



**WESTERN  
MICHIGAN**  
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

---

Volume 9  
Issue 2 June

Article 10

---

June 1982

## Eleven Infallible Laws Governing the Negotiating Process among Funding, Contractor and Client Agencies: By a Sadly Experienced Negotiator

Jeremy Miransky  
*Hunter College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Miransky, Jeremy (1982) "Eleven Infallible Laws Governing the Negotiating Process among Funding, Contractor and Client Agencies: By a Sadly Experienced Negotiator," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 9 : Iss. 2 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol9/iss2/10>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



**WESTERN  
MICHIGAN**  
UNIVERSITY

ELEVEN INFALLIBLE LAWS GOVERNING THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS AMONG FUNDING,  
CONTRACTOR AND CLIENT AGENCIES: BY A SADLY EXPERIENCED NEGOTIATOR.

Jeremy Miransky  
Hunter College of the  
City University of New York  
School of Social Work

In these days of Reaganomics and cutbacks in social programs, grant allocations are becoming limited and competition for existing funds fierce. However, some things remain constant. Among them are the negotiating processes involved when a university applies for a training grant to be implemented in a social agency.

1. Decision making and funding processes in a granting agency move at the speed of snail.
  - 1b. Grant proposals should therefore be submitted two years before they are requested.
2. Time frames for planning, training and evaluation proposed by the contractor always allow half as much time as is required.
3. The head of the client agency with whom the contractor negotiates will leave the agency as soon as the proposal is submitted to the grantor.
4. The grantor will submit funding compromises to the contractor which require the contractor to meet most of the costs of the grant.
  - 4b. When it is pointed out that it is unreasonable to expect the contractor to support the grantor, the granting agency will agree and will appear six weeks later with the same funding proposals.
5. The client agency's staff who have participated in needs assessment meetings will have left the agency by the time the program is implemented.
6. What the client agency's administration says its staff needs is never what the staff says it needs.
7. By the time the program is implemented, all agency and administration goals and trainee needs will have changed.

8. The administration of the client agency will demand certain training and evaluation procedures and will assure the contractor that implementing these presents no problem. When the time arrives for implementation, they will be very apologetic and inform the contractor that his/her demands were unreasonable.
9. The client agency will resist implementation of the program until the contract is signed.
10. The contract will be signed and the funds disbursed seven months after the program starting date.
  - 10b. However, the grantor will expect the final report within a month of program completion.
11. The contractor will lose money and the contractor staff will lose their minds.
  - 11b. However, wisdom and common sense to the contrary, the contractor will continue to apply for funding.