Memorandum To: Melvin D. Heckt, President

Subject: Notes on Meeting of State Presidents, State Executive Directors and NARC Board—April 3 and 4, Chicago

Prom: Franklin C. Smith

At the request of Jerry Walsh, I substituted for you at the above meetings. I was not able to be present on Friday evening, but I was there on Saturday and Sunday. The state presidents met with the state executive directors for a time on Saturday morning, and all three groups met together on Sunday morning.

Larry Coleman of California presided at the meetings of the presidents. Prior to my arrival, they had directed their attention to the problem of the relatively small number of state member units. The main reasons were three in number: many state associations have trouble in signing up the required number of local units; many state associations cannot afford an executive director; long delays in processing applications are encountered.

To deal with the first problem, the group decided that NARC should require that any local unit which desires membership in NARC be a member of its state association whether or not the latter is a state member unit. This passed with one dissenting vote. The group also decided that local units which are now members of NARC but not members of their state associations should be given a stated amount of time, the amount to be left to the discretion of the NARC Board to become members of their state associations under penalty of being dropped from NARC. This passed unanimously.

Many of the subjects which were discussed revolved around the completed questionnaires which were turned in. It was agreed that any state which turned in a completed questionnaire would in turn be given copies of all. Along this same line, it was agreed that any state which would send in its budget for duplication and distribution would be included in the distribution list.

The one item wanted from NARC more frequently than any other was help in the area of fund raising. However, consultation on a variety of matters including program standards and organization of local units was mentioned.

There was some discussion on what was termed the stampede to move many retarded from the institutions to the community. The mere existence in the community of four walls and a roof does not mean that the community is ready. There must be an assignment of responsibility and a program.

General agreement was expressed with the idea that retarded who work in institutions should receive some pay even though nominal.

It was brought out that the retarded in trouble with the law needs special legal help and that enforcement officers and judges are sympathetic if the proper interpretations are made. The need for separate facilities for retarded delinquents was stressed.
The state presidents indicated complete agreement with NARC's policy of obtaining rather than providing services.

In the area of finances, the states reported varying success with the gum ball machines. Some have earned as high as $800 per month. The results depend entirely upon the quality of the operator, that is, how good he is at getting locations and at caring for his machines.

Many states have not been able to set up any system of regular financial support by their local units but are entirely dependent on their own efforts. Most of the states which are supported by their locals use a percentage of funds raised locally as the formula for support. Massachusetts requires a minimum of 15% but adjusts this upward in accordance with a population and wealth factor. California assesses the local $2.50 per year per member. Since this formula gives the local an incentive to keep down the number of members, they are trying to change this.

Howard Merkin came in for part of the discussion of financial matters. He reported that the sale of the record to raise research funds was not particularly successful but had indirectly caused other donations of about $30,000. He reported also on his analysis of the use of "thrift shops or worn a-bit shops as an ongoing fund raising project. He said that such stores could be very successful under certain conditions; the community or merchandising area should be about 50,000 to 100,000; the shop should be located in an area which is convenient for both the middle class donor of merchandise and the poorer class purchaser; it is essential to have paid help.

Among other ideas, HM mentioned that he thought labor unions and organizations in rural areas had been overlooked as potential contributors. He suggested also that a state association could conduct a one-shot solicitation of business and industry for a sizeable endowment fund to be used only for the production of investment income. Since this would be a capital fund, there should be no problems with united funds.

HM stated that his department would propose a regulation that a local unit which wants fund raising assistance from KARC must send its request through its state association. He stated that they are also proposing a three-year plan of staff expansion which would ultimately result in a fund-raising staff member in each region.

Jim Daldini came in to discuss support payments and report forms. He stated that he is working to simplify the forms. It was proposed from the floor that NARC make some sort of financial allowance to the states for the staff time which is required to review and process the reports. JB stated that he feels that there should be one target date established on which the report, the support payment and the audit should be due. He also thought it would be a simple matter to require all units to be on the same fiscal year as NARC, but I reminded him that most united funds also have a requirement in this regard.

Elizabeth Boggs came in to discuss legislation at the federal level. You can refer to duplicated material for a presentation of the bills under consideration. She emphasised that a great amount can be achieved.
at the administrative level under existing legislation and that much which is available is provided by legislation not specifically aimed at the needs of the retarded. The NARO staff is constantly on the alert for opportunities of this kind.

EB remarked that three drawbacks in existing and proposed legislation are the tying together of grants for construction and staff, the restriction of certain services to low income groups when such services are unavailable to others at any price, and the inequities in the allocation of funds to the various states. She stated that the best strategy seems to be to support the bills as they are now and attempt to remedy these defects at another session.

All of the executive directors and state presidents met together for a brief session late Saturday morning and then split into smaller groups to report on the progress of the planning groups in each state. The smaller groups also contained both directors and presidents. I was in a group with representatives from California, Illinois, Missouri, Mississippi, New Jersey, South Carolina, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island. The progress reports ran the entire range between almost nothing done to a completed report. Almost all reported that the associations for retarded children and professionals interested in the retarded are well represented on the planning councils. However, many states reported that mental health people dominate the councils, and some try to adapt mental health reports to mental retardation. In some states the work of the council has resulted in the creation of a separate department of mental retardation with its own commissioner in the state government structure. Rhode Island reported the least progress thus far with appointments to the planning group starting only two weeks ago. This situation resulted from the election of a governor from the opposite party to that controlling the legislature and with the governor being elected on an austerity platform.

The Executive Director from California, Krauss, reported on the organization of the Conference of Executive Directors. He stated that the goals of the Conference are the development of in-service training programs for executive directors, the improvement of communications between executives and their associations, and the development of acceptable procedures in the operation of associations.

President Cobb commented on the matters which had been brought up in the reports of the meetings of the state presidents and executive directors. He was particularly pleased that the state presidents had gone on record in favor of the general policy of obtaining services rather than providing them. He stated that mental retardation is a problem which is not specifically ours but one which belongs to society in general. Too often associations become imbedded in the operation of costly facilities and fail to give attention to broad problems and programs. We must demonstrate the need initially; the responsibility for continued operation belongs to the community.
Dr. Cobb reported that some problems have arisen because the National Foundation has chosen birth defects as one of its areas of interest. This has often caused confusion in the eyes of the general public, and there has been some friction over financial campaigns. We certainly cannot oppose the support of research by the Foundation, but our interests are broader than research alone. Efforts to work out this problem with the Foundation have not been fruitful on account of the attitude of the Director. Therefore, the only approach is for us to make ourselves better known. In addition, we can work with National Foundation people at the state and local level and perhaps in time their support will prevail over the attitude of the Director.

Tom Tucker discussed the committee organization and regional structure of NARC. He stated that there are 27 committees, and many others have been proposed. There are in the neighborhood of 250 persons on committees. Committees are useful in developing NARC policies, in developing leadership for NARC, and in representing NARC to other organizations.

TT suggested that whenever a person is proposed for membership on a committee, the proposal contain detailed information about the person's background and qualifications for the job. He mentioned that one requirement which is often overlooked is the ability to work effectively by mail and phone as face to face committee meetings are rare.

TT feels that with the development of the regional structure will come the creation of regional committees in some fields to assist the regional vice-president. The regional vice-presidents as well as the regional field representatives are finding that their areas are too large geographically and that they are becoming more and more involved in NARC committees and with meetings of other organizations. He suggested that the development of strong state associations will help to solve these problems, he also recommended the creation of a NARC committee to study the regional structure.

Sam Kaminsky reported preliminary plans for the 1965 Convention. It will be from September 29 to October 2 in New York City. The theme will be Cornerstone of Progress - Comprehensive Planning.

The Massachusetts group asked about possible interest in NARC sponsorship of a film on PKU which could be used to get testing programs started. It was suggested that they prepare a more concrete proposal.

The chair recognized an architectural consultant who took the floor to warn against quick acceptance of a gift of an old building to provide facilities for the retarded. Often such buildings fail to fulfill the requirements for such facilities, and very few are adaptable.

In the joint meeting, the NARC Board approved one research grant, approved of four persons proposed as members of the Research Advisory Board, three to succeed retiring members, and approved by submission to the Convention of an amendment adding three members to the IIARC Board, these members to be proposed by the President and elected by the Board itself. The purpose of this amendment is to get national leaders on the NARC Board.