

COMMITTEE STRUCTURES IN NEXT 20 STATES AND CRITERIA FOR CHOOSING

We hope that since we will have a person working full-time on the process of identifying potential committee members in the various states that it will be possible to make many more contacts in the states and therefore to identify kinds of resources which have up to now been invisible to us. The discovery of these resources may lead us to develop new structural modes in addition to those we have tried thus far. We are basically satisfied with the three basic modes we have employed:

1. Arts Councils (or Arts and Humanities Commissions)
2. University Extension Committees
3. General Committees (any or all of the above and/or others). We are actively seeking new additions to General Committees such as media, labor unions, etc.

New Directions:

1. We will insist that at least one academic humanist be included on each committee.
2. In at least one of the twenty states we will experiment with a committee which is 90% academic humanists. These humanists will be chosen very carefully.
3. In at least one state we will invite a committee which is made up predominantly of higher education administrators outside extension. These would be, say, deans, department heads or others in the fields of the humanities.

The basic criteria which we have used in identifying states so far will continue to be used:

1. Geographic spread
2. Spread among various structural modes
3. Inescapable pressures: political, Political, other.
4. Existence of outstanding resources useful to the program in any state

In addition, we will keep in mind the possible advantages of clustering states so that they can benefit easily from each other's experience.

In an effort to identify new states, we will be open to the possibilities of:

1. Splitting a state (such as California--Northern and Southern)
2. Dividing a state into the major city and other (such as New York City/New York State, Cook County/Illinois)
3. Other