don't care -- trust you guys
2. Keep \$600 limit. Raise formula. Otherwise, we will be spending more than Moniz figured, because there will be no incentive to say no to anyone.
3. I'll go with whatever Wechs thinks is good here.
4. No strong feelings on this.
5. Not by much, since emergency grants aren't subjected to the kind of scrutiny and discussion that regular grants are, and since the potential grantees don't have to do so much work to submit a good proposal, I am in favor of keeping emergency grants at a lowish level.
6. Whatever
7. Something more for staff-- let them figure out among them what they most want.
8. Probably not -- at least not if provision is already made in personnel policy. And it seems to me that a case needs to be made that desktop is the way to go. We haven't had that discussion, so setting aside training money seems premature to me.
9. No. Not just for media.
10. Yes, if someone else hasn't already done it.
11. Only with the greatest caution. Paul's idea (using the \$\$ as a "challenge grant") is intriguing, but I wonder if it would work, and especially if it would work over the long run or only as a one shot deal.

So that's my take on it all. Enjoy your next meeting. See ya in the fall.

Nancy M -

The person I thought of is  
Maine who might be able to give us a  
reference for that Hospitality House in  
Hinchley, Me, is Renie Attean. I haven't had a chance to  
call her, she is a friend of my friend Evelyn  
Isaac, & I have met her, but don't know  
if she'd remember me,  
Her # is 207-827-7780

Tess

7/14/89

Dear Nancy,

I do not know if the Windfall decision RE \$ 600 limit has a duration; I would be in favor of raising it to \$ 1000. - We can be as careful as need be in going above \$ 600, - but the poss.

Should be there, singly for inflationary reasons. How long has the limit been \$ 600? If my memory is correct, since the beginning, i.e. 1967? (\$ 600 then would be \$ 1000 now). -

Yours -

Hans K.

Increase in NW + TS salaries

increase from \$10.888696 to \$11.455522  
is .566826/hr.

32

12.5

$$44.5 \text{ hrs} \times .566826 = 25.223757 \text{ /wk} \\ \times \frac{20 \text{ wks}}{5 \text{ mos}} = 100.895148 \text{ /yr.}$$

\$124.124122

\$499.80688 (1989)

\$504.47514 additional

$$1990 = 25.223757 \\ \times 52$$

\$1,311.635364

\$1,311.635364 additional

plus 1 more week of paid vacation @  
option for TS of additional  
week's pay if she can't take  
1 week additional pd vake



\* Windfall gift - At some point we need to have a political discussion of whether or not we want to try to become an endowed foundation (one which can live on its capital). That hasn't been an issue for us in the past, and it may not really be one in the future, but we should discuss it. People should have read Wechsler's write up in the packet about the anonymous donor who wants to give us approximately \$60,000 for three years. (Two checks each year.) We had a longish discussion about this money: Should we put it in our working assets account and/or check out other possibilities for socially responsible investing? Do we want to put more aside for advertising/outreach? Loan Fund? Emergency grants? Should we make this donation public, or would that hurt our other fundraising? Tatiana suggested we use some for short term projects, and suggested we fund development of a booklet/guide on funding possibilities for media projects. Moniz thought perhaps that should be expanded to include developing info sheets on funding possibilities for a number of different issue areas. (We need to check if the Funding Exchange has already done this.) We had a discussion about whether or not to raise our ceiling above the \$600 maximum, or simply to find a way to give out more money but stick to the \$600 limit. (See attached sheet of Nancy Moniz's financial analysis.) It was pointed out that we can give out more to groups in our priority areas because they can apply more than once a year. Now maybe we will actually have the money to deal with this if groups really do it. Wechsler felt strongly that it was important to give out more money this year. People need to feel like we are growing. They will be more likely to give us money if they see us giving out more and more each year. Her proposal is to leave the \$600 maximum for now, and really give groups the full amount if we like them. Some of this money (\$10,000) at some point should go into prospecting fund to cope with future inflation, etc. (We might never again get a chance to take \$10,000 and earmark it like this.) Roxanna suggested we consider staff salary increases and increasing paid vacation time. Tatiana said an increase in paid vacation time might not help her. Paul suggested one way to make this public was to say we had been given a large donation over three years and that that meant we could give out more money--but that we needed everyone's help to ensure that the changes we made this year vis a vis giving out more money could be maintained over the years to come. He thought we might be able to use this money as a kind of "challenge grant."

DECISION: We set up a sub-committee to discuss the following questions, and come up with a proposal for the next board meeting. Wechsler may not be at that board meeting (due to vacation). Louis suggested that if the board made substantive changes in the sub-committee's proposal, that it should wait for final approval until there is a board meeting that Wechsler is at (being the chief fiscal person for Resist). Everyone agreed. Subcommittee: Nancy Wechsler, Nancy Moniz, Louis Kampf (if needed), Oscar Hernandez, and Pam Chamberlain (if she is willing). Subcommittee will meet: June 27th 7PM at Louis Kampf's -- 14 Glenwood, Cambridge.

Questions for the subcommittee to consider:

1. Where to invest the money? (Working Assets and/or another socially responsible place.)
2. Keep the \$600 limit or raise it? Keep our \$250 formula or raise it? Forget the formula and just decide to give out up to \$600 per group?
3. Should we put \$10,000 (or some other sum) into our revolving prospecting fund?
4. Should we increase our revolving Loan fund?
5. Should we increase the amount of an emergency grant? (Presently at \$150)
6. Should we set aside a specific amount for outreach/advertising or just leave that up to staff each year?
7. Should we raise staff salaries, and/or add more paid vacation time?
8. Should we set aside a specific amount for staff training projects (so that we can go desktop in the future)? We should check personnel policy, because we did set aside some money for staff training.
9. Should we agree to Tatiana's suggestion for a short term project to develop a guide to media funding?
10. Should we take on a short term project and develop resource/info sheets on funding sources for a number of issue areas?
11. Should we make this major donation public? If so, how and when?

*Handwritten notes:*  
 move to \$300 from for groups  
 yes  
 \$5K - 2nd yr  
 \$5K - 3rd yr  
 no for now  
 no  
 up to staff  
 yes + yes (Huck)  
 no  
 not now  
 post project  
 yes

## A LITTLE BIT OF ANALYSIS & EXTRAPOLATION ON GRANTS FOR 1989

So far in 1989, we've had 3 board meetings  
given 64 grants  
for a total of \$25,100  
average of \$392/grant

The total amount for those meetings that was requested by  
the groups to which we gave grants was:  
\$34,710  
average/group of \$542

This averages out to \$150/group less than asked for.

Last year, we had 8 board meetings  
gave 126 grants  
for a total of \$51,500 (approx.)  
average of \$410/grant

On the present schedule, we'll have 8 meetings this year and  
give approximately 171 grants (all of the above doesn't count  
emergency grants).


If we decide to give full grants requested, this will mean  
approximately \$25,650 more in funds given.

One thing to note on the above is that we had an  
unusually large amount of requests in March (48) and had to have  
another and interim meeting in March (I've counted both March  
meetings as one meeting above). We may not reach the guessed at  
171 grants in 1989 but give closer to 150 grants. In that case,  
full grants funding increase would be closer to \$22,000.

If we decide to increase our maximum grant (which I'm not  
proposing) to \$800, this would mean an increase of approx.  
\$59,850 over a whole year based on possible 171 grants or \$52,500  
for 150 grants.

Even though I've done a survey of the actual grants given to  
this date, all of the figures are a little hard to determine  
because we have no way of knowing what groups will ask for in the  
coming months. We also have no way of telling if we will give  
more, less or the same number of grants as last year but at least  
the above figures give us something to work with.

This analysis is just to give board members some idea of the  
possible maximum figures involved in deciding to give full  
grants. This is probably an over-estimation but, personally, I'd  
rather know the high figure than be caught short.

  
Nancy Moniz  
Resist staff

1/20/89

RESIST GRANT PROGRAM  
ANALYSIS OF 1988 AND 1987

	1988	1987
Number of meetings	8	8
Number of grants given	126 (15.8/mtg)	131 (16.4/mtg)
Number of rejections	80 (10/mtg)	105 (13.1/mtg)
Total number of proposals considered	206	236
Number of proposals considered/meeting	25.75	29.5
Total money given in grants/year	\$53,225	\$50,065
Grants given by sectors*	# (% of total)	# (% of total)
Central America	40 (28.4%)	43 (30.3%)
Peace/Anti-Draft/ Anti-Nuke	17 (12.1%)	27 (19%)
Community empower- ment/Anti-Racist	10 (7.1%)	13 (9.2%)
Third World	6 (4.3%)	5 (3.6%)
Cultural & Media	3 (2.1%)	7 (4.9%)
Lesbian/Gay/	14 (9.9%)	12 (8.5%)
Native American	5 (3.5%)	9 (6.3%)
Health/AIDS	9 (6.4%)	3 (2%)
Middle East	13 (9.2%)	8 (5.6%)
Prisoners' Rights	4 (2.8%)	4 (2.9%)
Labor	6 (4.4%)	4 (2.8%)
Women	14 (9.9%)	7 (4.9%)
(Emergency grants	15	11 )
Geographically *		
Boston area	35 (24.6%)	30 (21%)
CA (state)	14 (9.9%)	22 (15.5%)
NY (state)	18 (12.7%)	15 (10.6%)
South	17 (12%)	5 (3.5%)
Midwest & Mt. states	23 (16.3%)	33 (23.2%)
OR, WA, HI, AK	9 (6.4%)	11 (7.8%)
New England (outside Boston)	9 (6.4%)	12 (8.5%)
DC, MD, PA, NJ	16 (11.3%)	14 (9.9%)

\*includes emergency grants & donor directed grants

RESIST GRANT PROGRAM  
ANALYSIS OF 1986 AND 1985

	1986	1985
Number of meetings	7	9
Number of grants given	57 <sup>6</sup> / <sub>10</sub> 102 (14.6/mtg)	151 (16.8/mtg)
Number of rejections	79 (11.3/mtg)	63 <sup>9</sup> / <sub>10</sub> 89 (9.9/mtg)
Total number of proposals considered	178	237
Number of proposals considered/meeting	25.43	26.33
Total money given in grants/year	\$33,310	\$49,665
Grants given by sectors	# (% of total)	# (% of total)
Central America	26 (28%)	46 (34%)
Peace/Anti-Draft/ Anti-Nuke	19 (20.4%)	28 (20.7%)
Publications	-	8 (5.9%)
Community empowerment/Anti-Racist \	13 (14%)	10 (7.4%)
Third World /		
Cultural	-	6 (4.4%)
Lesbian/Gay/Women	14 (15.1%)	11 (8.1%)
Native American	5 (5.3%)	3 (2.2%)
Other	-	20 (14.8%)
Prisoners' Rights	7 (7.5%)	-
Labor	6 (6.5%)	-
Donor Directed	6 (3.2%)	6 (4.4%)
Emergency grants	6	13



\* Windfall gift - At some point we need to have a political discussion of whether or not we want to try to become an endowed foundation (one which can live on its capital). That hasn't been an issue for us in the past, and it may not really be one in the future, but we should discuss it. People should have read Wechsler's write up in the packet about the anonymous donor who wants to give us approximately \$60,000 for three years. (Two checks each year.) We had a longish discussion about this money: Should we put it in our working assets account and/or check out other possibilities for socially responsible investing? Do we want to put more aside for advertising/out-reach? Loan Fund? Emergency grants? Should we make this donation public, or would that hurt our other fundraising? Tatiana suggested we use some for short term projects, and suggested we fund development of a booklet/guide on funding possibilities for media projects. Moniz thought perhaps that should be expanded to include developing info sheets on funding possibilities for a number of different issue areas. (We need to check if the Funding Exchange has already done this.) We had a discussion about whether or not to raise our ceiling above the \$600 maximum, or simply to find a way to give out more money but stick to the \$600 limit. (See attached sheet of Nancy Moniz's financial analysis.) It was pointed out that we can give out more to groups in our priority areas because they can apply more than once a year. Now maybe we will actually have the money to deal with this if groups really do it. Wechsler felt strongly that it was important to give out more money this year. People need to feel like we are growing. They will be more likely to give us money if they see us giving out more and more each year. Her proposal is to leave the \$600 maximum for now, and really give groups the full amount if we like them. Some of this money (\$10,000) at some point should go into prospecting fund to cope with future inflation, etc. (We might never again get a chance to take \$10,000 and earmark it like this.) Roxanna suggested we consider staff salary increases and increasing paid vacation time. Tatiana said an increase in paid vacation time might not help her. Paul suggested one way to make this public was to say we had been given a large donation over three years and that that meant we could give out more money--but that we needed everyone's help to ensure that the changes we made this year vis a vis giving out more money could be maintained over the years to come. He thought we might be able to use this money as a kind of "challenge grant."

DECISION: We set up a sub-committee to discuss the following questions, and come up with a proposal for the next board meeting. Wechsler may not be at that board meeting (due to vacation). Louis suggested that if the board made substantive changes in the sub-committee's proposal, that it should wait for final approval until there is a board meeting that Wechsler is at (being the chief fiscal person for Resist). Everyone agreed. Subcommittee: Nancy Wechsler, Nancy Moniz, Louis Kampf (if needed), Oscar Hernandez, and Pam Chamberlain (if she is willing). Subcommittee will meet: June 27th 7PM at Louis Kampf's -- 14 Glenwood, Cambridge.

Questions for the subcommittee to consider:

1. Where to invest the money? (Working Assets and/or another socially responsible place.)
2. Keep the \$600 limit or raise it? Keep our \$250 formula or raise it? Forget the formula and just decide to give out up to \$600 per group?
3. Should we put \$10,000 (or some other sum) into our revolving prospecting fund?
4. Should we increase our revolving Loan fund?
5. Should we increase the amount of an emergency grant? (Presently at \$150)
6. Should we set aside a specific amount for outreach/advertising or just leave that up to staff each year?
7. Should we raise staff salaries, and/or add more paid vacation time?
8. Should we set aside a specific amount for staff training projects (so that we can go desktop in the future)? We should check personnel policy, because we did set aside some money for staff training.
9. Should we agree to Tatiana's suggestion for a short term project to develop a guide to media funding?
10. Should we take on a short term project and develop resource/info sheets on funding sources for a number of issue areas?
11. Should we make this major donation public? If so, how and when?



New address after July 1, 1989 —>

1934 South University Blvd.  
Denver, CO 80210

June 19, 1989

Dear Nancy Wechsler,

Thanks for your letter. I am glad RESIST already has an endowment and is open to the idea in principle (not to make a pun). I understand that RESIST has no plans for establishing another endowment. I would expect that drawing up endowment papers is not easy (and takes either money for lawyers or some lawyer's contribution of time). I understand that there are no plans for an endowment campaign. I also understand that the Petal Fund money could go into the revolving loan fund and the RESIST development fund. The preferred vehicle for the Petal Fund money is an endowment.

There is a little problem with Petal Fund money going into the memorial fund for Arthur Raymond Cohen. Could Petal Fund money go into an endowment fund named for RESIST (hence it would be the RESIST Endowment)? If anyone wanted to make a gift to the endowment in someone's honor or memory, that gift could be so recorded. Or perhaps there is some way in which grants from this single RESIST Endowment could carry a designated name for endowment gifts over a certain amount of money (let's say \$1000, \$5000 or whatever). That is, if someone gives \$1000 in honor of X, the yearly grant of \$100 from that principle's interest would be labeled the X Award, even though the actual \$1000 principle would be kept unsegregated in the RESIST Endowment. This way you wouldn't have to set up a new endowment every time an honorary or memorial gift were given! Obviously the extra book keeping involved would not be practical for donations under a certain amount. Finally, this allows for those who want no one's name besides RESIST's on a particular grant from the Endowment. (Flexibility enough to satisfy every taste!) Incidentally, there would be no restrictions on the Petal Fund's donation, such that the interest could be used either for grants or for organizational expenses as determined by the Board.

I leave these decisions to the Board and do not need further involvement, although I would be curious to know the final decision. All I need to know is whether the Petal Fund money could go into a RESIST Endowment separate from the Arthur Raymond Cohen Memorial Endowment.

Thank you for the IRS letter. I will send it on to the Petal Fund when this decision is made. Enclosed are the Belle Fund Guidelines. I must tell you that I am very impressed with your thoroughness and speed of response!

Sincerely,

