

SIGNIFICANT POLICY ADDITIONS

Based on what we have learned from our own experience, and the experiences of the various state committees, the following are additions to program policy:

1. We are now insisting on a theme for each state program which:
 - a) reflects problems of public concern in the state to which the humanities can speak;
 - b) which is intelligible and translatable to the public;
 - c) which is narrow enough, on the one hand, to have real meaning and focus and which is broad enough to allow the inclusion of activities involving several fields of the humanities.
2. We are attaching much greater importance to the employment by the State-Based groups of at least one full-time staff person whose primary function would be the humanities program, and we are urging that this person be from one of the humanistic disciplines.
3. We are encouraging the various committees to think through carefully the implications of reserving a portion of grant funds for themselves and their programs and regranting the rest. We have come to believe that the Wyoming model, regranting 100% of program funds, is a good alternative to that approach. We are insisting, in short, that the rationale for reserved funds be valid in program funds rather than simply a convenient administrative device.

4. In a state where the committee thinks there is a real possibility of obtaining significant amounts of hard dollars for the program, above and beyond the required one-for-one program fund match, we have permitted the possibility of using the NEH Gifts and Matching mechanism. We are sensitive to the risk of encouraging juggling of in-kind figures but feel that the risk is worth taking.
5. We are insisting that committees supply us with the following information upon which we can evaluate their program:
 - a) a good narrative description of the program;
 - b) some speculation on what would not have happened if the program had not been mounted; and
 - c) whatever is necessary for the committee to improve their program.