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Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee:
I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to
discuss the reauthorization of the Institute of Museum Services.

As a member of the museum community for the past 23 years, I
have been familiar with the Institute since its inception in
1976. This agency has a record of solid support for museums' essential services. Since its inception, IMS has made 8,886
grants and involved thousands of museum professionals in the peer review process.

Our congressional mandate is to provide encouragement to virtually every kind of museum (zoos, arboretums, planetariums, history, art, children's, ethnic museums) and assist them: in their educational role; to help them conserve America's cultural, historic, and scientific heritage; and to ease the financial burden incurred as a result of increasing use by the public. The success of IMS programs has been due largely to input from our peer reviewers and policy-making National Museum Services Board (NMSB) which have provided vital channels of
communication with the field we serve. The input of the National Museum Services Board and the hundreds of museum professionals who participate as peer reviewers have shaped programs that address priority needs of the broad range of museum disciplines in a cost-effective way.

One product of this on-going dialogue is a recently distributed analysis of the General Operating Support program (GOS). The bulk of IMS funding is directed toward GOS which supports museum operations. The general operating support program is a highly competitive program that provides grants equal to 10% of a museum's budget up to a maximum of $75,000. GOS grants are crucial, unrestricted monies which can be used for virtually all museum expenses, such as utilities and salaries.

The analysis of the General Operating Support program by the NMSB and peer reviewers looked at the distribution of funding across geographic areas, budget sizes, and disciplines; the qualifications and performance of our field and panel reviewers; the application form and the agency's outreach efforts. The report made 33 recommendations for improvements and continuation of successful procedures.

One of the major recommendations of the analysis was to contract with an independent analyst to evaluate GOS data pertaining to trends in museum operations, the impact of receiving General
Operating Support, the methodology of our funding process, and the evolution of museum standards. This is the first time that such an analysis will occur and we look forward to utilizing this objective data to continue to improve our service to the museum community.

While the General Operating Support program remains the core of IMS, the last few years have seen growth in the number of programs we offer. The Conservation Project Support program, begun in 1984, has been extremely successful in assisting museums in developing long range conservation plans. Through communication with conservation professionals the priorities for this program have been streamlined. The new Conservation Assessment Program, that focuses solely on support for a conservation survey, has met with an overwhelmingly positive response from the museum community.

In addition to providing general operating support to museums the IMS also administers several other programs. The Museum Assessment Programs are particularly helpful to small and emerging museums. These three, non-competitive, first-come, first-served programs provide a professional assessment and site visit of overall operations (MAP I), collections care (MAP II), and public services (MAP III, pilot 1990). These programs continue to serve primarily institutions with budgets under $200,000.
For the last two years the IMS Professional Services Program has provided cooperative agreements with professional museum organizations. Training projects in conservation practices and assessment, museum management issues workshops, and dissemination of museum initiatives are some of the projects that have benefited the museum community at large. This small program has great potential to provide unique service to our Nation’s museums.

In closing, I would like to highlight the agency’s outreach initiatives. The General Operating Support analysis I mentioned earlier, recommended initiatives to upgrade our communication with the field. In an effort to respond to this initiative I have focused on learning about the needs, expectations, and plans of our constituency. I have visited zoos, botanical gardens, history, art, science, anthropological and children’s museums as well as aquariums and planetariums. I have met with representatives from over 40 museums from around the country in our Washington offices and, in the field - from the east coast of Florida to the west coast of California - I have visited over 35 individual museums and met with the staff members of an additional 25.

The IMS staff, who place a high priority on service to the museum community, provide individual applicant counseling, grant writing workshops, and important feedback to all candidates through their compilation of reviewers, comments and scores.
I believe that the open and on-going dialogue between IMS and the community we serve has provided a solid foundation for the future of the Institute. The reauthorization of the IMS will allow us to continue to serve that community.

I think it may be useful, at this point, for me to highlight for the Committee those provisions of the draft reauthorization legislation we recently submitted to Congress, which directly affect the Institute of Museum Services. By way of overview, let me state that it is our view that the enabling legislation in its present form, works well and is in no need of substantive revision. The minor changes we propose would contribute only to "fine-tuning" this authorizing legislation.

Section 32: This section adds "conservation" to the types of resources that are to be represented by the membership of the National Museum Services Board. This addition emphasizes the importance of conservation concerns to IMS programs, the museum community and the general public.

Section 33: This amendment changes the annual minimum number of meetings required for the National Museum Services Board from four to three. It conforms the authorizing legislation to actual practice, as approved annually by the Congress in appropriations acts.
Section 34: This section removes the restriction on the salary level of the IMS Director from the enabling legislation. This section corresponds with the addition in Section 43 to amend 5 U.S.C. 5315, to add the Director of the Institute of Museum Services to level IV of the Executive Schedule for compensation purposes. This level more appropriately reflects the Director’s responsibilities and role as advocate for the Nation’s museums.

Section 35: This section corrects a drafting error in current law, which refers to the "Chairperson" rather than the Director.

Section 36: This section changes the reference to "artifacts and art objects" to "collections" to symbolize the importance of conserving all types of materials in the collections of the various types of museums supported by IMS. Museums eligible for IMS programs include, for example, zoos and botanical gardens, historic houses, and science and technology centers as well as art and other types of museums.

Section 37: This section eliminates two restrictions on the funding of projects to strengthen museum services. First, it removes the provisions limiting funding to professional museum associations. This change would allow IMS to fund other types of organizations which propose worthwhile projects.
Second, it removes the one-year limit on these projects. The limit prevents extending the availability of funding in cases where a project is delayed by unexpected circumstances and prevents high quality, beneficial projects from being funded if they cannot be completed in one-year. The following provisions are renumbered to reflect the deletion.

Section 38: This amendment extends for five years the authorization of appropriations for all IMS programs, as well as the authorization of appropriations to match contributions to IMS. The proposal authorizes a total of $24,000,000 for FY 1991, the amount requested in the President’s 1991 budget.

I believe enactment of this legislation would serve the national interest by enabling the Institute of Museum Services to continue to increase and improve museum services.

Albert T. Klyberg, Director of the Rhode Island Historical Society

In a few weeks the Institute of Museum Services will announce its 13th round of General Operating Support Grants. Since 1977 the Institute has made more than 150 million dollars available in GOS and conservation grants. The accomplishment is all the more significant because a decade ago the Institute was nearly closed.

As one who has followed the Institute's course since its initial hearings in 1973 and was privileged to serve as a Board member for a year, I am pleased and honored to be asked to comment on the program during its current reauthorization hearings.

The issues confronting the Institute's award program have been well outlined and framed in the review prepared last November. Such issues as the length of application, the selection of field reviewers, and the fairness of the process are all there for consideration.

To these, and upon these, I would like to share the following comments and observations.

The application is a long one. I do not know how that can be changed. Something very close to what is being used is necessary if the applicant's institution is going to provide sufficient detail to enable a reviewer
ample opportunity to assess whether or not a quality program is being offered. The last time our institution totally revised our application it required three of us writing for a total of 100 hours to complete the task. That effort cost our institution about $3,000 in work time. I do not see how it can be avoided.

The review process has been made fairer by the addition of a fourth reviewer and by recruiting more reviewers so that each person reads fewer applications. To my mind, however, the greatest weakness in the review process is the imprecise and arbitrary values of the grades for each section. Each section of the application is graded by the reviewer on a score of one to seven, with seven being the highest for a score of excellence. The composite scores of all sections and all four reviewers make the total. The top 400 applicants get grants.

The key problem is that there are no real gradations for the middle scores of four through six. The opportunity for wide-ranging interpretation is greatest in these ranges and the ranking is the most arbitrary. From a practical standpoint an award is not made unless one scores nearly all "sixes" and "sevens" in all sections of the application. A score of four or five is fatal. Reviewers justification in these scoring areas are often the weakest. A better system for calibrating the middle scores is needed.
The other principal disappointment in the program is that, while the total dollars for the Institute has increased over the last 13 years, the number of annual awards has gone down. From nearly 550 awards in 1977 and 1978 we are now at a level of just about 400. The size of the awards has increased with a ceiling of $75,000 -- up from $25,000 and $35,000.

Estimates made by Institute staff and analysts from the American Association of Museums a decade ago concluded that the number of awards appropriate to standards of excellence would fall in the range of 560 to 575. We have gotten far afield from that goal and I hope that the direction would be reversed by larger appropriations. Failing that I would like to see the top award reduced so that more grants could be made.

I am absolutely convinced that well qualified institutions have been excluded year after year because the screen set up by the application process was too fine.

The examples of fully accredited institutions being denied grants while marginal ones squeaked through on exaggerated, self-certified, and self-serving claims of excellence are numerous. I offer as an example of too limited an award policy the 1986 and 1987 reports of the Institute. In my particular field of history museums, the state historical museums and state historical societies are the first ranking museums of their type, yet in these two years only seven were awarded grants in 1986 and only four in 1987.
There is one way in which the award process could rely on independent certification rather than self certification of applicant institutions. For nearly 20 years the American Association of Museums has administered an accreditation program which involves not only the filing of an extensive institutional profile, but also involves a site visit, sometimes lasting more than one day. The Institute has recognized the value of this accreditation by making Museum Assessment Program grants to assist museums contemplating accreditation to take stock of themselves and engage professional advice. Why doesn't the Institute take the next logical step and integrate accreditation in its award program. Quality points could be assigned to applications from accredited museums much the same way as job applicants for federal positions have their applications weighted if they are a veteran. Certainly accredited museums who have stood the test of on site scrutiny should not find themselves left out of GOS while unaccredited museums on the strength of their grantsmanship and nerve write a successful ticket.

I believe questions of fairness and accuracy would be best and most satisfactorily addressed by increasing the number of awards by 150 or 175 grants. After all, how much real assistance can it be for an institution to get a grant on an average of one every four or five years? Where is the service in that?
Statement of

Joel N. Bloom
President, American Association of Museums
President and Director, Franklin Institute Science Museum

regarding

Reauthorization of
The Institute of Museum Services

Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate

March 23, 1990
Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Joel N. Bloom, president of the American Association of Museums (AAM) and President and Director of the Franklin Institute Science Museum in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Thank you for the opportunity to testify about the importance of the Institute of Museum Services to America's museums.

Museums should be experienced, not talked about. So I have brought a little piece of the Franklin Institute with me. A science demonstration. What happens when you drop a rubber ball onto a table? It bounces, right? Now scientists always like to repeat an experiment. Appearances can be deceiving. This second ball is made of a new material. This special polymer is useful where bouncing is not desirable -- rubber matting or conveyor belts, for example. This demonstration is the key to the power of the museum experience. Perhaps some of you wonder why these seemingly identical balls behave so differently. This is an example of the kind of curiosity a museum can awaken. The kind of spark a museum can strike. For some very distinguished people, that spark lights a fire that burns for a lifetime. A museum experience can literally shape a life.

The AAM membership consists of more than 8,000 individuals and 2,300 art, history, natural history and science museums, zoos, aquariums, botanical gardens, planetariums, and children's museums. AAM serves the diversity of the museum community by providing ongoing professional and technical assistance through our programs on Accreditation, Technical Information, Meetings and Continuing Education, Publications, International Affairs, Government Affairs and the Museum Assessment Program. In order to improve communications across disciplines and space, AAM maintains strong relationships with local, state and other national museum associations, and
other cultural organizations. These activities enable the AAM to facilitate the exchange of information on collections and resources management, conservation practices, professional development and training, institutional standards, and basic operations. Implementing new and improved policies, procedures and techniques in our museums to care for collections and educate the public, however, takes time and money.

The historic Belmont Report, published in 1969, was a study commissioned by the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities on the conditions and needs of America's museums. This comprehensive report laid the foundation for a federal response to the escalating needs and increased public demands on museums. Seven years later, after many months of congressional hearings and deliberations, and under the guidance of former Representative John Brademas and you, Mr. Chairman, among others, Congress acknowledged the important mission of museums in collecting, preserving, interpreting, and exhibiting our nation's cultural patrimony, and President Gerald Ford signed into law the enabling legislation for the Institute of Museum Services.

With the creation of the IMS, critical federal grant assistance was made available on a competitive basis to:

...encourage and assist museums in their educational role...; to assist museums in modernizing their methods and and facilities so that they may be better able to conserve our cultural, historic, and scientific heritage; and to ease the financial burden borne by museums as a result of their increasing use by the public. (U.S. Code 20, Chapter 26, subchapter II, Sec. 961.)

This language, part of the enabling statute of the IMS, identifies still today the fundamental mission of our museums and the needs they continue to face today. The IMS makes it possible for many museums to fulfill and expand their educational missions, to preserve the artistic, historic and natural
artifacts that demand ever greater care, and to support the most basic operations of our museums, from paying the electric bill for exhibition lighting to support of staff salaries.

As you know Mr. Chairman, museums are unique among cultural institutions in their numbers; their diversity in size and discipline; their appeal to the broadest public; their links, both formal and informal, to this country's education system; their contributions to scholarly and scientific research; and their collections -- millions of unique and irreplaceable objects of natural history, history and art, as well as living collections of plants and animals. Museums are diverse indeed, but they share one important aspect: we all rely on real things. A real Titian. A real Titan Rocket. The fossil of a real Tyrannosaurus Rex. Even in this media-saturated age, there is no substitute for the real thing. Apparently, the American people agree. Every year, five hundred million people visit our country's museums.

Built and funded over the last century and one-half primarily by private philanthropy and the initiative of state and local governments, museums have achieved a standard of excellence equalled only by the affection and interest that Americans have for them. Museums have a long tradition of scholarship, education, access and public service. Their impact on the economic well-being of our communities is amply documented. Their contributions to our intellectual and cultural life, their stimulation of our senses of curiosity and vision are a cornerstone of our open society.

Museums have long held the principle that as custodians of the nation's natural, scientific and artistic heritage, their collections and programs should be accessible to all those who wish to see, study and learn from them. For this reason, museums have traditionally charged as little as possible for
admittance and have maintained hours that make visiting them convenient. In addition, museums have increased physical access to their buildings and adapted public programs to meet the needs of special patrons, such as school children.

Because of this commitment to public access, museum personnel must assure security, building maintenance, adequate storage facilities, climate control and collections care that must be met by their institutions each day. Museum collections must be kept secure, their environments carefully monitored and controlled, and their buildings properly maintained. Although priorities may shift and emphases change, these are ongoing and costly responsibilities, integral to the definition of a museum and part of the public trust placed in each one of them.

The challenges before America's museums today are greater than ever. With the ongoing mission of collecting, exhibiting and preserving artifacts and specimens of our cultural heritage, museums must reach deeper into their communities and be even more responsive to their publics. One area of particular growth in museums is the reflection of our nation's cultural diversity. Through exhibitions and public programming, museums have expanded their attention to different cultures -- Native American, Afro-American, Latino, and Asian American. Many museums with Native American collections, for example, have made Native American participation in collections, exhibitions and other programming central to their operations and approach with sensitivity the establishment of new policies for the treatment of Native American materials in museums.

My own museum, the Franklin Institute Science Museum, recently hosted an exhibit called Black Achievers in Science. It celebrated the often
unappreciated contributions made by African American scientists and
engineers. This exhibit was enormously successful, in part because of the
enthusiastic support of Philadelphia's African American community, and the
help of a community advisory committee chaired by Congressman Bill Gray. This
is just one example of the ways museums can respond to the needs of a
multi-cultural America.

These and other new challenges are able to be addressed in our museums in
part through the help provided by the Institute of Museum Services and its
support for the very foundation of our nation's museums.

The General Operating Support program of the IMS, the centerpiece of the
agency's funding programs, serves museums in assuring that both critical and
routine tasks such as these are accomplished. GOS grants can also help
museums in a variety of other respects, such as conducting research on
collections or exhibitions and sustaining ongoing educational programs. The
enabling statute clearly provides for assistance to museums for exhibition
installation and interpretation; staff development; administrative costs;
educational programs; and other costs associated with museum operations (Sec.
965). My colleague, Donald V. Hague, director of the Utah Museum of Natural
History, will present testimony on the important contribution of GOS grant
awards to the museum he directs.

Probably one of the most extraordinary examples of the value of IMS
general operating and conservation support is that of several San Francisco
Bay area museums that used IMS grant support to protect collections in the
event of an earthquake. When the massive October 1989 San Francisco-Oakland
earthquake struck, the Stanford University Museum of Art suffered extensive
structural damage. However, a $35,000 IMS general operating support grant
received several years earlier, exclusively used for protection of collections in the event of an earthquake, is credited with protecting all but a few of the museum's 30,000 objects from earthquake damage. It is safe to say that, together with the foresight of the museum's staff, the IMS played a significant role in the preservation of the Stanford collection.

In December of 1988, Lois Burke Shepard, former director of the IMS, wrote to many in the museum community requesting input on the reauthorization of the IMS. The AAM took the initiative to solicit comment from the AAM leadership including several AAM committees. Overall, the response from the AAM leadership was quite favorable regarding the enabling statute, but most particularly the value of the GOS program. In AAM correspondence to Mrs. Shepard, Edward H. Able, Jr., director of the AAM, wrote:

If any theme was common in the comments received by the AAM, discussion at the Council meeting, and across the field, it is the critical nature and importance of the current programs of the IMS. We believe that the General Operating Support program, the foundation of the IMS, is unique in its service to the field and should be strengthened, both structurally and financially, to assist museums in their most central and fundamental functions. As no other federal agency provides grants to museums to assist in sustaining their infrastructure and ongoing operations, GOS grants ensure the long-term welfare of the nation's cultural patrimony.

In addition to the praise for GOS, however, many within the museum community have expressed concern about several aspects of the award process utilized by IMS for the GOS program. Specifically, concerns have included the need for additional training of GOS peer reviewers, the high number of applications assigned to each reviewer, the number of available reviewers per museum type, and the scoring of grant applications. In several of these areas, the IMS has initiated new approaches to ameliorate lingering concerns, such as in reviewer training. In all areas, I know personally that the IMS staff and the National Museum Services Board (NMSB), the policy-setting body
of the IMS, are aware of the concerns of the museum community and we are willing to work with them further in the months to come.

A positive step was taken last year when the NMSB and IMS staff undertook a comprehensive review of the General Operating Support program, the first indepth examination of the program in its twelve-year history. This review was initiated in response to the kinds of concerns I have mentioned from the museum community regarding the administration of the program, the peer review process utilized in evaluating grant applications, and the distribution of grant awards.

After eight months of review, a committee of the NMSB issued a report in November 1989 that addresses seven sets of issues. These include: program and administrative funding; distribution of grants by discipline, budget size and state; budget categories; application requirements; reviewer qualifications; reviewer performance; and communications. The AAM commends NMSB chairman, Dr. Willard Boyd, president of the Field Museum of Natural History; James H. Duff, executive director of the Brandywine River Museum, a member of the NMSB and chairman of the committee that undertook the review; all members of the NMSB and the IMS staff.

For eight years, the AAM has played a significant role with the IMS in providing support for museums' general operations through the Museum Assessment Program (MAP). An adjunct to the General Operating Support program, MAP is significant for small and young museums that have few staff, limited resources, and strong ambitions to successfully fulfill their mission. Through this non-competitive grant program, eligible museums meeting a basic set of criteria receive guidance and assistance through self-study and peer review on all functions of museum operations, such as governance,
staffing, preservation and collections management. Currently undergoing research and development is a new component of MAP that will assist museums in their interaction with the public through educational programs, exhibitions, and audience development, research and marketing.

With a modest grant of $1,400, covering expenses incurred by the museum for the evaluative process, approximately 2,300 MAP grants have been made over the past nine years, many to museums that subsequently were successful IMS General Operating Support program grant recipients. The AAM is proud to produce and administer MAP and to work with the IMS and the National Museum Services Board to assure that museums across the country in need of technical assistance have access to this unique program.

Now in its seventh year, the Conservation Project support program continues to play a critical role in assisting museums in the area of conservation. Originally designed to support the treatment of specific objects and specimens, the program was redesigned several years ago to focus on priorities and long-range planning in conservation in order to meet overall conservation needs in museums. The program now supports every facet of collections care: surveys of collections and environmental conditions, planning for proper storage and climate control systems, conservation training and research, and the treatment of objects and living specimens.

In the most recent 1989 grant cycle, many museums received conservation support to undertake surveys of collections and environmental conditions, to hire a conservation consultant to conduct a general survey and to develop long-range conservation planning. The Chicago Historical Society, for example, received a $24,900 conservation grant to hire conservation consultants to conduct general surveys in their library of 70,000 titles,
13,000 linear feet of manuscripts, 300,000 architectural drawings and 1,400,000 photographs. The Museum of Natural History in Lawrence, Kansas received an $11,600 grant to hire a professional conservator to conduct surveys of the herpetology and ichthyology collections and to purchase supplies to improve tank storage of large reptiles. And the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston received a $24,000 conservation grant to conduct a general survey of the storage area and an environmental engineering survey of the 10,376 square foot storage area containing objects from the Department of Egyptian and Ancient Near Eastern Art and the Classical Art Department.

1989 conservation grants will also be used by many museums to treat specific objects and specimens. The Fernbanks Museum and Planetarium in St. Johnsbury, Vermont, will use the $24,300 grant to implement recommendations from a recently completed IMS-funded survey including environmental monitoring of collections, improvement of exhibit and storage facilities, employment of a professional conservator to clean unhoused specimens, and to develop an emergency disaster plan. A $25,000 conservation grant award received by the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore will enable the museum to hire a specialist in Asian scroll conservation to treat and remount seven scrolls and to purchase the supplies and materials needed for the treatments. Yet another example of the benefits of the conservation program is the support received by the Museum of Stony Brook in Stony Brook, New York. Judith O'Sullivan, director of the Museum of Stony Brook, is here to share her museum's successful experience with the Conservation Project support program.

Conservation treatment of objects and long-range conservation planning continue to be of the highest priority for museums. In 1984, the AAM was joined by the National Institute for Conservation and the American Institute
for Conservation to undertake a study, at the request of Congress, on the condition of collections in America's museums and to provide an overview of the resources that are available to museums as they care for their collections. "Collections Management, Maintenance and Conservation," the first major study of the needs of museum collections, was submitted to the Congress several years ago. However, the museum universe is large, diverse and constantly changing, and museum collections continue to grow and demand greater attention. The nearly 40 percent of museum collections deemed to be in serious or routine need of conservation in 1984 is likely to be matched by the number of artworks, artifacts and living specimens that today demand attention. New federal efforts to address certain types of collections -- books and paper, archaeological and ethnological materials -- are helping to address these serious problems.

The support provided for this critical work through the IMS Conservation project support program plays a major role and must be strengthened. The new Conservation Assessment Program, funded by the IMS and administered by the National Institute for Conservation, is modeled after the Museum Assessment Program and will provide additional technical assistance in conservation. The AAM strongly supports this initiative and others that address the preservation of our natural and cultural heritage.

Since the 1985 reauthorization of the IMS, a new IMS program has emerged as a result of a 1987 congressional appropriation to enable the IMS to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with professional museum organizations for programs and projects to educate museum professionals in conservation and museum management issues. Thus, the Professional Services Program was established under Sec. 206(b)(1) of the enabling statute. This
program filled the void created when the National Museum of Act of the Smithsonian Institution, which provided grant support for training opportunities for museum professionals, research on museum-related problems, and museum management, was not reauthorized by Congress in 1984.

The Professional Services Program (PSP) provides support to professional museum organizations for projects designed to strengthen museum services. The AAM has received two grants since the inception of this program, one for MAP III development as discussed earlier, and the other for AAM's Survey of Museums. Because of the critical need for current fieldwide information about museum operations and programs, the AAM has undertaken a national data collection project involving a comprehensive survey of information of museums in the United States. A PSP grant of $50,000 was received by the AAM for this project. In an unique multi-agency effort, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Science Foundation have joined with the IMS and also supported this project. The project plan calls for the information to be maintained in standardized categories in a permanent database. By mid-1990, the AAM will publish the "1989 Report of Museums," an important extension of the 1979 "Museum Program Survey," the last comprehensive survey of the field. Subsequently, information will be updated, analyzed, and distributed on a regular basis to museum professionals who may use the material to initiate programs of long-range planning and address current needs and future opportunities. This documentation of museum diversity also will help those in the field describe the museum community to the public, monitor changes in the field, and make comparisons among museum operations.

Other PSP grants have been awarded to organizations such as the
Association of Science-Technology Centers to produce a reference manual that will help museum exhibit designers apply the findings of ergonomic research to the development of interactive exhibits that are safer, easier to understand, and accessible to a wider range of visitors. The American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums also received a 1989 PSP grant to organize a workshop where leading conservation biologists will assemble to review current scientific techniques for genetic and demographic management of species in captivity and to formulate new methodology.

The AAM and its members believe the PSP program to be a significant addition to the IMS and urge its continued support and funding.

The membership of the AAM, and indeed all museums and museum professionals across the country, view the 1990 reauthorization of the IMS as an important and historic opportunity. In previous reauthorization rounds, the question surrounding IMS was simply whether the agency should or should not exist. Through your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and members of this subcommittee, we have come to a point today where the existence of the Institute of Museum Services is not in doubt. Your steadfast commitment to this small but important federal agency helped to turn around an administration that repeatedly sought the demise of the IMS and to bring us to this new era in which the administration acknowledges its significance to the museum community.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not also mention the important contribution of the new director of the IMS, Mrs. Daphne Wood Murray. Mrs. Murray's direct experience of twenty-three years working in museums makes her uniquely qualified to head the IMS. Her commitment to advancing the goals of the agency and to serving the museum community will be critical to the future
of the agency. Her predecessor, Lois Burke Shepard, should also be mentioned as her leadership helped stabilize the agency during difficult times.

Once again, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I thank you for the opportunity to present this statement. I speak on behalf of the AAM, its thousands of members, and for every person in this country who loves museums.
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Chairman Pell and members of the subcommittee:

My name is Donald Hague and I am Director of the Utah Museum of Natural History (UMNH) located at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City. I am the founding president of the Utah Museums Association (1972), a former member of the Accreditation Commission of the American Association of Museums (1974-80) and a former member of the Advisory Council of the National Museum Act administered by the Smithsonian Institution (1981-84). I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today in support of the reauthorization of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act specifically that dealing with the Institute of Museum Services.

The Museum which I direct is the State Museum of Natural History. It is located at the University of Utah through a 1963 act of the legislature. UMNH serves as the repository for all archaeological/paleontological resources recovered from state lands as well as for large federal collections. With its outstanding collections and exceptionally well-qualified staff, UMNH fosters the development and growth of other museums statewide through the loan of materials and the sharing of expertise in the natural sciences. It also serves as the curation facility for the University of Utah's collections in anthropology, biology and geology/geophysics and has direct involvement in the teaching and research of those departments. The Museum opened in 1969 with public exhibition and educational programs which in 1988 recorded over 300,000 visitors.

The Museum's audience is made up of all residents of the state, its visitors and the University community. This includes preschool, elementary and secondary students and teachers, the academic community from college
students and faculty, to scientists and researchers worldwide, and residents and visitors with an interest in and appreciation of the natural heritage of the state. The Museum offers credit and non-credit programs which reach into all parts of the state but is particularly recognized for its teacher recertification workshops. It also has placed teaching kits in regional distribution centers throughout the state for use by educators.

The Museum holds major systematic collections in the fields of anthropology (½ million specimens), biology (248,000 specimens) and geology (21,000 specimens) most of which are from the Great Basin, Great Plains and northern Colorado Plateau. The Cleveland-Lloyd dinosaur collection is considered one of the most important Jurassic dinosaur collections in the world from which some 43 museums, both national and international have received exhibitable specimens since 1965. Specimen loans of all types are made to institutions both in and out-of-state.

The Utah Museum of Fine Arts and the Red Butte Gardens & State Arboretum are also located on the campus, maintain valuable collections in their respective fields and serve much of this same audience through their programs. All three organizations have received and benefitted from IMS grants in the past collectively totalling $525,000. Other IMS recipients in the state have received funding in the amount of another $250,000.

The Utah Museum of Natural History first applied for IMS monies in 1978. An initial grant for $15,000 was awarded which was matched by a donor and was used to develop a master plan for the Museum focused on the architectural needs for the decade of the '80's. That document provided a roadmap for phased development beginning in 1982 and attracted additional
donor support for the orderly remodeling of Museum collection areas, offices, laboratories and exhibit shops culminating in the final phase, a major new exhibition gallery, which opened in 1989. I estimate that our first IMS grant/match created a fifteen-fold return.

The Museum subsequently received four General Operating Support (GOS) grants in 1979-80 ($50,000), 1984-85 ($50,000), 1985-86 ($1,037) and 1986-87 ($66,468). In addition to the master plan efforts these IMS grants enabled us to significantly improve care and access to collections, obtain equipment, duplicate valuable records, develop school outreach programs, give technical assistance to other Utah museums and provide staff development and travel.

One of the most important uses of the IMS funds was in establishing the Museum's development program with the appointment of a salaried person in 1985 with additional grants helping to sustain and expand the program since then. Through this program our base of corporate support has more than doubled while 90% of all Utah-based private foundations are now consistent Museum supporters because of our development solicitations. For Fiscal Year 1985, operating income was $405,000, with in-kind (non-cash) support of goods and services totalling less than $100,000. By comparison, Fiscal Year 1988 operating income was $1,533,000 with non-cash support of $501,000. This development effort demonstrates, I believe, that IMS's investment in the Utah Museum of Natural History has been well-leveraged with over a three-fold increase in non-governmental operating funds and a five-fold non-cash increase in four years. This has been true in the membership program as well where IMS funds have helped the Museum to double its membership numbers in the same period.
The Museum has been one hundred percent successful in applying for Conservation Project Support grants through IMS receiving a 1984 grant ($1,817) for the purchase of environmental monitoring equipment, and a 1985 grant ($16,592) for the purchase of Museum collection storage cabinets. The Museum submitted a successful joint application ($6,528) with the Utah Museum of Fine Arts on campus in 1989 for a Conservation Survey of the respective museums aimed at developing plans for the long-term preservation of their collections. The Utah Museum of Natural History currently has both GOS and CPS grants pending with the Institute of Museum Services.

I have served IMS as a Museum Assessment Program (MAP) reviewer although the Museum, itself, has not undergone a MAP survey inasmuch as the program was not in place when the Museum received its initial AAM Accreditation in 1972. I have, however, been a strong advocate of the MAP phase of the IMS program for two reasons. First, in service to the American Association of Museums (AAM) Accreditation program as a chairman of numerous accreditation committees and later as a member of the Commission I observed the need for a program to assist small museums raise their standards to qualify them for accreditation. Secondly, I noted in my own state that many small museums would likely never qualify for accreditation but were nonetheless caring for valuable collections, particularly historical, and needed outside assistance and recommendations toward making them more professional. The MAP program was designed to do this and I have seen it work for many museums throughout the country. One MAP program I carried out at an unnamed western museum provided the needed reassurance to the staff that their museum was not about to fall apart in spite of a
chaotic and unknowing administration which had allowed aimless wandering and ethical problems to disrupt operations over an 18-month period. That museum operates in a professional manner today because of MAP.

The Museum Assessment Program is an IMS-funded consulting service which provides practical assistance to museums--at no cost. Through an application process individual museums can receive $1400 toward the registration fee, consultant's costs and funds to acquire technical assistance material. The initial MAP survey is directed at operations and programs; MAP II, typically conducted after the first MAP, is a detailed study by a consultant aimed at meeting the challenge of basic long-term care and management of the collections entrusted to an institution. Each is a separate grant and a museum may apply for both.

The Institute of Museum Services currently supports this extremely valuable service whose administration it has wisely delegated to AAM. A museum need not be accredited to apply for MAP nor does being accredited preclude a museum from applying. To meet eligibility a museum must be not-for-profit, open at least 120 or more days per year and have a full-time paid or volunteer staff person. Budget size is not a criterion for funding which, incidentally, is given on a first-come, first-served basis. Since 1986, nine organizations from my state of Utah have received MAP grants and have seen substantial improvements in their operations as a result.
Two major cultural organizations receiving major GOS and Special Project grants in Utah with whom I'm familiar include the Utah Historical Society (Division of State History) and the Hansen Planetarium. The Historical Society used its awards primarily to provide technical assistance to Utah's many small historical museums and to conduct workshops on collections care, security, education and fundraising. The Hansen Planetarium has established a Development Office through which it has found the support to initiate planning for a Science Center for Utah and has been able to provide outreach science education programs to all school districts in the state.

IMS funding for museums and other qualifying institutions represent an important source of support which can be applied directly to operations. Unlike the important but specific project support which NEA and NEH are able to provide, a General Operating Support grant from IMS can be spread across a variety of needs in a museum. For a small museum a one-time federal grant can be the difference between attaining a measure of credibility or going out of business. GOS grants are the foundation of the IMS and serve to assist museums in their most central and fundamental functions. The level of IMS funding available to museums, however, falls short of the real need which argues strongly for the reauthorization of the Arts and Humanities Act now being considered and, at the least, for funding in the recommended amounts. For Fiscal Year 1990 IMS received and is reviewing 1,370 applicants, but approximately 28% will receive actual funding even though most are deserving.

The application process has been criticized for being too complex. IMS has responded to this in the past with simplification of its forms and instructions. In November 1989, after an eight-month study, IMS published a Review of the General Operating Support Program in which the Board and staff addressed this particular issue along with all other aspects of the program. After reading
this review, which was widely circulated to the museum community, I feel confident that improvements will have been made for the next cycle of grants. Their willingness to solicit criticism and to pursue a constructive self-study reassures those of us who are beneficiaries of IMS monies that the program administrators are indeed anxious to serve museums in the best possible way. If anything, the program could use more help to effectively carry out the IMS mandate. My colleagues report that the Washington staff are always accessible and helpful in dealing with inquiries from applicants.

The GOS review process has suffered in the past from inconsistent grading of applications by reviewers. In 1989, IMS initiated reviewer training programs at five national association meetings and plans to repeat the same at six regional meetings in 1990. Reviewers are currently drawn from a pool of 1,200 museum professionals. Those with whom I have talked feel that increasing the pool of reviewers would reduce the number of applications (9 to 16) that each must handle... most are reviewing 12 to 13. It is important that the quality of the reviewers, however, not be compromised. In fact, efforts have been made by the staff to substantially upgrade reviewer quality and reviewers are removed from the pool if they perform poorly. The Hansen Planetarium feels that because so few planetariums apply for IMS funds that the pool of reviewers is probably inadequate with the result being that reviews are done by people lacking an appropriate understanding of planetariums. These concerns have been presented to an IMS staff who were courteous and welcomed the comments. The individual reviewer method, nonetheless, because of the large number of essentially voluntary professionals is one of the most cost-effective, with the IMS program having one of the lowest federal overhead ratios for service rendered.
The distribution of successful grants by numbers appears to favor the urban museums in states with large populations; i.e., eastern and midwest. IMS says there is no bias in its 1989 Review Document, but the 1988 figures I reviewed suggest otherwise. Similarly, the largest number of reviewers come from the eastern/midwestern states, although there are exceptions to both of the above patterns. This tends to work against the western/rural/small population states in my judgement. It may also be noted that among the types of museums (13) that Natural History/Anthropology Museums and Planetariums are the least funded, (20.6% and 16.7% respectively) while Children's/Junior Museums enjoyed a 40.4% success rate with the average for all categories being 29 percent. The nationally recognized Hogle Zoo in my own state of Utah has never been successful in obtaining an IMS grant and feels that those zoos receiving awards are the same ones who were initially successful and now repeat year after year. Discouraged, they have not applied in the last two years.

In an era of budget constraints and deficits, it is not easy or popular to argue for more funding for museums. Nonetheless, these unique institutions, curators of the nation's history, art and science, should be supported by citizens and governments alike for the role they have played in preserving this heritage. Further, their potential to increase understanding between all nations and to provide rich leisure/educational opportunities for our own populace will be needed more than ever in the next decade and the 21st Century.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the reauthorization of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act. All of us in the museum profession commend you and others of the Congress who have consistently supported this legislation and I urge that it be funded at no less than the recommended levels.
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Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Judith O'Sullivan. I am the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Museums at Stony Brook, New York, Long Island's largest privately supported museum complex. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the American Association of Museums regarding the reauthorization of the Institute of Museum Services, a matter of vital importance to the future of those institutions that preserve and interpret our national heritage.

The Museums at Stony Brook house incomparable collections of American art, costume, and material culture. Among our many treasures are the best documented extant examples of American vernacular architecture, the homestead of the noted artist William Sidney Mount, who often depicted it in such seminal studies as Dance of the Harpmakers (also in the collection of the Museums at Stony Brook); a 19th-century one-room school house, in which we conduct classes for today's school children; an encyclopedic archive of American clothing and carriages, including the spectacular riding habits and accoutrements featured in the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Man and the Horse exhibition; and wildfowl decoys, miniature rooms, toys, and furniture to suit every age and taste.

1989 and 1990 witnessed extraordinary world events, all inspired by the American democratic experience. The year in which the bicentennial of the French revolution was celebrated the world saw the renaissance of democracy in Eastern Europe. And this year, the democratic movement has triumphed in Nicaragua.

The power of American symbols to inspire the citizens of the world was demonstrated by the sights and sounds of the international democratic movement. In Tiananmen Square, for example, Chinese students erected a
"goddess of democracy" inspired by our Statue of Liberty, whose proud centennial we celebrated in 1986. And on the crumbling Berlin Wall, and throughout Eastern Europe, students sang the songs of our Civil Rights movement.

But while our ideals are celebrated abroad in statue and in song, the American institutions that preserve their visible manifestations are at grave risk. Provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 have had a documented disastrous effect on donations of both objects and dollars by individuals to American museums. Continued federal support of the preservation and interpretation of our national culture has become even more critical.

It is propitious that the international movement for democracy has triumphed at the same time that we are considering reauthorization of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act. As the world analyzes and interprets the American experience, it is vital to preserve our past and to document our present.

Among those institutions committed to the preservation of our cultural patrimony is the Institute of Museum Services. Each year, the IMS provides, through a nationwide competition, small amounts of "leveraging" money for general operating support and for conservation. At the Museums at Stony Brook, such awards have made possible accelerated programming for Long Island's richly diverse ethnic audiences through General Operating Support, as well as long-range plans for collections care and management and the immediate treatment for endangered items in our large and varied collections of Americana through Conservation Project support. Among the many items in our collections are clothing and ritual objects used to mark major milestones in American family history. I have with me today, for example, a late
19th-century christening gown, and an early twentieth-century Hanukkah goblet, the base of which contains a candleholder and oil wicks for holiday observances. Also in our collections are wedding gowns of every description, as well as children's clothing, costumes of sport, fine fashions, and everyday apparel through which can be traced the history of the family in America. Such history is, at the Museums at Stony Brook, accessible to the community by means of exhibitions, including our forthcoming shows, To Love and To Cherish: Rituals of American Courtship and Marriage, A Long Island Childhood, Traditions!: A Jewish Life in New York and Long Island, and American Beauty: The Feminine Ideal.

While popular exhibitions are often of interest to corporate and foundation funders, however, conservation of the treasures to be presented in such shows is seldom appealing to underwriters. The reason for this is simple. Conservation, if properly performed, is a largely invisible activity which restores an artifact, as closely as possible, to its original condition, providing an historically accurate window on the past. Invisibility is seldom the goal of the underwriter, which is often the public relations office of a major corporation.

While conservation is not consonant with private sector public relations priorities, it is of paramount importance to understanding our country's past, and, therefore, of special importance to those federal agencies whose missions include the preservation of our cultural patrimony. Primary among these agencies is the Institute of Museum Services, which provides conservation assessment, survey, and implementation funding unavailable elsewhere.

At the Museums at Stony Brook, the Institute of Museum Services in 1989 made possible emergency conservation treatment of three vehicles in our
carriage collection: a unique 18th-century phaeton, an 18th-century Berlin coach, and a 19th-century Bavarian coach. The phaeton (ca. 1780), was imported from France and used by American Revolutionary War hero General Peter Gansevoort. The Berlin coach is one of the few examples of an 18th-century aristocratic coach on public exhibition in an American museum. And the Bavarian State coach, which once belonged to Prince Adebert of Bavaria (1818-1878), the youngest son of King Ludwig, provides an instructive contrast to American carriage-making techniques.

The Institute of Museum Services also awarded in 1989 a conservation grant to the Museums for a two-part conservation survey of exhibition and storage facilities, as well as a study of the Museums' archives and library. These surveys will serve as the basis for a long-range conservation plan for the Museums.

Through the Museum Assessment Program (MAP), a unique program funded by the IMS and administered by the American Association of Museums, the Museums at Stony Brook received a MAP II grant enabling us to bring to the Museums outside evaluators to counsel our staff on collections management issues.

I urge the members of this subcommittee not only to reauthorize this pivotal agency, but to augment substantially its modest budget, so that museums from coast to coast, small and large, rural and urban, might preserve for our children and their children such artifacts as the Conestoga wagons in which our pioneer forefathers transversed America, the paddle boats which navigated our virgin waterways, and the first fragile aeroplanes in which our ancestors soared heavenward.