

2017

Conference Material (1976): Report 01

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_31

Recommended Citation

"Conference Material (1976): Report 01" (2017). *Conference Material (1976)*. Paper 5.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_31/5
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_31/5

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conference Material (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

IN MATERIAL WE DEVELOPED DURING THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES
MOST RECENT HEARINGS

IN FOUR YEARS

STATE HUMANITIES COMMITTEES HAVE SUPPORTED
3500 PROJECTS, REACHING AN AUDIENCE OF
20 MILLION...

In One Year -- 1975 -- state committees supported
1,700 projects

IN ONE YEAR (1974 on which we have comprehensive data
compiled by the State Arts Agencies Association)

STATE ARTS COUNCILS SUPPORTED 6,903 projects
REACHING 57,101,000 people.

It can be said that the Arts program in the States
is four times the size and dimension of the State
Humanities program -- in terms of outreach, benefits
to the grass roots development of the arts, and in
terms of actual numbers of people involved.

Note: the Humanities may argue that their federal dollars are
matched by private dollars. ~~True~~ True, BUT

At present, federal dollars for the Arts are matched
in total on a four-for-one basis -- \$15 federal, \$60 million state.

And... each federal dollar stimulates at least two
extra private dollars for the Arts, according to the Arts Endowment.

NOTE ATTACHED RESOLUTION RELATING TO COUNTY SUPPORT FOR THE ARTS.
A NEW DEVELOPMENT, BUT A GROWING ONE.

THERE IS JUST NO PARALLEL TO ANY OF THIS ON THE HUMANITIES SIDE.

RESOLUTION ON THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN OUR COUNTIES

WHEREAS, surveys, public demand and increasing private support and participation indicate that citizen involvement with the arts is strong and growing; and

WHEREAS, continued growth of the arts in quantitative and qualitative ways can no longer be sustained by traditional support resources; and

WHEREAS, the arts are an essential element in providing the opportunity for quality environment;

NACO URGES THAT:

. That counties recognize the arts as an essential service, equal in importance to other essential services, and help to make the arts available to all their citizens,

. That every county be encouraged to establish a public agency specifically concerned with the arts,

. That the physical appearance of the county, its architectural heritage and its amenities, be acknowledged as a resource to be nurtured,

. That counties should be encouraged to establish a percentage of the total costs of every county construction budget to be set aside for the purchase or commission of works of art,

. That counties working together with the public at large shall help to effect a new national goal; "That no American shall be deprived of the opportunity to experience the beauty in life by barrier of circumstance, income, background, remoteness or race."

Adopted by the National Association of Counties
41st Annual Conference
Salt Lake City, Utah
June 30, 1976

Arts Education

We can accept a simple amendment to section 409 of the Education Amendments of 1974 which would authorize \$2 million to increase arts education programs in elementary and secondary school programs... for FY 1978.

This is all that remains of a \$20 million program which was in our Senate bill -- but there was much objection to it being placed under the Arts Endowment as we conceived it. No one supported the idea...

This amendment gives it a possible springboard for another time.

It's been checked with Jean. The House proposal for this part of our bill would not interfere with formulas for funding in the 1974 Education Amendments. It's innocuous, but may serve a useful purpose at a later time.

SHORT SUMMARY OF STATE HUMANITIES PROPOSAL

1. For the first year, matching would be required for any amounts above \$100,000 by state monies. Matching for the first \$100,000 could come from any source.
2. The state would be able to immediately appoint 50% of the membership of the state's humanities program.
3. The state matching requirement would be 100% after the first year.
4. In the event that the state does not match available Federal monies in the second year, the state appointees would be removed.
5. Two members on the state humanities would be appointed by the governor regardless of matching provision.

FUNDING LEVELS

(in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 1977</u>	<u>FY 1978</u>
Arts Endowment	98.	113.
(Treasury Funds)	10.	12.5
Humanities Endowment	98.	113.
(Treasury Funds)	10.	12.5
Challenge Grants: Arts	7.5	10.
Humanities	7.5	10.
Museums	15.	25.
Photo and Film Project	4.	2.
Arts Education	0	2.
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	250	300

Talking Points...

1. The Impact of the Arts and Humanities -- 10 years ago and today.
In the early days, the Humanities were the strongest partners, by far.
2. The State Arts programs and their benefits at grass roots level
 - . from \$4 million to \$60 million in State monies, per year
 - . the development of over 1,000 community arts councils
 - . the new development of county arts councils
 - . state leaders vigorously endorsing the arts
 - . the State arts program (with State Councils) is at least four times larger and broader than the program conducted by Humanities Committees.
3. There is for the Humanities no Federal-State partnership, a major strength of the arts program
4. Berman calls our bill which provides options for the States in the Humanities, and would allow for the continuance of his own committees, if the State so desired --- "wholly unacceptable." And remember, the State program we are proposing is only 20% of the total, as for Arts.
5. He advocates therefore a central authority for all of the program.
There is a great danger
No balance in the program. There is a good balance in the Arts -- 50 potential unallied critics in the States.
6. Berman's job -- passable, but nowhere near exceptional.

Exceptional leadership an essential for the job.
Should be for four years unless exceptional merit proved.

State Humanities Program...

As I said when last we met, I see great merit in the House proposal to resolve the State Humanities issue.

However, I believe some refinements are needed. I feel we all agree that a true Federal-State partnership in the Humanities is to be encouraged, and that there should be sufficient incentive to get it started.

Accordingly, I suggest that in Fiscal 1977 the percentage required from State funds be 25% rather than the 50% in the House proposal.

Then we would continue with the House proposal, for the following year and thereafter.

To: Senator

From: LB

Aug, 27

Interim Memo -- State Humanities

I have discussed with our Counsel, Blair Crownover, possibilities for adding to the Brademas proposal more incentives for the States to get involved.

In essence, these are as follows: Your thought of making the

- A. provisions mandatory, so that existing Committees would have to receive State monies in order to operate;

or a sliding State-Federal involvement. Brademas would have 1/2 of the funds contributed by the State in the first year

- B. in order for the State to have 50% gubernatorial appointments on the Committee -- after that it would be 100% State matching to assure such representation... To give more incentive, we could phase in the State monies required, more gradually -- say, 25% the first year; 50% the second, and so on...

or, we could require a State-wide study at the outset, to

- C. actually involve the States in the planning process, to get them interested, to have all parties concerned heard from. This would provide a similar incentive for State involvement, as was the case for the Arts when they began State programs. There are many advantages to the study idea, but the disadvantage is that it postpones getting things going...

For our purposes, I rate these as above. The mandatory provision, Blair tells me is Conferenceable, and he will have a means of doing this very simply, with the Brademas language.

State Humanities Program

A One-Year Study

In cooperation with the State involved, each existing Committee (except as below) would conduct a one-year study to determine State needs in the Humanities, leading to the development of a plan to meet those needs.

In cases where there is a State agency for the Arts and Humanities already in place (some 14 states), the State agency would conduct the study (as its authority is already mandated in State law) or the State would determine who would conduct the study -- the State agency, or the existing committee.

In cases where the State opted for the existing committee to conduct the study and there was in that State a State Arts and Humanities agency, the committee would cooperate with the agency, or consult with the agency, as one means of general cooperation with the State.

In cases where the State opted for the State agency to conduct the study, the agency would cooperate with the existing committee.

The plan would be implemented in accordance with the House proposal, whenever a State committee was involved.

Advantages:

1. It protects the rights of existing State agencies for both Arts and Humanities without unduly favoring them. They were established before the State Humanities committees, but have never received Endowment funds for their potentials to develop State-wide programs.

2. It is a logical plan. It follows the format leading to the development of the very successful Arts programs in the States -- i.e. a one-year study preceded the establishment of these programs.

3. It is orderly. It allows for a better timing sequence than we had considered.

4. It provides a real opportunity for State input, and thus an incentive for the States to join in funding the plan and to have an equal voice in its development.

5. It requires existing Committees to cooperate with States and with Arts and Humanities state agencies where they exist.

6. It preserves the reforms in the State committees which we had already agreed on -- rotation, broad representation, etc.

7. It permits us to hold, if desired, oversight hearings on the way the studies are going, and how the cooperative efforts are proceeding... so that we can help keep a balance and prod when needed.

8. It does not contravene our basic agreement with the House.

9. It satisfies the Javits grievance concept... As the study and plan develop, all parties now excluded from State committee programs can be heard, or will have the opportunity for input.

Funding:

The Arts programs began with studies funded at \$25,000 each.

In those days the States themselves supplemented the Federal grant -- which was non-matching in each case for the studies.

In retrospect, it is amazing to think how much was accomplished with such a relatively small amount of money.

I would recommend a higher figure. For a good study of State needs (and I'm thinking of RI in this regard) I propose up to \$100,000 per State. We really should get something for that investment, and we really should expect major State input.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO INCLUDE THIS CONCEPT WITHIN THE FINAL
CHALLENGE PROGRAM AGREEMENT.

Both Arts and Humanities challenge programs are based
on the Endowments raising funds from outside sources to
trigger appropriations.

Money is appropriated up to the authorized ceiling
only when the triggering funds are raised from outside.

To allow the most enterprising Endowment to get maximum
use out of the total funds available for these challenge programs,
there should be a cut-off point after 9 months of a fiscal year --
and funds not being used by one Endowment transferred to the other,
if the other can indeed use these funds.

The language is on Page 7 of our challenge grant
proposal, as follows:

"(B) If the Chairman determines at the end of the ninth month
of any fiscal year that funds which would otherwise be available
under subsection (a) of this section to an Endowment cannot be
used, he shall transfer such funds to the other Endowment for the
purposes described in subsection (a) of this section.

State Humanities Programs

The purpose of the Conference agreement is to encourage and stimulate the development of a Federal-State partnership in the ~~Humanities~~ broad cultural areas of the Humanities, so that this partnership may be increasingly beneficial to our people in each State. The Conferees have taken note of the dramatic growth of the Federal-State partnership with respect to the programs of the National Endowment for the Arts, exemplified by a 15-fold increase in ^{annual} State funding for the Arts in ten years -- from \$ million to \$60 million, and by the development of more than 1,000 community arts councils. The Conferees agreement envisages the development of similar challenges and opportunities for the Humanities Endowment.

The Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities is directed to help encourage State participation and to work more closely with State governments and State officials than in the past, so that the particular to values ~~of~~ the Humanities, can enter the mainstream of our democratic processes and make a more vital contribution to American life.

The Chairman is urged to study State needs in the Humanities with State leaders, so that these needs can be met in the broadest sense, through programs representing the full scope of the Humanities, and through programs which ~~particularly~~ will be addressed to a multiplicity and variety of worthwhile projects. It is the position of the Conferees that the 20% of the total funding allocated to the States is of deep importance in bringing the values of both the Arts and the Humanities into local communities and to groups whose needs may be relatively modest, but who have potentially great significance.

Digest of State Humanities Programs


SENATE BILL

HOUSE BILL

Funding: 20% of total funds appropriated

20% of total funds appropriated


To receive this funding...



A State designates one of these options:

- a. an existing committee, provided it have a satisfactory grievance procedure
- b. an existing committee, if within 3 yrs. a procedure is established so that a majority of comm. members are appt. by governor
- c. an existing combined arts and humanities State council (as in Texas and 10 other States. The humanities part would then be funded by Berman.)
- d. a new State entity -- just for Humanities

To receive this funding...



The Endowment Chairman chooses one of these options:

- a. an existing committee
- b. a State arts and humanities council
- c. a new entity -- just for the Humanities

(Note: Since the Chairman has sole discretion to choose here, it would seem obvious what he would choose.)

Safeguards:

Both bills provide safeguards, with respect to existing committees, if funded. These include: rotation of membership, broad public representation, proper reporting procedures, and public access to information.

We do not have this proposal (we have the above grievance procedure) * * * * *

The House bill provides that 2 members of an existing committee would be appointed by governor.

Note: Humanities committee members and chairmen come from a Washington source. A small number of people involved in the Humanities in each state were invited by the Endowment to form a committee nucleus. They in turn got others to join -- hence "a laying on of hands." Chairmen were chosen from among these members.

There is no State funding for these committees. They seek none. They don't want the Humanities in the State political process... Hence there is no Fed-State partnership as in Arts -- its major strength.



The Main Issue:

States determine what is best
Decentralization of control

Chairman decides which is best
Central control

(Safeguards are insufficient without State involvement -- i.e. memberships could be rotated among friends)
Note: Under our bill an existing committee can continue if the State thinks that is best.

With respect to the following years, I recommend another refinement aimed at fair and equal sharing between Federal and State governments, while at the same time providing an appropriate ~~opportunity for appropriate support to~~ incentive to continue ~~some~~ private support.

We have said that future State involvement would mean a 50% representation on the State committees or entities we are discussing.

It seems to me that ~~the State allotment need not exceed~~ funding to achieve this 50% representation need not exceed the Federal allotment involved to the State.

The Federal allotment is described elsewhere in the legislation. It is based on a basic State allotment of not less than \$200,000, and it is based on 20% of the total funds appropriated to the Humanities Endowment.

We have reached a point where that State allotment, in terms of appropriations ^{already approved} for the Humanities Endowment for fiscal 1977, could be somewhere the \$200,000 and \$250,000.

To give you an example, let me set out these factors:

Let's say that group in a State three years from now is composed of half State representatives and half private citizens.

Let's say they have developed a total program for the Humanities whose cost is \$900,000.

Let's say the State allotment under our bill is \$300,000 for that year.

Let's say the State representatives and the private citizens are in full agreement on the value of the program.

Let's say they know that a third of the money -- \$300,000 is available from private sources... because the private citizen members, in this case, have had experience in raising private funding for the Humanities.

Under the House proposal, to maintain its representation of 50%, the State would be required to ~~fund one-half of the~~ *fund far more than* ~~the Federal share.~~ *the Federal share.*
 ~~project~~ (The Federal share would be \$300,000.)

But the State share would be \$450,000 -- 50% more than the Federal share -- because the State must fund half the cost of the ~~program~~ program whose total cost is \$900,000.

In this case, the private share would be \$150,000. *That's only 1/6 of the cost, and not in both hands.* ~~private and State members feel that keeping with the potentials of private they can raise \$300,000 from private sources. Support me and seeking to stimulate - as well as state help.~~
 I believe there is an inequity here which I would help.

hope we could correct. *In these beginning years, when we need maximum incentives, I feel we should require state matching -*

Let's go over those figures again:

FOR \$900,000 PROGRAM IN A STATE

Under House proposal: (with 50% State representation)

- Federal -- \$300,000
- State -- 450,000 (half the cost)
- Private --- 150,000

Under My amendment:

- Federal \$300,000
- State \$300,000 (same as Federal)
- Private \$300,000

but not in excess of the Federal share.
We are initiating a new concept. The possibility of state involvement in the Humanities in coop. with the private sector. we need

Accordingly I recommend this -- that the State share under this proposal in ~~not~~ ^{and not} exceed the State allotment we have described elsewhere in this legislation.

The State allotment is based on 20% of the total funds appropriated, divided into initial equal shares of not less than \$200,000 per State. There are the 50 States -- and then the other five entities (Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and the Bistrict of Columbia) -- which are eligible.

55 entities in all.

55 X \$200,000 is \$11 million.

The Humanities Endowment's appropriation for FY 1977, which has already passed both Houses and has been signed into law, with a contingency clause relating to the action we take on authroization, is \$77 million.

Twenty per cent of the Humanities Endowment's funding for next year is approximately \$15.5 million.

The difference between 11 million and 15.5 million would go to the States or regional groups, or the allotments to the States could be increased -- say to \$250,000 per State. That would amount to approximately \$13.5 million.

Let's suppose that the Endowment received \$100 million in appropriations. State monies would be \$20 million -- or up to \$360,000 per State.