

Internal Use

OFFICE OF STATE PROGRAMS

A. Objectives

1. To establish and to support 55 humanities programs, one in each state and territory, directed by an unpaid, broadly representative citizens' committee.
2. To increase, through committee programs, citizen access to the resources of the humanities.
3. To increase, through committee programs, public understanding, appreciation, and use of the humanities.
4. To foster, through committee programs, the interchange of information in the humanities among citizens, scholars, institutions and organizations.
5. To insure, through committee programs, that the benefits of the humanities are broadly available to the state's population.
6. To encourage, through committee programs, increased use of state and local humanities resources for the benefit of the state's citizens.
7. To test, through committee programs, various means to bring the humanities to the state's citizens.
8. To maintain close liaison and program coordination between the state programs and NEH programs.

B. Beneficiaries

1. The citizens of the states, especially those not presently aware of, or not having access to, or not making use of the humanities.
2. Scholars in the humanities.
3. The humanities programs of cultural and educational institutions and organizations.

C. Need

1. The difficulty experienced by the state's citizens when seeking humanities programs outside of educational institutions.
2. Recent uncertainty about the value of formal education in the humanities.
3. Public unfamiliarity with the ideas and methods of history, literature, philosophy, etc.
4. The negligible level of private or state support for public humanities programming.
5. The fact that the public does not link history, literature, philosophy, jurisprudence, ethics, and so on as part of a single national resource.
6. A significant percentage of the population has no easy access to resources of the humanities, institutional or individual.
7. The state programs of the Endowment are the only programs of their kind in the nation.
8. Humanities resources, supported by private and tax dollars, are dramatically underutilized by the citizens of the state.
9. The absence of clear coordination of programs in the humanities at the local, state, and national levels to insure the most efficient and effective allocation and use of humanities resources.

D. Relationships

1. A decentralized program is one of the best ways to increase local support and understanding of the humanities.
2. Increased state and local participation in humanities programs will increase understanding and appreciation of the humanities.
3. State humanities committees can serve as conduits of information about the humanities to citizens, scholars, institutions, and organizations.
4. A decentralized program with appropriate guidelines can insure extensive and diverse program beneficiaries.
5. The involvement of local and state resources serves to increase public understanding and support of those resources as well as support of the humanities generally.

E. Indicators

1. The number of regrants (pattern of demand and amount requested).
2. The type and distribution of institutional participants (regrantees, hosts, scholars taking part).
3. The number of scholar participants and their disciplines.
4. The number, and makeup of audience.
5. The location of programs.
6. The kind and extent of humanities content in the projects.
7. The number and variety of project sponsors.
8. The nature and extent of participation of committee members.
9. The dollar contribution from non-federal sources in support of state programs.
10. The frequency of repeated requests from communities which have taken part in regrant projects.
11. Increased public humanities programming without state committee support.
12. The nature and intensity of public attention to projects (e.g., news coverage, follow-up activities).

F. Data Collection

1. Information contained in proposals.
2. Ad hoc surveys conducted by the OSP.
3. Individual state-initiated surveys.
4. Media coverage.

6/3/77