

2017

Conference Position Paper (1976): Report 03

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_32

Recommended Citation

"Conference Position Paper (1976): Report 03" (2017). *Conference Position Paper (1976)*. Paper 1.
http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_32/1http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_32/1

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 Position Paper (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Two Possible Alternatives for Arts Education Program

(Title IV)

Senator

1. Retain the text as currently contained in the Senate Arts & Humanities bill but delay the effective date until FY 1978. This would answer Mr. Quie's objection that the House had not considered the matter, since it would have time to consider it as part of elementary and secondary education oversight hearings prior to the section's becoming effective. If they didn't like some of the provisions of the section, they could propose changes before the program became operational. This approach would have the advantage to us of cementing something into the law that would take effect unless subsequent legislation changed it.

2. Add a cut-down version of the provision (minus the teacher training authority) to Section 409 of the Special Projects Act (Education in the Arts). This would vest authority in the Office of Education, not the Arts endowment. It could be justified as building upon the successes of the small program run by OE and the Kennedy Center--an expansion into a demonstration program for exemplary arts education programs, and dissemination of results. Elimination of the retraining provisions would avoid criticism about elimination of general teacher training authority at the same time as the creation of new art teacher training authority.

It would be parliamentarily questionable (under the House rules) whether this could be done in the Arts & Humanities conference. However, such an amendment could be added to S. 2657.

(If asked, the Special Projects Act contains a very carefully worked out series of relative percentages of the appropriation for each of several categorical programs, including the existing section 409. However, it is possible to draft the expansion without disturbing all the other percentages, by making the expanded authority a separate authorization.)

A third alternative is to drop this project and bring it up again next year. Brademas has suggested a joint hearing on the matter featuring David Rockefeller and a study now in progress. Catherine Bloom, the lady who worked on Arts and Humanities with great success in the days when Francis ~~Keppel~~ Keppel was Commissioner of OE (the early '60s), is also much involved in this study and now works with the Rockefellers.

The advantage of dropping it now and coming back to it with more ammunition is that this is what the House wants, and we could trade it for a commitment to keep our disparity in funding at a more basic level.

In Title I (basic program) in Senate bill...

Arts get \$100 million	
Humanities get \$90 million	Fiscal 1977
Arts get \$105 million	
Humanities get \$105 million	Fiscal 1978

The House will fight us on equalizing these amounts. They have total parity in their bill. If we could keep the above disparity I would recommend, if necessary, dropping Arts Education.

IN SUM: MAKE ANY DECISION ON THIS SUBJECT TO FINAL AMOUNTS OF MONEY.

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