

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Interior Appropriations Bill: Pell Statements
(1990)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

6-4-1994

Interior Appropriations Bill: Pell Statements (1990): Correspondence 01

Fern Lapidus

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_40

Recommended Citation

Lapidus, Fern, "Interior Appropriations Bill: Pell Statements (1990): Correspondence 01" (1994). *Interior Appropriations Bill: Pell Statements (1990)*. Paper 16.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_40/16https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_40/16

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Interior Appropriations Bill: Pell Statements (1990) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

LAPIDUS ASSOCIATES

TO: DANIEL RITTER
 FROM: FERN LAPIDUS *Fern Lapidus*
 RE: TITLE XI-CULTURAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR AT-RISK
 CHILDREN AND YOUTH
 DATE: JUNE 7, 1994

Following your request, I have put together some background information that I hope you will find useful in preparation for floor consideration of your legislation. I believe that if you confine your arguments to how the arts and cultural institutions can benefit the education of children as part and parcel of achieving the overall objectives of S. 1513, you can avoid the unpleasant discussions that often surround "arts" legislation. There is broad bipartisan support for "education" legislation. "Arts" legislation is far more controversial. The Senate legislation addresses this issue by making it very clear that there would be a broad group of education and cultural groups working together to benefit children.

THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

The federal government has invested in education when it has perceived it to be in the national interest. The earliest foray into federal involvement dates back to 1862 with the passage of the First Morrill Act establishing the state system of land grant colleges to address the needs of an agricultural society. Next came vocational education, following World War I, to provide a skilled workforce for our industrial economy. By World War II, it became necessary to insure that our recruits were healthy and Congress adopted the child nutrition programs.

The nature of federal involvement changed again in 1965 following passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964. The government now assumed the role of providing equity and access to those special populations which historically were unserved or underserved by the institutions that were charged to serve them. Thus began such programs as Title I, Individuals with Disabilities Act, Bilingual Education, Pell Grants for higher education, etc. These programs provide highly targeted funds for the poor, disabled, migrant, Indian and special populations that are most at risk in society and the least able to gain access to the institutions designed to serve them.

The Clinton Administration has broadened the role of the federal government in education without abandoning the previous twin objectives of assuring equity and access. With the passage of GOALS 2000, Congress has declared that money for special populations are not enough. In order for our citizens to compete in

the emerging global economy, all our children, including those most at risk, must be expected to meet high standards and perform at a level that is competitive with their peers in other democratic countries.

CULTURAL PARTNERSHIPS FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Purpose:

- Provides federal funds for the development of quality cultural programs for at-risk children and youth.
- Links schools and cultural entities in the community together to develop programs for children and youth.
- Provides for staff development to insure quality programs.
- Encourages parental involvement.
- Targets funds on those students who have the least opportunity to benefit from cultural resources.
- Uses federal money to leverage local cultural resources for the benefit of at-risk children and youth.

Why Needed:

- Local school budgets, particularly in areas serving high concentrations of low-income children, are inadequate to provide cultural programs. (This addresses the equity/access issues. Two-thirds of the schools in New York City have neither music nor art programs, even though New York State mandates arts education.)
- Research increasingly demonstrates that when students receive arts education, they often transfer their acquired discipline, self-esteem, and problem solving-skills to other subjects like math, English and history. (Sources: NEA, Getty)
- Arts education increases self-esteem, which gives at-risk children new hope for the future. That translates into such tangibles as less violence and fewer teen pregnancies. President Clinton has said: "The young man who picks up a clarinet or a paintbrush or a fistful of clay is not likely to pick up a gun or a needle. He's got better things to do. He's got art."
- Studies have concluded that the arts provide at-risk children with a positive self-image, and encourage them to perform better in academic subjects and remain in school longer. (NEA, Getty)
- Recent studies by the University of Chicago concluded that students who studied more than four years of music and arts scored an average of 34 points higher on the SAT test and 18 points

higher on the math section than students who took these subjects for less than one year.

- The arts are considered a core subject and have been included by Secretary of Education Richard Riley in Goals 2000 (issues of economic/ global competition). Most schools will never approach these goals without federal help.
- Historically, the arts and cultural institutions have been considered merely a frill to be enjoyed by only the idle rich. In fact, the arts play a huge economic role. The Port Authority of NY and NJ released a report showing that in 1992, the total economic impact of the arts on the NY-NJ metropolitan region was \$9.8 billion. The arts industry in this region supports 107,000 jobs (economic/global competition).
- Our major trading partners -- Germany, Japan and Italy -- heavily subsidize cultural institutions in their societies. Their students receive a good foundation in subjects such as art and design which helps make the products they manufacture competitive worldwide. We cannot compete if our students don't have the same extensive training (economic/global competition).
- Real change can only be accomplished by teachers, parents, schools and cultural entities working together at the local level. This legislation mandates cooperation in order to receive funding.

QUESTIONS THAT CAME UP IN THE HOUSE AND MAY ARISE IN THE SENATE

Q. WHY ISN'T TITLE XI UNDER THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS (NEA)?

A. It is partially. The Senate legislation is much broader than the program envisioned by the House and includes the active involvement of ED, NEA, IMS, and NEH. This is an education program using the arts and cultural institutions and not an arts program using education. Our new Title XI funds working partnerships between schools and cultural institutions. We have mandated coordination of efforts to avoid duplication and insure quality programs. Title XI targets those children most at risk of having academic difficulties and also those least likely to access cultural institutions. Since our legislation targets Title 1 eligible schools, the data relevant to the administration are in the Education Department and requires the active participation of the Department in addition to the cultural agencies.

Q. WHY ISN'T TITLE XI UNDER ESEA TITLE 1?

A. In theory, Title 1 has always permitted the funding of arts programs. However, in practice the emphasis has been, and continues to be, on reading, mathematics and language arts. By emphasizing reading, mathematics and language arts, Title 1 sends a strong message to states and local school districts that they are not permitted to do anything else. This remains true in H.R. 6.

Section 1001 (d) (2) of S. 1513 takes a giant step toward rectifying this problem. But even here (Believe me, I'm thrilled and am not complaining!) the arts are viewed as enrichment and not as a mandated core subject by themselves or even as a tool to achieve academic success.

Schools will never take the arts seriously until they are ranked by their arts scores as they are by their reading and math scores.

Q. WHY DO WE NEED A NEW CATEGORICAL PROGRAM ?

A. The need for a new program is in response to the National Education Goals. The federal government supports separate programs for math and science. The arts are equally important.

Local schools facing severe budget constraints frequently eliminate arts programs. We cannot expect our children to meet the arts standards set out in GOALS 2000 without encouragement and help from the federal government.

Technically, the only provision that makes this program categorical is the prohibition against supplanting local programs. The purpose of the "supplement, not supplant" provision is to insure that federal money is not used to reduce local support. This bill intends to increase the number and quality of cultural programs that are available to at-risk children and youth. Without this prohibition, localities may substitute local funds for federal ones and not increase programs.