

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Artists-in Schools Program (1974-1976)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

November 2016

Artists-in Schools Program (1974-1976): Report 01

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_4

Recommended Citation

"Artists-in Schools Program (1974-1976): Report 01" (2016). *Artists-in Schools Program (1974-1976)*. Paper 6.

https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_4/6https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_4/6

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 Artists-in Schools Program (1974-1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

The Artists-in-Schools Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 19, 1974

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on September 23 I had the privilege of presenting an address to a 3-day meeting of the National Advisory Panel on the National Endowment for the Arts' artists-in-schools program.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the Panel was recently formed to help guide the growth of what is widely regarded as one of the Endowment's most successful programs, artists-in-schools.

Inaugurated in 1969, Mr. Speaker, the artists-in-schools program has this year placed 1,750 artists in over 5,000 schools.

Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents who serves as Chairman of the National Panel also addressed the meeting.

I refer to Dr. Thomas P. Bergin, dean of Notre Dame University's Center for Continuing Education, who also serves as chairman of the Indiana Arts Commission.

Because I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in Tom Bergin's perceptive comments on the role of the arts in improving the cultural literacy of our young citizens, I include a copy of his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

ARTISTS-IN-SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Distinguished guests, fellow panel members, and representatives of the National Endowment, it is a warm and cordial greeting which I extend to each of you this evening.

We are delighted to have you here . . . Father Hesburgh asked especially that I extend his best wishes and say you are indeed welcome to Notre Dame.

His new Presidential assignment on the Amnesty Commission may jeopardize his being able to be with us briefly tomorrow. He is at the present time returning from Lon-

don and apparently they would like to set up a Commission meeting sometime Tuesday.

In light of the somewhat monumental task we have before us in reviewing the various proposals from all the States, I decided earlier that this evening should be an informal, unstructured, friendly gathering . . . one which would provide us an opportunity to get to know one another better and this indeed is what we want to do.

RECEPTION FOR ARTISTS-IN-SCHOOLS PANEL

The more I thought of what might be the most productive use of our time and lead to greater exchange of ideas, I decided perhaps it would be helpful to present a very quick overview of where we are and hopefully where we are going.

OVERVIEW

The artists-in-schools program began in 1969 and since its inception, the program has been enthusiastically greeted by children, artists, schools, teachers, parents and communities.

During the 1973-74 school year, the artists-in-schools program was operating in 5,000 schools in all 50 States and the 5 special jurisdictions. There were approximately 1,750 artists involved: dancers, musicians, poets, painters, sculptors, graphic artists, photographers, designers, craftsmen, actors, filmmakers, architects/environmental artists, and this year we are to add folk artists if we can find the money.

As the needs of the artists-in-schools program continue to grow, the question of support becomes increasingly crucial.

UNMET NEEDS

In the State of Indiana, for example, the request for \$51,700 for school year 1975-76 represents a 118% increase over this year's funding and the impressive thing is that this increase is backed up with \$100,800 in matching dollars, for a proposed total program (if our budget only permitted) of \$152,000 to place craftsmen, visual artists, poets, filmmakers, and dancers in Indiana schools.

Lest one feel Indiana was immodest in its request, one should note that other States responded in the same way: New Hampshire requested a 347% increase, Pennsylvania a 308% increase, and Florida a 258% increase over last year!

Requests such as these arrived even though States were advised in the guidelines to request only modest increases from the 1974-75 school year program. The total request for the 1975-76 school year program is already approximately one million dollars over the amount budgeted for artists-in-schools.

Tremendous pressure is on the endowment and indeed upon this panel to secure the additional money to fund these programs and meet the individual needs of the States.

LOCAL SUPPORT

The money needed is not in the endowment and so we must look elsewhere.

Obviously one place we must look is to the communities for support. One of the most vital and successful programs operating almost entirely on community funding is an artists-in-schools project in the visual arts and crafts in San Francisco, initiated and developed by one of our artists-in-schools panelists, sculptor, Ruth A'sawa Lanier.

This project, the Alvarado School Arts Workshop has received significant funding from several community foundations including the San Francisco Foundation, the Rosenberg Foundation, the Zellerbach family foundation and others from 1969-72. The program has also received school district funding and funding from the California Arts Commission. This indicates a high degree of community and state investment in the program, resulting in an exemplary model for visual artists and craftsmen.

Only this year, long after the project's proven success, has the endowment had funds to assist this project.

We understand through Ray Okimoto, a member of our artists-in-schools panel, that the department of education of the state of Hawaii is drawing up plans to ask state legislators for several million dollars to support artists-in-schools activities.

At a time when the United States Office of Education has disbanded its arts and humanities program, when the National Institute of Education's attention seems elsewhere, and when many schools are dropping art and music teachers from their staffs as they slash their budgets, the artists-in-schools program takes on an even greater significance.

In our schools, this program still is opening avenues of perception and awareness for our children and demonstrating to education systems and to the public the great value and necessity of incorporating (not excluding) the arts into school curricula.

HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

The artists-in-schools program is an outgrowth of the endowment's earlier poets in schools program, now an integral part of artists-in-schools. Historically, artists-in-schools has been a joint program with the United States Office of Education. The United States Office of Education suggested the endowment join it in expanding the program to, first the visual arts, and then to all the arts, and provided transfer funds to the endowment for expansion of artists-in-schools in the 1969-70 and 1970-71 school years. These first pilot projects accomplished with the United States Office of Education transfer money initiated the visual arts component in six states. (Incidentally, we currently have requests from 50 states for the 1975-76 visual arts and crafts component totaling \$1,429,163—a far cry from the \$100,000 in 1969.)

Both these pilot programs, in poetry and in visual arts, were so successful that in the school year 1970-71, 31 states participated in programs involving visual arts, theatre, dance, poetry, and music residencies. During the 1971-72 school year the film and architecture/environmental arts components were added and by the 1972-73 school year, all 50 States and the five jurisdictions were operating one or more artists-in-schools components.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION ROLE

Traditionally, the United States Office of Education transfer formula to the endowment has been the most successful funding avenue. Under this formula, planning at all levels has been joint between the United States Office of Education and the endowment. The formula has been an efficient administrative method for avoiding time lags, confusion on matching and guidelines, and duplication of staffing work-load and manpower.

Somehow this highly successful formula has fallen away, as has arts programming at the United States Office of Education. Faced with the realities of bureaucracy, money for artists-in-schools, when identified by the United States Office of Education has come from areas where arts are not funded for, and in, themselves but rather to assist to accomplish other goals.

566-062-38810

For example—in the 1972-73 school year, the United States Office of Education provided approximately one million dollars from title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—commissioner's discretionary funds for support of some highly successful artists-in-schools activities.

In the 1973-74 school year, the United States Office of Education had to draw from funds appropriated under the Manpower Development and Training Act to offer a series of grants for training programs and technical assistance for artists (poets, dancers, filmmakers). These funds were utilized primarily for workshops and seminars, and accomplished the goals of the act by training young artists for new areas of employment in our schools. Yet, as with title III funds, when the funds were not available from the United States Office of Education budget in the ensuing years, the strain was felt in the program and in the field.

Although, artists-in-schools has not received any direct support from the United States Office of Education for the current school year artists-in-schools program nor for the coming 1975-76 school year, we must be hopeful that this may change. Particularly as the total requests for the 1975-76 year program are approximately one million dollars over the amount budgeted for artists-in-schools.

There are signs to indicate that the United States Office of Education and the National Institute of Education still have some interest in furthering the development of the arts in education. Yet, the problem that exists seems to be a lack of priority for the arts in their Federal legislation which has given rise to doubts concerning congressional intent. This seems particularly true in regard to the United States Office of Education. What is needed is a clear statement of congressional intent, one which would demonstrate how the Congress feels and how their constituents feel.

KENNEDY CENTER AND ARTS EDUCATION

Are the arts an important part of the learning process of every person?

Grass roots response would seem to say yes. Congress has set aside funds for the Kennedy Center's Alliance for Arts Education (PL 93-380, section 409).

"The Commissioner shall, during the period beginning after June 30, 1974 and ending on June 30, 1978, through arrangements made with the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, carry out a program of grants and contracts to encourage and assist State and local educational agencies

to establish and conduct programs in which the arts are an integral part of elementary and secondary school programs. Not less than \$750,000 shall be available for the purpose of this section during any fiscal year during the period for which provision is made in the preceding sentence."

It would be a major step forward if this legislation could be amended to provide authorization for shared funding of joint programs with the arts endowment, such as artists-in-schools, and for general support of the arts and the humanities in education, including workshops and seminars for artists, teachers, administrators, and scholars.

TO CHANGE THE FACE OF EDUCATION

Pilot projects have proven the arts can change the face of education and present an exciting new way of learning. The response of our States indicate that our schools and State arts agencies working together feel that the artists-in-schools program has a great potential for contributing to this valuable change, and for helping America reassess its role towards the arts, so that they may indeed become an integral part of everyone's life in this country.

It just makes sense, as we know ourselves, the arts make our lives more pleasant outside the schools, think how pleasant the schools are when art exists inside as well.

It seems to me this brief and obviously sweeping analysis of the artists-in-schools program demonstrates rather clearly the task which lies ahead of us as members of this Panel.

It is difficult to exaggerate the total thrust this program can have . . . the boundless opportunity it represents . . . and above all, what it might yet become.

I know I speak on your behalf when I say we intend to work at it.

We believe this program provides a whole new dimension for the arts. . . .

A whole new communication system or network, one which enables us to reach out to all our young people across the Nation . . . and at the same time sensitizes teachers to the great rewards which the arts bring to their teaching and the whole educational endeavor.

On many different occasions and in many different ways, John Kennedy used to say . . .

"We must begin with our young if we truly want to bring about lasting change . . . whether it is in greater appreciation of the arts . . . greater human dignity, better citizenship, or whatever, our young can change the world."

Surely, artists-in-schools is on that track.