

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services
(IMS) (1990)

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

1984

Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990): Response or Comment 01

Alexander D. Crary

Albert T. Klyberg

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_74

Recommended Citation

Crary, Alexander D. and Klyberg, Albert T., "Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990): Response or Comment 01" (1984). *Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990)*. Paper 7. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_74/7

This Response or Comment 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 Reauthorization: Institute for Museum Services (IMS) (1990) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

6/27.

Senator:

Reply to Al Klyberg is attached per your request.

Al raises some very valid points which should be raised early on with the new IMS Director Daphne Murray.

Still no formal transmission of her nomination.

ADC

/ agree



The Rhode Island Historical Society

110 Benevolent Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02906
Telephone (401) 331-8575

file: IMS policy

July 30, 1984

Ms. Rowena Stewart
Rhode Island Black Heritage Society
One Hilton Street
Providence, RI 02905

Dear Rowena:

Thanks for offering to take suggestions about IMS with you to your meeting with Mrs. Phillips. I think that there are several areas which might be worth looking into:

- The instructions to the reviewers ought to be as clear as possible. If the reviewers are to judge on the basis of excellence, then some standards of excellence and high performance ought to be identified.
- Across the profession, AAM accreditation has been recognized as a standard. While I would not want to penalize museums not having accreditation, I think that something is wrong with the IMS process if accredited museums end up at the bottom of the list. In the IMS process there is no way to check the truthfulness of the application's claims of excellence. At least in the AAM process an outside evaluator has visited the museum. Ideally, I would like to see quality points given a museum in the IMS process which has achieved accreditation. If that concept is too radical, then I would like the IMS review panel to check the computer print out of suggested IMA grant awards and see where accredited museums fall. Those which turn up in the lower half ought to be looked at by the panel.
- Medium to large museums near the \$600,000 break point seem to be at a disadvantage. We got grants when we were smaller than \$600,000; now that we are bigger, we have lost them. Our place in the total ranking has ranged from #27 to #892. Yet we are still the

same organization. If anything, this year when we have ranked 892, we are better than we were. Who else has a show like Creative Survival on one hand and a Sampler Show at the Met in New York at the same time?

- Another idea which would make it possible for IMS to stretch their grant money further would be to fund museums of our size at \$25,000 to \$35,000 instead of \$50,000. These smaller grants would still be a significant amount for us.
- Lastly, it might be worthwhile for someone with a mathematical background to look at the computer program which ranks the scores. I do not fully understand it, but Maureen Robinson at AAM tells me that there are some built-in biases.

Thanks for entertaining these thoughts.

Sincerely,

Albert T. Klyberg
Director

enclosures
kg

cc Sandy Crary
Senator Pell's Office