

CHAPTER 5

MONEY: ALLOCATIONS AND SPONSORED PROJECTS

During the 1991-2004 period, the COE's financial resources came from three sources. The largest, by far, was money allocated to the COE by central administration which, in turn, was primarily state appropriated money and tuition. A much smaller, but still appreciable, amount came from sponsored projects. A smaller amount came from private sources through development and other fund-raising.

Central Administration Allocations. There is no way fully to appreciate what was going on during 1991-2004 with sponsored project activity (this chapter) in the College of Education or with "development" (Chapter Six) without a reminder of what was happening with respect to central administration allocations to COE and the other academic colleges.

First, the budget allocation process in 1991-2004 was such that it was quite difficult for any college or any department to plan, and to prepare, in any substantial way, for years following the current fiscal year. Second, during the 1991-2004 period, it was not at all uncommon for funds previously allocated to the COE (and other colleges) to be "recoup-ed" by central administration during the course of the fiscal year. Third, and perhaps most important, was that state appropriations to EMU (and other institutions in the state) generally declined, especially when "purchasing power" and inflation were considered. As was noted in Chapter 2, the number of ranked faculty members in the COE declined about seven per cent during the 1991-2004 period and the number of FTE lecturers in the COE increased about 30% during the same period of time. Thus, we in the COE were coping with growth in the student body and program expansion generally through ever-increasing reliance on relatively inexpensive, part-time (fortunately generally highly-effective) instructional personnel.

The Need for Money. Central administration allocations were barely enough to support the instructional mission of the COE, with just enough extra to support a small infrastructure of administrators, clericals, and PT's to meet instructional needs. There were small pools of money, available on a competitive basis, from central administration for travel and a bit of support for scholarly activities and service—but not nearly enough for what some faculty members wanted to do. The master contract with the faculty union required that faculty members engage in scholarly activities and service, but there were only extremely limited funds, typically not under COE or department control, to support such.

The COE "Culture" of the Early 1990's. Many of the more senior (in point of service) COE faculty members in the early 1990's had worked at EMU for some years and had become "socialized" (to various degrees) to a culture in which what was expected of them—and available

to support them--was to “teach their classes and do just enough scholarly activity and service (often out of their own pockets) to ‘pass’ any evaluations and promotion/tenure criteria.”

I found this aspect of the “culture” to be unacceptable, but struggled to “do something about it” in the absence of resources. Fortunately, I found, among the faculty, some kindred spirits who were determined to find resources such that the EMU COE could do more and better things for the good of children, youth, young adults, parents, schools, and for the education and related professions. Interestingly, much of the interest expressed was more in the “service” area than in the “scholarly activity” (especially traditional “research” activities) area, but that was OK. Collectively, we determined that there must be money “out there” that we could apply for and obtain such as to “do good” in the educational world.

Sponsored Projects

Quantitative Progress. The quantitative data given below will appear modest to many readers. And, indeed, these figures are rather small in comparison with comparable figures from “research” universities and even some other regional state universities, with other periods of time, and with other units at EMU. In the case of dollar amounts, these are given in then-current dollars, not adjusted for what they might be worth in terms of 2019 or later dollars, and that should be taken into account as well.

Table 1 below shows data from the EMU Office of Research Development (ORD) that was reported in the *Monday Report* from time to time that shows our progress in submitting applications and receiving grants.

During the early part of the 1991-2004 period, sponsored projects in the College of Education were relatively few and small, measured at first in just a few hundreds of thousands of dollars per year. By 1994-95, we received about \$450,000. This increased to about \$1.3 million in 1996-97, declined to a bit less than \$1.0 million in 1999-2000, reached almost \$2.9 million in 2000-2001 (the highest figure for the 1991-2004 period of time), and ended at some \$2.3 million for 2003-2004 (12.6% of the COE’s total income that year), the second highest figure for the 1991-2004 period. To me, what is/was important is not so much how far we got quantitatively, as was the degree of progress that we made, given the EMU and COE “culture” of the time.

Proposals Submitted. A special word of appreciation needs to go to the faculty members who wrote and submitted proposals, but who were not funded. “Failure” is neither fun nor encouraging, especially after appreciable effort had been put into the proposal development. But many of these faculty members “kept on trying”—and their efforts are much appreciated. I read some of these proposals. In general, they were perfectly good proposals, but they were up against intense competition for limited funds, often from institutions with a good deal more capacity for handling sponsored projects than EMU and the COE had at the time.

Table 1.
COE Sponsored Project Activity, 1991-2004,
As Reported in Various Issues of *Monday Report*

Fiscal Year	#Proposals	Value, Proposals	#Awards	Value, Awards
1991-1992				\$174,666
1992-1993	22	\$1,263,779	13	\$166,578
1993-1994	36	\$4,429,670	18	\$335,515
1994-1995				~\$450,000
1995-1996				\$1,056,809
1996-1997	32		25	\$1,338,243
1997-1998	39	\$5,291,948	22	\$1,286,214
1998-1999	46	\$7,199,988	22	\$1,196,951
1999-2000	33	\$5,583,685	22	\$969,231
2000-2001	29		20	\$2,869,600
2001-2002	41		28	\$1,848,304
2002-2003	37	\$23,100,000	16	\$1,406,842
2003-2004		~\$15,594,372	~14	~\$2,300,000
TOTAL				~\$15,398,953

Some Sponsored Project “Heroes.” Several COE faculty members deserve special recognition for their efforts and successes in securing outside funds.

– Rosella Bannister. Dating from prior to my arrival in the COE, the National Institute for Consumer Education (NICE) received almost no support money beyond salaries from EMU central administration. As a result, essentially all of NICE’s activities had to be supported from funds raised from outside sources. Rosella Bannister managed to raise the money to support a wide variety of national and international consumer education educational activities from these outside sources, in addition to conducting most of the activities herself—a substantial accomplishment.

– Dale Rice. As a senior, tenured, full-professor faculty member in Special Education, Dale Rice could have had an “easy” end to his career. Instead, Dale “discovered” “academic service-learning” (or vice versa!) and related activities and wrote, received, and implemented a large number of grants, with substantial funding, to incorporate that concept into EMU’s programming. In addition, he (with an increasing number of “helpers” from throughout the university), provided training and leadership to bring this important concept to other universities and to some secondary schools. Thanks go to Dale for a huge and valuable late-career contribution that put EMU “on the map” in many ways.

– Alison Harmon (with Nora Martin, Jerry Robbins, Mary Ann Homann and numerous others). Millions of dollars from the Skillman Foundation, over an 8+ year period, to support EMU’s role as the “university partner” in the implementation of the Comer Schools and Families Initiative in Detroit provided the opportunity to do much good in the Detroit Schools, as well as to accomplish many other worthy objectives. Comer Project activities are described in greater detail elsewhere in this document.

– Peggy Daisey. Peggy Daisy used a succession of grants having to do with science and scientists to work with teachers of under-represented groups in how to use biographies, oral story-telling, and hands-on science experiences for teaching not only science but language arts, history, and other topics. This provided an excellent service to children, teachers, and schools with substantial minority/under-represented clientele in southeastern Michigan.

– Robbie Johnson. Robbie Johnson, later followed by Carolyn Finch, used several grants to support activities to increase minority enrollments at EMU, especially in the educator preparation programs. These efforts had an appreciable degree of success and, as a result, contributed substantially to a local-area and national issue related to the composition of the teaching force.

– Jim Berry. Jim Berry and his colleagues in Leadership and Counseling used a series of modest-sized grants to assist local-area school districts improve their programming.

– Pat Williams-Boyd. Pat Williams Boyd, with Kaia Skaggs and others, used funding from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to improve academic outcomes for several middle-level schools in the area.

– Margaret Moore-Hart. Margaret “Peggy” Moore-Hart, with Peggy Diamond and Peggy Liggett (Biology) and others secured grants to improve literacy and the full range of language arts skills among elementary-age students in area schools.

– Christina Jose-Kampfner. Christina Jose-Kampfner obtained several grants to improve the academic performance of Latinx students, especially Latinas, in the southeast Michigan area.

– Georgea Langer. Georgea Langer, with Pat Pokay and others, obtained and administered a series of appreciable sub-grants from Western Kentucky University on behalf of a large Renaissance Group-sponsored project that focused on teacher preparation that resulted in student learning. The effect of these activities on our initial teacher preparation program was substantial,

and we were clearly among the leaders among the Renaissance Group participants in having great success as a result.

–Ellen Hoffman. Ellen Hoffman, with other colleagues from the College of Education, the Halle Library, and elsewhere, obtained a series of substantial awards, all involved with educational technology, including notably an NSL grant and sub-grants from the University of Northern Iowa and Western Illinois University. The sub-grants were part of a Renaissance Group project involving multiple institutions to improve both appropriate faculty and student use of technology in instruction.

–Special notice should be taken of the several faculty (and staff) members who secured and implemented grants related to improving conditions for LGBTQ students, those who secured funds to bring international educators to our campus and area, and those who secured equipment and software (sometimes purchases, sometimes as a donation) to support research, instruction, and clinical experiences in various segments of the COE.

Logistics. The “logistics” for sponsored projects, especially in the cases of large, complex activities, were formidable. These included, but were not limited to, identifying funding sources; preparing a proposal; securing (in many cases) “human subjects” approval; complying with funding agency submission requirements; dealing with payroll, purchasing, and other financial matters; evaluation mechanisms; writing and filing reports; etc., all in addition to implementing the objectives of the project. This was quite a burden for many faculty members, especially for the larger projects, and especially when an individual was attempting to secure or hold multiple grants at the same time.

This is to express appreciation for EMU’s Office of Research Development (ORD) for assistance in this matter, Ms. Connie Witt in particular. In fact, the COE’s level of activity became such that Ms. Witt was assigned exclusively to the COE as of December 2002. We provided office space for her on the third floor of the Porter Building for the convenience of the COE faculty and much appreciated her work in assisting with the substantial amount of logistics involved.

Benefits of the Sponsored Project Activities. Obviously, the primary beneficiaries of most of the sponsored-project activities were the preK-12 and higher education students and faculty members toward which the various projects were directed. But there were many other important benefits from the sponsored projects as well.

One benefit was to those directly involved with each project. Their classroom teaching was enriched by the experience. Their scholarly output increased as a result of opportunities to present papers and publish articles based on their experience with the respective projects. In many cases, a great service was provided to a cooperating school, institution, or other agency.

Another benefit was that of creating many more opportunities for collaboration. Many of the projects involved collaboration with colleagues across EMU departmental and office lines, with colleagues in other EMU colleges (especially Arts and Sciences), and with colleagues at other institutions. Many of the projects involved collaboration with preK-12 teachers, counselors, and administrators in southeast Michigan and elsewhere. Many new “academic friends” were made through these activities.

Yet another benefit can be described generally as “public relations.” Many of these activities took EMU, especially COE, personnel into classrooms, school buildings, administrative offices, state agency offices, and the like. This demonstrated that the EMU COE was no “ivory tower,” but an organization where many faculty members worked directly with practitioners to solve problems and to “make things better.” There is no way to estimate the benefit to the institution in terms of “becoming better known” as a result of these sponsored-project activities.

Agencies with Which We Worked. The sponsored projects funds permitted us to work with a variety of agencies internationally, elsewhere in the U.S., and in Michigan, especially southeast Michigan. In addition, there were many ways that we worked with EMU faculty and students outside of the COE, and, of course, sponsored project funds were used to improve our own programming and services within the COE.

Sponsored project funds helped to support national and international conferences, workshops, and publications. They helped us bring students and academics from other countries to our campus. We worked with a number of corporations and private sector groups.

The sponsored project funds enabled us to interact with schools and higher education institutions in such states as Colorado, Minnesota, North Carolina, Alabama, Ohio, New Mexico, Washington, Louisiana, Idaho, Mississippi, and Vermont. Within the state, we interacted, through our sponsored project activities, with at least the Washtenaw ISD, the Livingston Educational Service Agency, the Monroe ISD, and the Genesee ISD, as well as with several city recreation departments and the Michigan Department of Education. Our work brought us into collaboration with such in-state institutions as Central Michigan University, Western Michigan University, Northern Michigan University, University of Michigan-Flint, Washtenaw Community College, Henry Ford Community College, and Mott Community College.

I am very proud of the assistance that the COE faculty members, using sponsored project funds, were able to provide at the school district/building/classroom level. This was both extensive and intensive in Detroit, Ypsilanti, and Willow Run. Important activities also occurred in such districts as South Lyon, Howell, Van Buren (Belleville), Wayne-Westland, Highland Park, Inkster, River Rouge, Waterford, Dearborn, Berkeley, Southgate, Plymouth-Canton, Saline, Tecumseh, and Romulus.

My Role? My personal involvement in all these sponsored projects varied considerably. In a few cases, I served as the “project administrator,” dealing with the project financial and logistical aspects. In several cases, I served as a ceremonial figurehead, showing up for and often speaking in support of the activities of the project. In some cases, as a leader in such organizations as The Renaissance Group, I had “advance knowledge” that funds would be coming available and that we should prepare to apply for them at the appropriate time. At the other extreme, I learned of a project award when it was formally announced and I had nothing to do with obtaining it or with its implementation.

In all cases, I continuously made it known that I considered sponsored projects extremely important to the COE. I encouraged sponsored-project activity in every way I could. I sometimes intervened to “troubleshoot” some logistical problem. I tried to recognize and provide psychic rewards for those who had had success in obtaining sponsored-project awards.

My thanks go again to all those who, during 1991-2004, applied for funding from some outside source. My special appreciation goes to those who received such grant awards and successfully implemented some project that “did good” for a variety of clients.