

detailed NFSS budget update

Regnerus, Mark

Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2011 10:52 AM

To: [REDACTED] - .137

Cc: Regnerus, Mark

Hi Luis,

I wanted to write and update you about where things stand with the NFSS budget. In general, it's in fine shape. Indeed, we haven't spent that much at all just yet, since the UT contract with Knowledge Networks has not yet been finalized. It is very close--basically waiting on a KN staffer who's vacationing to glance at it and give it the thumb's up. KN will move ahead with the pretest phase as soon as they get that thumbs up, which could come today or tomorrow. At that point, we will start spending the lion's share of the grant money--\$625,000 to KN. I'm not sure if that goes out the door in two chunks--one at the beginning of data collection and one at the end--but it doesn't much matter, since UT and KN will have agreed to a timetable for that.

I'm writing more to tell you about a few shifts in the rest of the budget, especially the personnel side (not the \$625k and the \$88k indirect). You didn't ask for this, but I just want to operate with "open books," basically. WI is the funder, after all, and deserves to know how we're spending the money. That total personnel amount is about \$254,000, earmarked roughly as follows:

Salaries/Fringe: \$206,000

Travel: \$6,000

Tuition for RAs: \$3,000 (required by UT)

Consultants: \$24,000 (mostly for a planned Fall 2011 meeting, travel and honorariums)

Other: \$3,500 (misc expenses)

Publications: \$7,000 (my best guess at costs of producing a nice electronic report)

Materials and support: \$4,700 (for data-analyses software, computer hardware, and room rental for consultant meeting)

My focus for this will mostly be on the salaries part.

I am taking \$5,000 per month in salary from the NFSS for July, August, and September (15k total). I had intended to do 10k for the summer, but since I'm not free to take salary from NFSS during the academic year, I decided to consolidate it to the summer. I will do something like that, perhaps 5-10k max, next summer as well. And that will be it as far as my salary goes.

Brad and I decided to pay [REDACTED] \$15,000 to co-analyze and co-author the report. That will be payable to her \$5,000 on July 1 (last week) and \$10,000 at some point mid-late Fall 2011.

I've paid a graduate student \$6,000 (the standard here) in summer pay to write an extensive literature review on same-sex parenting and youth development. I'm monitoring her progress, and am pleased with it. I had earmarked another \$6,000 to pay a graduate student for summer work, but he went to work for Pew in DC, and so that second 6k has gone unspent.

Fringe benefits are typically add-ons to this, required by UT (health insurance, etc.). They total about \$35,000 (of the 206k) for the length of the grant. Given that no one's getting a raise at UT these days, I think the total spent on fringe will be less than 35k. But it's not a number I can shift around or decide to change.

That brings us up to the end of this summer. For Fall 2011, which actually begins Year 2 of the two-year NFSS budget, I anticipate some personnel budget savings:

1. I had budgeted for a Fall course buyout for myself (which costs \$16,000 or so), but have elected to teach a full

load. It's not that difficult for me to do so, since one course I can teach in my sleep, and the other meets sporadically, and only once a week. So that is 16k unspent.

2. I've spent very little of the travel budget (\$6,000), but will spend a little in August by meeting up with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (family scholar) and Glenn Stanton (of Focus on the Family) in Denver for a day's worth of conversation. I will be vacationing up north soon for a couple weeks, during which time I hope to send a graduate student or two to the DC-based conference on "Counting Families." I hope to find out today whether there is space for them. I offered to pay Brad's way, but I haven't heard whether he plans to attend or not. [REDACTED] and I may--after we discuss public and media relations for this project--have more ideas about travel, either for us or for bringing a few writer types to Austin to discuss the project. Nothing planned yet.

3. I originally budgeted for a full-time research associate to work on the project from Sept 2011 to Aug 2012, at a cost of \$51,000 (UT determined cost). I may elect to not fill that slot, and earmark it instead for possible extra funds for KN, or at least keep it available for such use. I have decided to outsource data analyses to [REDACTED] a postdoc at UNC and former student of mine, and have agreed in principle to pay him \$8,000 to \$10,000 for doing so, this Fall. I will also be analyzing data, but he's more current on techniques, and he's very uptight about getting things right. So I trust him. I can't really hire him for a year, since he's already gainfully employed (which is good), but he agreed to take this on on the side. For the sake of the report, which needs to be basic and media-readable, I don't believe we'll need someone who works on data analyses for many months full-time. I *think* this is the right call. If Fall comes and we have loads of data to work through and [REDACTED] strapped for time, at that point I will make the call about hiring someone from that \$51k, but right now I prefer to set it aside.

There's just under \$20,000 budgeted for the consultants for a Fall conference to look at the initial data. I don't know when that will happen; it depends on how quickly we get data returned to us from KN, how quickly we accumulate cases of same-sex parents, etc. I hope that it doesn't get scheduled later than January 2012, because that will mean we're further behind schedule. As it stands, I still hope to deliver the report in Spring 2012. It may not be February, as once hoped, but I'm confident it can be by May. Toward that end, I will follow through with a budgeted course buyout in the Spring (I will teach one course, instead of two). That costs 16k or so, payable to UT from the \$202k personnel budget. That should free up time for me this Spring.

One other shift in funding concerns my own research. You stressed at the outset that WI wanted to make sure I maintained my own independent research agenda while conducting the NFSS. I appreciate that, and [REDACTED] salary (\$2200/month) is most of that. I decided that the primary thing I need in order to write my next book is some modest funding for data analyses of several existing datasets, as well as a data collection effort of interviews with unmarried young adults aged 24-32, about how they conduct their relationships, what they think of marriage, etc., basically a follow-up to the book I published earlier this year. That data collection process, which involves RA travel to Milwaukee and DC and a location or two TBD, should run in total about \$10,000 to \$12,000. I am doing some of the interviews here in Austin, but most of them (a total of 100-120) are being done by [REDACTED] and one other person. Given the savings in the Fall course buyout, I decided that this was not too much to ask of the NFSS to cover. I hope you concur. It will make for much material to discuss in the next book, which I'll begin writing in earnest next summer. I have authorized [REDACTED] to be paid \$1,000 to begin doing some basic analyses for me this summer and early Fall. I will not, however, make personal requests of him while he's analyzing NFSS data, probably this Fall.

Of course, being a bit conservative about the budget can backfire, leading me to not spend money when I need to. I recognize that, and [REDACTED] is helpful with that.

That is the update for now. I don't see that there's any reason to ask WI for more personnel \$\$ for this project. The only request would be for data collection, payable to KN, and that of course hinges on what happens in Phases 1 and 2. I hope to know the answer to that by early Fall, end of September I think. And per some personnel savings described above, I *may* be able to shift some money--perhaps around \$40k to 50k--toward more KN data collection if need be.

Please let me know if you have any questions, concerns, or objections to what is stated above. I want the budget to be pretty straightforward and transparent, not smoke and mirrors. Thanks for your continued support of this project. I'm back to a state of guarded optimism about it, after talking to KN and a few consultants who are

pleased with our progress, even if the initial N is lower than hoped for.

yours,
Mark

Re: UT Austin Grant "The New Family Structure Study" - Dr. Mark Regnerus - (...)

Re: UT Austin Grant "The New Family Structure Study" - Dr. Mark Regnerus - (...)

Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 2:39 PM
To: Crim, Reggie W [REDACTED] -137
Cc: Regnerus, Mark

Dear Reggie:

We propose to pay the remaining \$ 170,730 in three installments:

July 1, 2012 \$ 50,000
December 1, 2012 \$ 40,000
July 1, 2013 \$ 80,730

Should there be a need for earlier payments, Dr. Regnerus can so tell us any time and we will make whatever adjustments are necessary to meet the need. This schedule however suits us well.

Yours,

Luis Tellez

In a message dated 5/1/2012 10:36:01 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, [REDACTED]

Good morning Mr. Tellez,

Thank you for sending the revised award letter for Dr. Regnerus' New Family Structure Study Grant. We are in the process of revising the agreement to Knowledge Networks and reducing the overall award. I have one quick issue and I was hoping you could help, or let me know if I should forward to someone else. I pasted our payment schedule from the award below as well as the payments received. The revised award letter we received changed the total UT Austin funding from \$966,771 to \$640,000, so I understand the payment schedule from the original award will be modified. To date, we have received three payments totaling \$469,270 and was curious when we are scheduled to receive the remaining \$170,730.

Thank you again for all your help and please let me know if you have any questions.

Payments per award letter 4/19/11		Payments received		Current status
5/1/11	104,270.00	6/1/11	104,270.00	0.00
7/1/11	215,000.00	8/19/11	215,000.00	0.00
9/1/11	305,000.00	10/18/11	150,000.00	-155,000.00
11/1/11	120,000.00		0.00	-120,000.00
1/1/12	120,000.00		0.00	-120,000.00
4/1/12	102,501.00		0.00	-102,501.00
Total	966,771.00		469,270.00	497,501.00

Mark and Brad

I had a meeting get cancelled today, so I finally got to these measures. Sorry for the slow reply - too much interviewing around here right now with both graduate student admissions and our job freeze finally lifting (we are interviewing 6 faculty candidates in a 2 1/2 week span).

Attached are some measures that I have used in my research. The Family Impact and Family Environment scales are original RELATE scales. The Relationship Readiness scale is a RELATE scale too.

The Parent Closeness Scale is a commonly used measure with teens in Dev. Psych circles (I included the reference).

The attachment scale below (AAS) is one of the commonly used scales in adult attachment research. I have also included the adult attachment questionnaire (AAQ) - this is the scale we use in RELATE. As you will see, they are VERY similar in content and length. Both are very reputable, but quite long. The problem is that psychologists love long scales - so we would either need to trim them and use a "modified scale" or use the full scale to match existing studies. I can use RELATE data to run some psychometrics on the AAQ if we want to try to narrow it down to 3 or 4 items scales.

Let me know if you need me to follow up on some other scales or measures. I am off campus from Friday (18th) to Wednesday (23rd) this coming week, so I will have time to go after some items or scales.

Jason

Jason S. Carroll, Ph.D.
School of Family Life
Brigham Young University

[REDACTED] / [REDACTED] - .137

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Regnerus [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 10:42 AM
To: [REDACTED] - .137
Subject: attachment q's

Hi Jason, is this of some value, or not so much? I'm out of my league in discussing attachment.

Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990)

Please read each of the following statements and rate the extent to which it describes your feelings about romantic relationships. Please think about all your relationships (past and present) and respond in terms of how you generally feel in these relationships. If you have never been involved in a romantic relationship, answer in terms of how you think you would feel.

[137]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: 9/22/2010 10:41:11 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subj: Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon Institute

Luis,

Thanks, I'm talking it over with my colleagues. I think there will be interest if the project can be a truly inclusive one and its objective are framed clearly and appealingly.

Also, one of my colleagues is good friends with a key scholar, and a friend of mine is a second good bet, so I think we have at least two pretty approachable possibilities here without really having looked, reviewed literature, etc.

David

[REDACTED]
09/22/2010 10:18 AM To [REDACTED]
cc [REDACTED]
Subject
Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon
Institute

David,

Last week's conversation was most helpful, as you said, it is important to spend time up front to get the process right. I meant to write to you afterwards to thank you, but no sooner I hang up that I delved into this rather complex world of trying to figure out the way forward.

Brad has promised to send me his thoughts as to how this could be shaped from the perspective of a diverse group of scholars that may be willing to participate. I am awaiting his inputs; I think he is checking with colleagues.

In short, the research appears to me more interesting than ever; I am focusing right now in getting a better sense of how we put together a

diverse group of scholars--as soon as I have something to share, I will. Our interest in working with Abt remains unabated. My sense is that there is little point to explore the funders until we can demonstrate a strong grounding for the scholarship.

Luis

In a message dated 9/22/2010 9:53:33 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Hi Luis,

I wanted to touch base to see if you've had a chance to think/talk w/Brad about the issues we discussed and whether, in that light, you're still seeing this as a viable project for Abt. Especially, I'm wondering what you and Brad think are the prospects for generating support from scholars and organizations/funders who'd bring real diversity to what could be a groundbreaking research effort.

Thanks,

David

[REDACTED]

09/14/2010 11:07

To

AM

[REDACTED]

cc

Subject

Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon

Institute

David:

Tomorrow at 11:00 works; [REDACTED] Luis

In a message dated 9/14/2010 11:05:21 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time,

[REDACTED] writes:

Hi Luis,
Thanks for the information... I would like to talk about this... Please let me know if any of these times work for you: tomorrow/Wednes at 11:00 or 4:00; Friday between 3:00-4:00..
Thanks,
David

[REDACTED]

09/13/2010 04:50

To

PM

[REDACTED]

cc

Subject

From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon
Institute

Dear David:

At the request of Brad Wilcox, I am sending you a description of "The New Family Structure Study."

The Witherspoon Institute's mission is "to promote the principles that sustain free and democratic societies." A core institution of society is the family, and consequently the raising of children that will constitute the next generation is of great interest to us.

We think that current debates about family structures could significantly benefit from non-ideological research, and therein lies our interest in the possible undertaking of this project by Abt Associates.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or if you need anything else from us. I am available as well be phone (609 688 8779 x 308) or in person should it be of benefit to meet in the near future.

Sincerely,

Luis Tellez

President
The Witherspoon Institute

The New Family Structure

Study

Sponsored by The Witherspoon Institute

Aims. The New Family Structure Study (NFSS) seeks to understand how young adults (18-35) raised by same-sex parents fare on a number of social, emotional, and relational outcomes compared to young adults raised in homes with their married biological parents and young adults raised in homes with two adoptive parents. In particular, the NFSS aims to determine if biological relatedness and the gender of young adults' parents are related to important social, emotional, and relational outcomes. Moreover, because there have been no large-scale, random, and representative studies of young adults (or adolescents) raised by same-sex parents, the NFSS would seek to field a large, random, and representative survey of young adults from these three family groupings. Accordingly, the NFSS would provide scholars with an up-to-date portrait of the association between three different family structures and the welfare of young adults.

Theory/Literature Review. Most of the extant research on family structure indicates that children are most likely to thrive in an intact, biological married home (e.g., Amato 2005; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994; Moore, Jekielek, and Emig 2002). On average, children from single parent homes, stepfamilies, and adoptive homes do less well than children in families headed by married, biological parents. The advantage that biological, married parents seem to have over other family types is plausibly related to biological relatedness, the gender of the parents, the relative stability of their relationship, socioeconomic resources, and social status.

Yet, most research on children with same-sex parents suggests that children from these families do just as well as children from intact, biological families (e.g., Biblarz and Stacey 2010). This is surprising, given that same-sex parents (1) cannot both be biologically related to a child, (2) bring only one sex to the parenting enterprise, (3) are less stable, and (4) have less social status than married, biological parents.

However, the impact of this new family structure may only manifest itself in adolescence or young adulthood. Since most studies of children of same-sex parents have focused on young children, these studies may have missed the potential impact of same-sex parents on adolescents and young adults. Thus, the NFSS seeks to test the following hypotheses, which are drawn from the larger research on family structure and child well-being, with a sample of young adults drawn from same-sex, adoptive, and heterosexual families:

Hypothesis 1. Children raised by married, biological parents do better as young adults than children raised in other family structures;

Hypothesis 2. Children raised by a mother and a father in a biological or adoptive home do better as young adults than children raised in other family structures; and,

Hypothesis 3. Children raised in a stable family do better as young adults than children raised in unstable family structures;

If each of these hypotheses are confirmed, we would expect that overall young adults from intact, biological, married homes do best on most social, emotional, and relational outcomes.

We also aim to test the following competing hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4. Young adults raised by same-sex parents do as well as young adults raised in an intact, biological married household;

Hypothesis 5. Young adults raised by same-sex parents do as well as young adults raised in an intact, biological married household once the effects of social stigma/bias against gays and lesbians are controlled for.

Methods. This study would build on the My Daddy's Name is Donor Study, conducted by SRBI in connection with the Institute for American Values and the University of Texas at Austin, in its sampling strategy and its measurement of key indicators. Specifically, the New Family Structure Study would seek to sample 1000 young adults from same-sex households, 1000 young adults from adoptive households, and 1000 young adults from heterosexual households. It would explore socioeconomic indicators, the relationship quality and stability of the parents' relationships, the quality of parenting, and key social, emotional, and relational outcomes for young adults.

Outcomes. The New Family Structure Study seeks to look specifically at the following kinds of social, emotional, and relational outcomes:

- 1) Social – educational attainment, idleness in young adulthood, delinquency, and criminal activity;
- 2) Emotional – depression, substance abuse, self esteem, and loneliness; and,
- 3) Relational – the quality and stability of romantic/marital relationships, the quality of relationships between young adults and their

parents, number of sexual partners, and nonmarital childbearing.

Process. The New Family Structure Study would be conducted by a nonpartisan research organization with a strong and widely acknowledged commitment to scientific integrity. The NFSS would draw on the scholarly advice of sociologists, psychologists, and demographers from across the ideological spectrum—such as Charlotte Patterson and Ross Parke on the left, and Brad Wilcox and David Eggebeen on the right—in an effort to design and implement a fair-minded scientific study of its subject matter.

Conclusion. The Witherspoon Institute is committed to funding a reputable, large-scale study of young adults from same-sex, adoptive, and heterosexual households and to working with a nonpartisan research organization to do the best and fairest possible job of conducting such a study.

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, disseminate or copy it unless you are the intended recipient. If this message has been received in error, we kindly ask that you notify the sender immediately by return email and delete all copies of the message from your system. Thank you.

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, disseminate or copy it unless you are the intended recipient. If this message has been received in error, we kindly ask that you notify the sender immediately by return email and delete all copies of the message from your system. Thank you.

This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended solely for the addressee. Please do not read, disseminate or copy it unless you are the intended recipient. If this message has been received in error, we kindly ask that you notify the sender immediately by return email and delete all copies of the message from your system. Thank you.

fyi

[137]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10/19/2010 2:01:53 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subj: Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon Institute

Well, after our conversation I surmised as much, and so you set me off in the search for that major university and it appears we have found it. We'll keep you posted, Luis.

In a message dated 10/19/2010 1:58:42 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Hi Luis,
Thanks for the update. A pop center as host sounds promising. After talking a bit here, we do feel that a for-profit company would not provide a very credible platform for this project. But an arrangement where Abt partnered with a major university, likely with the latter in the lead, could work well. I'll look forward to hearing more.
Best regards,
David

[REDACTED]
10/19/2010 11:17 AM To [REDACTED]
cc [REDACTED]
Subject
Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon Institute

David:

Mark Regnerus of the Population Research Center at the University of Texas-Austin is in conversations with us about PRC hosting the project. When I have more specifics I will let you know. I hope you are well, Luis

In a message dated 9/22/2010 10:41:11 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Luis,
Thanks, I'm talking it over with my colleagues. I think there will be interest if the project can be a truly inclusive one and its objective are framed clearly and appealingly.

Also, one of my colleagues is good friends with a key scholar, and a friend of mine is a second good bet, so I think we have at least two pretty approachable possibilities here without really having looked, reviewed literature, etc.

David

[REDACTED]

09/22/2010 10:18

To

AM

[REDACTED]

cc

Subject

Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon
Institute

David,

Last week's conversation was most helpful, as you said, it is important to spend time up front to get the process right. I meant to write to you afterwards to thank you, but no sooner I hang up that I delved into this rather complex world of trying to figure out the way forward.

Brad has promised to send me his thoughts as to how this could be shaped from the perspective of a diverse group of scholars that may be willing to participate. I am awaiting his inputs; I think he is checking with colleagues.

In short, the research appears to me more interesting than ever; I am focusing right now in getting a better sense of how we put together a diverse group of scholars--as soon as I have something to share, I will. Our interest in working with Abt remains unabated. My sense is that there is little point to explore the funders until we can demonstrate a strong grounding for the scholarship.

Luis

In a message dated 9/22/2010 9:53:33 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time,
[REDACTED] writes:

Hi Luis,

I wanted to touch base to see if you've had a chance to think/talk w/Brad about the issues we discussed and whether, in that light, you're still seeing this as a viable project for Abt. Especially, I'm wondering what you and Brad think are the prospects for generating support from scholars and organizations/funders who'd bring real diversity to what could be a groundbreaking research effort.

Thanks,

David

[REDACTED]

To 09/14/2010 11:07

AM

[REDACTED]

cc

Subject

Re: From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon
Institute

David:

Tomorrow at 11:00 works; 609 688 8779 x 308. Luis

In a message dated 9/14/2010 11:05:21 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time,
[REDACTED] writes:

Hi Luis,

Thanks for the information... I would like to talk about this... Please let me know if any of these times work for you: tomorrow/Wednes at 11:00 or 4:00; Friday between 3:00-4:00...

Thanks,
David

[REDACTED]

To 09/13/2010 04:50

PM [REDACTED]

cc

Subject

From Luis Tellez, Witherspoon
Institute

Dear David:

At the request of Brad Wilcox, I am sending you a description of "The New Family Structure Study."

The Witherspoon Institute's mission is "to promote the principles that sustain free and democratic societies." A core institution of society is the family, and consequently the raising of children that will constitute the next generation is of great interest to us.

We think that current debates about family structures could significantly benefit from non-ideological research, and therein lies our interest in the possible undertaking of this project by Abt Associates.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or if you need anything else from us. I am available as well be phone (609 688 8779 x 308) or in person should it be of benefit to meet in the near future.

Sincerely,

Luis Tellez
President

Hi Mark!

There were 562 adult sperm donor offspring, 562 adults adopted as infants, and 563 adults raised by their biological parents. For the purpose of the analysis reported in My Daddy's Name is Donor we analyzed the data from the 485 adult sperm donor offspring who said they knew (rather than merely suspected) that they were sperm donor offspring.

No one knows how many sperm donor offspring there are in the population. Some estimate maybe about one percent were conceived this way.

I pasted the link, below, to the pdf of our report. The methodology and limitations section has more of the details on incidence rates and such, on pp 119-122.

I still am amazed that we were able to find a population of adult sperm donor offspring this way that was fairly representative (and not drawn from online networks of such persons and other problematic samples). I think we could definitely find adults raised by SS parents this way, at least those raised by lesbian mothers, though I think we'll need to think carefully about the screener questions and what kind of SS couple offspring we want to find and study. There is no one family structure that you can call a SS couple headed family. There are so many variations among them, precisely because none of them by definition can be a two parent bio family.

http://www.family-scholars.org/assets/Donor_FINAL.pdf

My best to you --

E

Elizabeth Marquardt
FamilyScholars.org

From: Mark Regnerus <[REDACTED]>
To: Elizabeth Marquardt <[REDACTED]> - 137
Sent: Fri, September 24, 2010 10:21:17 AM

Subject: RE: RE:

Hi Elizabeth,

I'm trying to gather some info here. What was the sample size of sperm-donor kids in your study? What's the estimate of their size in the population at large--as in, what share of young adults today at any given age have a sperm donor father? And AbtSRBI didn't really have difficulty gathering such a sample? Thanks,

Mark

RE: Work?

Rick Li [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 3:10 PM

To: Regnerus, Mark

Cc: Michael Lawrence [REDACTED]

Hi Mark,

Below is a summary of the items we discussed last week. Please let me know if anything is different from your understanding.

1. KN will recruit approximately 500 cohabiting households and approximately 1500 other households for the full survey.
2. KN will add programming to randomly select an appropriate % of cohabiting and other households to complete the full survey resulting in the Ns above.
3. Client agrees for us to release the survey to all 18-39 people on the KN panel (one person per household). The expected number of screener completes is approximately 7200.
4. KN will only recruit same sex household and adoptive households for all ABS samples.

Thanks,
Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Regnerus, Mark [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 1:02 PM

To: Rick Li

Cc: Michael Lawrence

Subject: RE: Work?

So you've got the high res .EPS files, and we're good to move forward on this?

Mark

From: Rick Li [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 1:38 PM

To: Regnerus, Mark

Cc: Michael Lawrence

Subject: RE: Work?

Hi Mark,

Can you ask your contact to send me the high res images for #1 and #7. The best format would be .EPS file.

Thanks
Rick

-----Original Message-----

From: Regnerus, Mark [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 10:24 AM

To: Rick Li

Cc: Michael Lawrence

Subject: FW: Work?

Rick, what do you think? One of these should be OK, no? I prefer to avoid the bottom one (the use of teh tower image could involve permissions, etc.). The rest are fine

with me.

Mark

[137]

From: Rob [redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 12:18 PM
To: Regnerus, Mark
Subject: Re: Work?

Here's what I've come up with.

The typeface is Trajan, which is what UT uses for it's official name. The star is easy enough to use (it's a Zapf Dingbat), so I started from there. I also found out the official UT burnt orange specification (Pantone 166 for uncoated stock). I sort of followed the "look and feel" of the UT stationary.

I made a whole mess of permutations for you to compare. Then I sketched out a UT tower logo and tried to see how it looks. Ain't too bad. I don't know if it infringes on any UT trademark (probably does) but at least the artwork is my own work and not lifted from anywhere.

Whaddya think?

--R

> From: "Regnerus, Mark" <[redacted]>
> Date: Mon, 29 Aug 2011 16:46:12 +0000
> To: Rob <[redacted]>
> Subject: RE: Work?

> Easy for you! What to do about it has haunted me for a couple weeks.

> From: Rob ([redacted])
> Sent: Monday, August 29, 2011 11:45 AM
> To: Regnerus, Mark
> Subject: Re: Work?

> Oh yeah. We can do better than that. I am about to send you a few
> ideas on a pdf. This is pretty easy.

> --R

>> From: "Regnerus, Mark" <[redacted]>
>> Date: Mon, 29 Aug 2011 16:34:50 +0000
>> To: Rob <[redacted]>
>> Subject: RE: Work?

>> I forgot to attach the one I'm working with at present. Pretty
>> uninspiring header, as you can see.

>> Mark

>>
>>
>>

[137]

An academic that is a fiscal conservative?????

In a message dated 9/22/2010 9:25:40 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, regnerus@prc.utexas.edu writes:

That's fine with me. I'm a fiscal conservative.

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
 Sent: Wed 9/22/2010 8:07 AM
 To: Mark Regnerus [REDACTED]
 Subject: Re: Next Steps

As I said, take charge plan to spend what we ought to, nothing less nothing more, and just give me a heads up, as we begin to understand costs we will draw up a budget; we will include some money for you and Brad on account of the time and effort you will be devoting to this. We are not lavish but we do pay....

In a message dated 9/22/2010 9:02:50 A.M. Eastern Daylight Time, [REDACTED] writes:

Got it; thanks, Luis, and Brad. I think it'll work well. Will keep you in the loop. I have a light teaching load all this year, which is a significant help. Providential, perhaps. And I'll put [REDACTED] onto some of this stuff--is very capable.

Mark

From: [REDACTED] [mailto:[REDACTED]]
 Sent: Wed 9/22/2010 7:56 AM
 To: [REDACTED] Mark Regnerus
 Subject: Re: Next Steps

This all seems reasonable; Mark there is flexibility here and you should feel free to weigh in as to what is best in a given issue including the timing. Naturally we would like to move along as expeditiously as possible but experience suggests we ought not get hung up with deadlines, do what is right and best, move on it, don't dilly dolly, etc....It would be great to have this before major decisions of the Supreme Court but that is secondary to the need to do this and do it well....I would like you to take ownership and think of how would you want it done...rather than someone like me dictating parameters....but of course, here to help. Luis

In a message dated 9/21/2010 11:33:06 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time [REDACTED] writes:

Dear Mark:

This sounds right on target. My thoughts in CAPS. Thanks, Brad

On Sep 21, 2010, at 6:27 PM, Mark Regnerus wrote:

> Brad,
 >
 > OK, so let me process some of this. I need to have my stuff together before I approach Mark Hayward, perhaps early next week if I'm clear about things.
 >
 > Tell me if any of these aren't correct.
 >
 > 1. We want to run this project through UT's PRC. I'm presuming 10% overhead is acceptable to

Witherspoon. YES

>

> 2. We want a broad coalition comprising several scholars from across the spectrum of opinions about same-sex relationships/marriage, including folks from UT and PSU. We'll bounce around some names, a few of which include people like Paul Amato, Cynthia Osborne, etc. I'll be curious about Mark H's recommendations, too; he's well-connected, and perhaps has some capital with Paul. Certainly there are enough family demographers at Penn State that we will get interest. YES

>

> 3. We want to "repeat" in some ways the DC consultation with the group outlined in #2, with the outcome being a 10-15 page study proposal that is structured in NIH or Templeton style. The point of this is less about "proposing" such a study to a funder as it is laying out the protocol that the coalition would agree upon. The emphasis, however, is on getting the science/methods of this right. YES - THOUGH PROBABLY MORE LIKE 20-30 PAGES ONCE WE'RE DONE SKETCHING OUT THE PLAN.

>

> 4. This document would in turn be used to approach several research organizations for the purpose of acquiring bids for the data collection project. YES

>

> Did I understand that correctly?

>

> And per your instruction, I should think of this as a planning grant, with somewhere on par of \$30-40k if needed. YES

>

> I would like, at some point, to get more feedback from Luis and Maggie about the "boundaries" around this project, not just costs but also their optimal timelines (for the coalition meeting, the data collection, etc.), and their hopes for what emerges from this project, including the early report we discussed in DC. Feel free to forward this to them.

>

> thanks,

> Mark

>

>

Yours,
Brad

W Bradford Wilcox
Director, National Marriage Project
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of Virginia
<http://www.virginia.edu/marriageproject/director.html>

Contact:
409 Ridge Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902

