

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

National Foundation on the Arts and
Humanities: S. 1386 (1979)

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

October 2016

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: S. 1386 (1979): Speech 03

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_65

Recommended Citation

"National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: S. 1386 (1979): Speech 03" (2016). *National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: S. 1386 (1979)*. Paper 9.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_65/9

This Speech 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 National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: S. 1386 (1979) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

QUESTIONS FOR LIVY

1. Your bill requests "such sums as may be necessary" for authorizations of appropriations for the Endowment. What levels of funding would you consider adequate to ensure the Endowment's future growth?

2. From your bill, I understand that you are proposing to raise the Chairman's discretionary share of State grants from 25% to 50% over the next five years. Won't this mean that some States will lose money?

3. Don't the three factors specified for the Chairman's discretionary grants--quality, level of State appropriations, and size of State population--all favor States with existing strong arts programs, at the expense of States which have small populations and/or less ambitious programs?

4. Which of the three factors will you give the greatest weight to? Will you issue regulations specifying relative importance of the criteria? What other factors could you also use in determining the distribution of Chairman's grants to States?

5. The Investigative Staff Report to the House Appropriations Committee was generally critical of the Endowment's management. What steps have you taken to address the criticisms made by the report?

6. The report makes the point that the Endowment shows a certain reluctance to terminate grantees. Should there perhaps be an automatic cut-off point for grants?

7. The report notes that the Endowment seems to fund service organizations without seeking to fully determine the contributions such organizations have made to the arts community. What steps are you taking to correct this?

8. One of the major threads of current concern is accountability, the question of whether taxpayers are getting their money's worth for Federal dollars spent. What are you doing to assure that NEA programs are accountable for publicly raised funds?

9. You have been Chairman of the Endowment now for almost two years. What problems have you encountered in administering Endowment programs, and what legislative remedies could you suggest to make your job easier?

10. Could you review for the Committee your policy of limiting Program Directors to five-year rotations? Will this policy inhibit the Endowment from hiring the best people for the job?

11. The House Investigative Report stresses the concept that the Endowment is a "closed circle." I am informed that several program directors, who have been rotated out by the 5-year limitation, still occupy high positions in the Endowment or are recipients of generous Endowment contracts. Doesn't this reinforce the "closed circle" concept?

12. In preliminary conversations that my staff has had with your staff, there has been discussion of institutional development grants. This concept does not appear in your draft bill. Do you believe that you have the authority to help developing arts institutions under your existing law?

13. What is the status of NEA's community agencies task force? How and when will the recommendations of this task force be implemented? As you know, I have included language in my bill to encourage you to give more attention to local arts

Livy - 3 -

agencies. As more and more local groups are created,
are State Councils able to meet their needs?

14. What procedures does the Endowment follow in awarding Chairman's grants? How many are granted, and what is the process of review for such grants?

15. In preliminary discussions at the staff level, one of the major areas of confusion concerns Treasury grants. Where does your legal authority for Treasury grants come from? What are the limits on Treasury grants? Where did you get your initial appropriations for Treasury grants, and how are annual amounts made available, if not through the appropriations process?

16. What is the size of the Endowment staff? Has it increased since you became Chairman? Would you provide for the record the grade-level breakdown of your employees, and how many of them are consultants rather than full-time employees?

17. Could you give us a break-down as to what percentage of your money goes to major institutions or organizations and what goes to individual artists?

18. Why are you proposing a major shift from Challenge grants to Treasury grants, in the light of the success of challenge grants in the past?

Question for Livy

We are all aware of reports of projects funded by the Arts Endowment that have been of questionable artistic merit. I think one of these projects might have been the recipient of the Golden Fleece Award. A project that comes immediately to my mind is one that funded something that is called "the Hartford Rocks Project." Can you tell me what artistic merit this project had, and further, can you tell me what criteria you used in determining whether a project to be funded is of artistic merit?