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A Project of the National Art Education Association
In this chapter, existing art education data and related literature are examined in order to provide a demographic portrait of art teacher education today. Our goal is directed toward contributing to the knowledge and understanding of art teacher education in the broader community of art education scholars and educators.

We first describe research methods and databases employed in this chapter and provide an overview of how demographic research is defined in relation to art teacher education. Second, we look at issues that surround development of a demographic picture within art teacher education. Third, our inquiry focuses on questions related to three major themes: teacher education programs, preservice and practicing teachers, and teacher educators. We then follow with a discussion about other demographic issues that affect how art teachers are prepared today. We conclude with a few reflective comments about the future of demographic research within art teacher education.

DEMOGRAPHICS: RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

In this section of the chapter, our purpose is to outline what it means to conduct demographic research within art education and explore the relationship of this research to art teacher education. We also provide a rationale for the issues, themes, and questions that have shaped this inquiry.

Demographic Research: Methods and Sources

Zimmerman (1997a), citing Burton (1996), identified demographic research as the identification of specific populations using “geographic, economic, social, educational, and other parameters” (p. 29). In this chapter we pay particular attention to identifying and asking questions about teacher education programs (e.g., program size, location, and context) and specific populations (e.g., preservice teachers, practicing teachers, postsecondary art education faculty) that encompass art teacher education today.
Zimmerman (1994a) outlined certain types of research that can be employed in collecting demographic data. These methods include basic research, previous demographic research, foundational research, rationales, broad-based research, comparative research, single-group research, and trend analysis. Zimmerman (1997b) elaborated further by stating that demographic researchers often collect data through the use of surveys and by regrouping and analyzing data that have been previously collected in data banks. Richardson (1996) noted that descriptive studies of teacher education programs and systems often comprise large- or small-scale surveys or multiple case studies. These studies are designed to provide “verbal pictures of systems” (Richardson, 1996, p. 716) as they describe the characteristics of populations, programs, and the contexts of these programs. Additionally, as Sevigny (1987) noted, determining changing demographic patterns and trends within teacher education requires some understanding of traditions prior to such changes.

We began our inquiry with an extensive literature review of demographic research within art education and specifically targeted research that related specifically to art teacher education. We identified relevant sources and studies by conducting database searches such as ERIC, FirstSearch, Dissertation Abstracts, and Arts & Humanities Citation Index. We also examined existing syntheses of art education research (see, for example, Colbert & Taunton, 2001; Galbraith, 2002; Jones & McPhee, 1986), as well as key writings on art teacher education (see, for example, Davis, 1990; Day, 1997; Zimmerman, 1994b) and selected National Art Education Association (NAEA) publications on teaching and learning and on teacher education quality (see, for example, the Standards for Art Teacher Preparation, NAEA, 1979, 1999). We also consulted publications of the NAEA Research Commission (see, for example, NAEA, 1994a, 1998; Zimmerman, 1994a), along with reports and documentation from the various NAEA Research Task Forces (specifically the task forces on Demographics and Teacher Education). The NAEA executive director, Dr. Thomas Hatfield, forwarded a number of teacher-education-based reports to the authors. An examination of recent annual NAEA Convention catalogs also was conducted in a search for relevant information.

This search was extended to include applicable research located in handbooks on general education research and teacher education (see, for example, Murray, 1996; Wittrock, 1986) and other arts disciplines (see, for example, Colwell & Richardson, 2002). We also examined standards for teacher education programs outlined by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994), by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2001), and by recent reports written by proponents of educational reform for teacher preparation within the United States (see, for example, National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

In addition, the National Center for Educational Statistics (www.nces.org) and the Educational Testing Service (www.ets.org) served as useful Web site databases. Other helpful electronic databases were the report on the quality of teacher preparation issued by the U.S. Department of Education (www.title2.org/statereports/index.html) and Web sites from the departments of education within various U.S. states. These sources provided information on various licensure and certification procedures and standards.

DEMOGRAPHICS: DEVELOPING A PICTURE

Developing a Picture: Issues and Considerations

Wilson, Floden, and Fernini-Mundy (2001) argued not only that development of a research base that closely examines teacher education programs only began in the 1960s and gained momentum in the 1980s but also that research in this area is lacking. Clark (2001) maintained...
that the chronic discrepancy between institutional regard for the role of educator and institutional regard for the role of scholar was a constant impediment to development of teacher education as a field of study. Ducharme (1993) has posited that those faculty members who work closely with K-12 schools are regarded less highly on college and university campuses than faculty who are viewed as working in more theoretical and less practical subject disciplines. The past decade, however, has seen the rise of unprecedented new scholarship in the area of teacher education. As yet, this focus in teacher education does not appear to have the same impact on art education as it does on other fields of education.

Galbraith (1990, 1995) and Zimmerman (1994b) also noted that there is a body of research on general preservice teacher education and that research that is specifically linked to art teacher education practices is sorely lacking. Zimmerman (1997b) reaffirmed the paucity of art teacher education research and data in her demographic analysis of art teacher preparation programs in the United States. For example, after extensive research, Zimmerman found few studies related to art teacher education demographic research, and very little evidence related specifically to art teacher education practices nationwide. Burton (1998) concurred that few articles on demographic research have appeared in the published literature over the years. In his synthesis of art teacher education practices and development of discipline-based art education, Sevigny (1987) concluded that there is minimal historical documentation on teacher preparation in the visual arts. These concerns are echoed in Davis’s (1990) important and historical analysis of teacher education in the visual arts: Little is known about the practice of teaching art at the various levels of schooling.

A number of reasons are possible for why the art teacher education research base is still limited in the early 21st century, specifically in terms of demographic research. Moreover, it is important to lay out these reasons in order to provide an accurate assessment of demographic research within art teacher education, for in many respects, such a discussion is central to both understanding the state of the field today and examining the possibilities for the future. First, since the early 1970s, a decrease in federal or state sources for large-scale research projects in art education sharply curbed possibilities for conducting large-scale studies or replicating previous inquiries within the United States (Chapman, 1982; MacGregor, 1998). Some researchers have sought funding from philanthropic and private organizations, such as the Spencer Foundation and the Jacob Javits Gifted and Talented Discretionary Grant Program (see, for example, Clark & Zimmerman, 1997). The former Getty Institute for Education in the Arts (previously known as the Getty Center for Education in the Arts) also sponsored research projects related to discipline-based art teacher education. This sponsorship was primarily aimed at inservice teacher education (see, for example, Wilson, 1998), although some initiatives were directed at examining preservice teacher education (see, for example, Day, 1997; Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988). Some of the Getty Institute’s funding was supplemented by funds from the U.S. Department of Education, the National Education Association, and national foundations such as the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Researchers have also relied on funds from higher education institutions, state organizations, or on the grants programs sponsored by the NAEA Research Commission and the National Art Education Foundation. Nonetheless, it is fair to say that research funding is generally limited and that large-scale demographic research requires some form of financial support.

Second, many researchers have embraced theoretical or qualitative methodologies (Hamblen, 1989; MacGregor, 1998) as alternatives to empirical and descriptive studies; the latter of which are often more suitable for conducting demographic research. There have been a large number of descriptive and quantitative studies over the years within art education as a whole (see, for example, Brewer, 1999a; Chalmers, 1999; Jones & McPhee, 1986), yet as Wilson (1994) reflected, experimental research has fallen into disfavor recently. Many doctoral-granting programs and students in the United States and Canada favor more humanistic
arts-based research methods (Anderson, Eisner, & McRorie, 1998; Hutchens, 2001). Given this assessment, the future of art teacher education research may reveal an increasing commitment to qualitative concerns and methodologies.

Our literature review established that research on art teacher education problems can be categorized as either singular case studies or small-scale research projects reliant on observational, survey, and interview data or on summaries and interpretations of existing data. As we sorted through and read these studies, we found that some share certain demographic characteristics. For instance, as disclosed in this chapter, a few research studies focus on the beliefs and concerns of preservice teachers (see, for example, Ellingson, 1991; Grauer, 1998; Kowalchuk, 1999; Short, 1995; Thurber, 1989), and so when reexamined and analyzed together, this cluster of studies provides the beginnings of a verbal picture (Richardson, 1996) of this population. Obviously, we are unable to generalize from these groups of studies, yet they may serve as a springboard for further large-scale research or for the eventual development of a body of case study knowledge. Howey and Zimpher (1989), for example, developed a series of in-depth case studies of six teacher education programs within the United States. This work serves as a model for further data collection on teacher education programs and faculty (see, for example, Ducharme, 1993). Furthermore, the shift toward qualitative research provides researchers with opportunities for exploring the demographics of preservice and practicing teachers in terms of examining the contexts in which they learn and teach. As other chapters in this handbook section on teacher education show, researchers are conducting case study research in a variety of K-12 classroom contexts (see, for example, Anderson, 2000; Bresler, 1994; Degge, 1987; Wolfe, 1997; Zimmerman, 1991, 1992).

Third, teacher education topics are not central to research within the field. Research is usually conducted by higher education faculty members, graduate students, and independent scholars (Zimmerman, 1997b); although, practitioners in schools have been encouraged to participate in research studies (Galbraith, 1988; NAEA, 1996; Zimmerman, 1996). Yet many faculty members who work in research institutions show little interest in teacher education issues (Hutchens, 1997). Pankratz (1989) made the case that research topics are usually chosen by individual scholars and are based on their own interests and concerns, as well as on their own beliefs about art and art education. As Wilson (1994) remarked, researchers ideally relate their interests, values, and assumptions about life and human purpose to their research activities.

In a demographic survey of 332 art education educators in higher education institutions, Burton (1998) found that faculty and doctoral students principally pursue research in theoretical and conceptual areas, whereas master’s-level graduate students most often focus on curricular and instructional topics related to the practicalities of teaching and teacher education. Anderson et al. (1998) surveyed 124 visual art education graduate programs in the United States and Canada to ascertain their location, scope, and nature. Their findings show that teacher education is also central to graduate study at the master’s level, whereas in the leading doctoral programs, research is conducted on a variety of art education issues and concerns. Unfortunately, research at the master’s level is rarely published in journals (Carroll & Kay, 1998); thus, much of this academic work remains unknown unless it is submitted to the DissertationAbstracts database.

Galbraith (2001) found that many faculty members and other instructors responsible for preparing teachers, especially those in the smaller, more teaching-oriented institutions, tend not to conduct research or publish their work in established journals or texts. The form of “scholarship” and/or creative work that they pursue usually centers on teacher preparation, course design, and giving presentations and workshops.

A review of NAEA Annual Convention programs over the last 6 years found that a large number of presentations focus on teacher education issues (a few of which reflect demographic reports). However, a literature review could not ascertain how many of these presentations have been subsequently published. Burton and Boyer’s (1998) listing of demographic studies in the
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The status report of the NAEA Research Task Force on Demographics is extremely helpful as an indication of the types of demographic research conducted recently in art education. However, only three of the studies listed reflect demographic teacher education data (see Jeffers, 1994; Kautz, 1996; Spradling, 1995), and all of the studies are reported as presentations at NAEA annual conventions. Unfortunately, a search of the literature could not ascertain that these studies were subsequently published in refereed journals. As we suggest later, examining the types of scholarship and academic work undertaken by graduate students (especially at the master’s level) and by faculty whose primary responsibilities involve the preparation of teachers may be helpful in providing a more succinct demographic profile of art teacher education (Galbraith, 2001).

Finally, the various national educational demographic databases, such as those developed by the Educational Testing Service and the National Center for Educational Statistics, rarely include data about teaching preparation in the arts in their research and reports (Hatfield, 2000, personal communication; Zimmerman, 1997b). They most often focus on the teaching areas of math, science, social studies, and language arts. Thus, if the arts are included, they are under the umbrella of other subject areas, or have been related to how students fare in the arts within schools (Eisner, 1999; Perskey, Sandene, & Askew, 1998), rather than on teacher education trends and practices. Nonetheless, these national reports provide essential demographic information that is helpful and should not be dismissed out of hand. National trends and statistics have great relevance to our field and to the future of teaching art (Day, 1997).

Developing a Positive Demographic Picture: Themes and Questions

Despite the lack of baseline data, developing a demographic picture (albeit broad) is a positive endeavor for art education. There is much to learn from examining existing demographic studies as well as from combing through other art education data looking for demographic insights, clues, and patterns (Zimmerman, 1997a). Arguably, there is also much to be learned from describing where “demographic gaps” exist and suggesting possibilities for future study. It should be noted that demographic research is a part of the larger research commitment made by the NAEA Research Commission. Also a recent survey of secondary art teachers (NAEA, 2001) spearheaded by Michael Day demonstrates the potential for further demographic research within the field.

As suggested earlier, this demographic inquiry focuses on three major themes: teacher education programs, preservice and inservice teachers, and teacher educators. Under the three thematic headings, we developed a series of questions that underscore our study. Some of the questions are as follows:

- **Teacher Education Programs:** In what kinds of institutions are these programs located and what are they like in terms of size and demographics? How many art teachers do these programs prepare on an annual basis? What are art teachers taught within these programs? What kinds of degrees and certification coursework do they offer? What do these degrees and options look like in terms of curricula, pedagogy, state and national standards, and graduation requirements? What types of student teaching and field placements exist in these programs? How do teacher education programs articulate within and across institutions, states, and nationwide?

- **Preservice and Practicing Teachers:** Who are these teachers? What demographic information about them is available? What is the role of art teacher education for preservice art teachers? What demographic information is available on elementary majors who take art education courses? What roles do school practitioners undertake in preservice art
What opportunities are there for inservice teacher education and professional development?

- Teacher Educators: Who prepares art teachers? Where do they teach? What are their backgrounds and qualifications? What and how do they teach? What are their responsibilities in terms of teaching, research and/or creative work, and professional service?

The questions listed here are not inclusive, and due to the complexity and interrelationship of art teacher education characteristics, natural overlaps and similarities of concepts are threaded throughout the themes. In the next part of this paper, we explore the three themes listed previously and address questions posed within them. We then examine other demographic issues and trends that serve to broaden our picture more extensively. Michael Parsons (2001) succinctly wrote the following about art education at the beginning of the 21st century:

> Along with the rest of schooling in the United States, it [art education] is about to undergo important and perhaps unprecedented demographic shifts. Large numbers of older teachers are ready to retire. New patterns of hiring and of teacher preparation are appearing. Student numbers are due to swell. Yet it remains that we do not know much about ourselves as art educators. Who are we? What are our goals? What do we believe about art, our students, our society? Are we happy in our institutional life? (p. 99)

Therefore, we examine art education data alongside and within the context of today’s changing times and recent national reports that advocate change in the preparation and continuing education of teachers. Hopefully, we will learn more about ourselves as art teacher educators from the portraits painted of teacher education programs, preservice and practicing teachers, and teacher educators.

**TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

There are an estimated 1,200 programs across the United States, which are responsible for preparing teachers of all subjects, each with their own individual approaches and traditions (Doyle, 1990). One quarter of these institutions are private institutions (Wenglinsky, 2000). Murray (1996) argued that there has been little change in the actual structure or content of teacher education programs during the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, in many states, schools or departments of education do not need to be accredited; therefore, as Darling-Hammond (2000) cautioned, only about 500 of all of the teacher education programs in the United States meet common professional standards such as those advocated by NCATE.

An early descriptive study of teacher education programs within the United States was developed for the U.S. Office of Education (Howey et al., 1977). Since 1987 and each subsequent year, the Research About Teacher Education (RATE) project, supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, has provided yearly detailed information on various aspects of teacher education (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996). This project, for example, supplies data on student and faculty demographics, teacher salaries, and the nature of secondary methods courses (Richardson, 1996).

It is difficult determine the exact number of programs that prepare art teachers (Zimmerman, 1997b). There is a broad spectrum of degree and certification options available at the undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, and graduate levels for art specialists, and some programs only offer art education methods courses for elementary classroom majors. Hutchens (1997) has estimated that there are over 500 programs that prepare art teachers. Galbraith (1997) found that over 600 postsecondary institutions offer some form of art teacher preparation.
coursework for art specialists and elementary classroom generalists. Of these, 150 institutions offer certification coursework at the postbaccalaureate and graduate levels (Galbraith, 1997).

The institutions and their respective art teacher education programs vary considerably according to size, economics (private or state supported), orientations to research and teaching (Research I, land-grant, doctoral granting, undergraduate, etc.), and affiliation (professional art school, liberal arts, religious) (see, for example, Galbraith, 1997; Thompson & Hardiman, 1991; Zimmerman, 1997b). Some institutions, regardless of size and student enrollments, are described as universities, and others are known as colleges. These institutions are located within a diversity of settings, ranging from large metropolitan centers to more sparsely populated and rural areas across the United States. They also vary in terms of the undergraduate degrees and postbaccalaureate certification options offered, as well as in terms of opportunities for teacher education course work at master’s and doctoral levels.

Institutional Demographics: Size, Location, and Enrollments

Acquiring knowledge about the institutions in which art education programs reside is vital if a demographic profile of art teacher education is to develop. Institutional size, location, enrollments, resources, commitment to art education, as well as their general characteristics (e.g., university, college, research, land-grant, church affiliation, liberal arts, 4-year school, doctoral granting, professional art school, etc.), are necessary data to collect. Moreover, the number of teachers who are actually prepared and the number of art education faculty are also key demographic indicators of program size.

Zimmerman (1997b), in her survey of teacher education programs in Indiana, identifies 18 institutions that offer art education coursework. She established that nine (50%) institutions had total student enrollments ranging from 900 to 3,000, five (28%) with 3,000 to 13,000, and four (22%) with 20,000 to 36,000. Galbraith (2001) in a study of 128 institutions (representing 43 states) uses slightly different criteria to classify institutional size and status. She found that art education coursework is offered in colleges and universities that run the gamut from small private liberal arts colleges with 600 to 1,500 students (e.g., Coker College, South Carolina; Dana College, Nebraska; Viterbo College, Wisconsin) to small state institutions with 1,500 to 3,500 students (e.g., Adams State College, Colorado; Black Hills State University, South Dakota; Castleton State College, Vermont; New Mexico Highlands University) to slightly larger institutions with 4,000 to 6,000 students (e.g., Alabama A & M University; Emporia State University, Kansas; University of the Pacific, California); midsize state and private institutions with 8,000 to 16,000 students (e.g., Louisiana Tech University; Youngstown State University, Ohio; University of Minnesota-Duluth); larger universities with 18,000 to 26,000 students (e.g., Boise State University, Idaho; Ohio University; Southwest Texas State University; University of Kansas); and large research institutions with 35,000 to 52,000 students (e.g., The Ohio State University; Pennsylvania State University; University of Wisconsin). Whatever criteria were used to determine institutional size as well as geographical locations, these aforementioned data already suggest that programmatic differences will exist.

Art education programs can be found in every state within the United States, although many are concentrated in the Midwest, upper Midwest, East, and Southeast. For example, the state department of Ohio lists 36 institutions that offer teacher education programs (out of 56 teacher education programs statewide) for art teachers. Indiana, often known as “The Crossroads of America” (Zimmerman, 1997b, p. 38), has 18 art preparation programs. However, in Wyoming, there is only 1 higher education institution responsible for preparing art teachers (University of Wyoming in Laramie) (Galbraith, 2001). Programs can also be found in urban, suburban, and rural areas. To return to Zimmerman’s (1997b) survey of Indiana institutions, eight institutions (18%) are located in urban areas (with populations over 500,000); six (33%), in suburban areas
(with populations from 50,000 to 500,000); and eight (44%), in small towns (with populations under 50,000). Zimmerman also concluded that the larger institutions (56%) are generally state supported, whereas the smaller institutions (44%) are generally church supported.

Zimmerman (1997b) reported further that the majority of art education programs have an affiliation with colleges or schools of art. Thompson and Hardiman (1991) surveyed 350 institutions that granted undergraduate and graduate degrees in art education within the United States. The results of their study, based on 170 completed questionnaires (46.6%) with 121 from public state-supported colleges and 49 from private colleges and universities, found that 75% of art preparation programs that exist in doctoral-granting institutions are housed in colleges, schools, and departments of art. In institutions that did not offer a doctoral degree, 65% programs were affiliated with schools of art. The other programs in the study were affiliated with schools of education (6%), and others (19%) were affiliated with schools of both art and education. Zimmerman (1997b) noted in her Indiana survey that 16 of the 18 programs are affiliated with schools of art. Galbraith (2001) found a similar pattern in her study of 129 art education programs, in that 108 (73%) programs resided in schools or departments of art. Art teacher education programs exist in professional art schools; however, few studies have examined demographic data on these programs (see, for example, Caroll, Jones, & Sandell, 1995, for an overview of the program at the Maryland Institute, College of Art).

Few data have been acquired on the actual numbers of prospective teachers who are prepared within teacher education programs (Day, 1997). No large-scale systematic and longitudinal studies have examined graduation rates from the various individual art teacher education programs within North America. Also, no information exists on the number of art teachers prepared each year (Hatfield, November 2001, personal communication). However, individual state departments of education may have records relating to how many art teachers are certified. For example, correspondence with the Ohio State Department of Education confirmed that 189 multicertification art teaching certificates were awarded during the 1999 to 2000 academic year (Nichelson, 2001, personal communication).

Galbraith (1997, 2001) examined graduation rates from selected art education programs, but the numbers she acquired are estimates only, because they were derived from reports supplied by faculty rather than from actual figures supplied by educational institutions and/or state licensing and certification agencies. For example, a faculty member at Lawrence University, Wisconsin, a small private liberal arts college with a total enrollment of 1,100 students, reported that the college graduates 2 to 3 art education students per academic year. In another example, a faculty member at Stephen F. Austin University, Texas, a smaller university with a total enrollment of 12,000 students, reported that the program graduates 3 to 5 art teachers a year. And in a final example, a faculty member at Purdue University, Indiana, a large university with a total enrollment of 35,000 students, reported that the program graduates 15 to 20 art teachers a year.

Similarly, there are few data on the actual number of faculty who teach in art education programs. Anderson, Eisner, and McRorie (1998) indirectly address faculty issues in their study of graduate programs in the United States and Canada. They found that over 37% of respondents were sole full-time faculty art educators in their individual programs, and that 33 graduate programs were coordinated by either part-time or adjunct faculty members. It is not clear from these data if these faculty respondents mentioned are also responsible for teacher preparation. However, there is possible overlap, in that 81 programs surveyed offer K-12 certification coursework within their master’s-level courses.

Degrees and Coursework

A number of degree and certification options exist for becoming an art teacher. Teachers can be prepared within traditional undergraduate programs that offer various undergraduate degrees (e.g., Bachelor of Arts in art education, Bachelor of Fine Arts in art education, Bachelor
of Science in education, Bachelor of Science in art education). Some programs offer more than one bachelor’s degree option at the undergraduate level (Galbraith, 1997). There are also certification options at the postbaccalaureate (postbaccalaureate certification) and graduate levels (e.g., Master of Arts in education, Master of Arts in art education, Master of Arts in teaching). In some cases, there are graduate-level programs that add an additional year (sometimes 2 years) to the traditional undergraduate 4-year degree, such as the fifth-year teacher education programs and professional development schools advocated by the Holmes Group of educational deans (Holmes Group, 1986). Some states (e.g., Arkansas and California) require teacher candidates to have a bachelor’s degree before they enter a teacher preparation program. Many states offer certification from kindergarten to 12th grade; however, some make distinctions between elementary- and secondary-grade-level certification.

There is no one single degree or mandated set of courses that all prospective teachers are asked to take within the United States. Yet, the broader components of art teacher education programs are similar across the country (Davis, 1990; Galbraith, 1997; Sevigny, 1987). These components usually consist of credit hours in the following: art content (e.g., studio, art history requirements, and in some programs, aesthetics and/or art criticism), the theoretical foundations of art education (e.g., history and philosophy of art education, curriculum theory, instructional strategies), and supervised field experiences (e.g., student teaching and other types of clinical internships in elementary, middle, or high schools). Moreover, most programs require a semester grade point average of 2.5 or above for admission into teacher education programs (Galbraith, 1997).

Many programs also require preservice teachers to take coursework in professional education subject matter (e.g., educational psychology, child development, the history of American schooling), which is usually taught in schools, departments, or colleges of education (Davis, 1990). Undergraduate art education majors are usually required to take liberal arts and general education courses as part of their bachelor degrees. In many states in the United States, prospective teachers now are required to pass external examinations in art subject matter and professional education prior to or shortly after they begin teaching.

Curriculum and Coursework

Researchers have looked at the course content of teacher preparation programs over the years (Arnold, 1976; Davis, 1990; Eads, 1980; Galbraith, 1997; Hobbs, 1993; Sevigny, 1987; Willis-Fisher, 1991, 1993; Zimmerman, 1994b, 1997b). The average undergraduate art education degree program is composed of 120 to 130 semester credit hr (Galbraith, 1997), and these numbers have remained constant over the years (Arnold, 1976; Sevigny, 1987).

Changes took place in course offerings during the late 1980s and 1990s in relationship to discipline-based art education and the trend toward comprehensive art education (Day, 1997; Sevigny, 1987). Most preservice teachers are now expected to take some coursework (even if it is not taught in a separate class) in aesthetics and art criticism, as well as traditional emphases of studio art and art history (Day, 1997; Galbraith, 1997; Willis-Fisher, 1993). However, studio art is still the most prevalent component in the programs for education of art teachers (Davis, 1990; Galbraith, 1997; Hutchens, 1997; Willis-Fisher, 1991). Willis-Fisher (1991) surveyed a representative sample of state-approved undergraduate art education programs. Using data acquired from her questionnaire research, she found that preservice teachers take an average of 36 semester hr in studio coursework compared to an average of 9 semester hr in art history. Earlier, Sevigny (1987) surveyed 30 undergraduate programs in art education in order to ascertain if they were addressing course content required of discipline-based art education. After this baseline survey, he analyzed 14 programs in order to see if they had modified their programs in relation to discipline-based art education. His findings, as well as those of others (Rogers & Brogdon, 1990), suggested that studio courses are also the mainstay of the
preservice experience. Studio offerings run the gamut from foundational courses to courses in more specialist areas, such as painting, ceramics, printmaking, and digital imagery.

The availability of courses is limited within smaller institutions (e.g., because of limited numbers of faculty, faculty expertise), and it is usually the larger programs (e.g., in terms of faculty and course offerings) that provide separate classes on aesthetics, art criticism, and other more specialized art education courses, such as those that examine multicultural issues and technology.

A review of the literature on curricular and course content suggested that the student teaching experience usually takes place during the final semester or term of a preservice teacher’s program (Galbraith, 1997). Preservice teachers are assigned an elementary or secondary supervisory (or cooperating or mentor) teacher and spend the good part of a semester (or term) in the supervisory teacher’s classroom. Faculty members, instructors, or graduate students from the preservice teachers’ preparation programs then make regular supervisory visits to the student teaching classroom (Kowalchuk, 1999). There are exceptions to this state of affairs. For example, some teacher education programs are involved with professional development schools (e.g., The Ohio State University), and so opportunities for field and internship experiences are expanded (see, for example, Haynes & Schiller, 1994; Short, 1995). In many colleges and universities, student teaching experiences are conducted in liaison with schools or with departments of professional education.

There are few data that provide information on the impact of the NAEA’s Standards for Teacher Preparation (NAEA, 1979, 1999) on teacher education curricular content. Murchison (1989) found that the Louisiana teacher preparation programs showed inconsistencies in their art requirements when compared to the 1979 NAEA Standards. In a study of the certification programs in Alabama’s 14 colleges and universities, Rogers (1987) found that only two programs were close to compliance with the NAEA recommendations for art teacher education (NAEA, 1979). There are currently no data that examine whether art teacher education programs have adopted the current Standards for Art Teacher Preparation (NAEA, 1999). Galbraith (1997) also found that most faculty members in teacher education programs within or across states communicate little with one another, if at all. There are no data that indicate how statewide or nationwide programs articulate with one another.

There are also no large-scale demographic studies on the pedagogical practices employed and modeled within art teacher education programs, although there are reports on curricular activities and initiatives of individual art teacher education programs (Carroll, Sandell, & Jones, 1995; Roland, 1995; Thurber, 1989), as well as practices of individual faculty art educators (Grauer & Sandell, 2000; Myers & Grauer, 1994; Zimmerman, 1994c). Likewise, there are no demographic studies that examine the range of alternative art education approaches (e.g., feminist, social theory, critical pedagogy) within teacher preparation programs and the impact these approaches have made or are making on teacher preparation practices. Similarly, there is little demographic information on how preservice teachers are being taught to meet needs of diverse student populations, in terms of race, gender, disabilities, and sexuality (see, for example, Guay, 1993; Knight, 2000; Lampela, 1995, 2001).

The Canadian Context

In Canada, there are 48 universities and colleges that provide teacher education programs (Canadian Education Association, 2002). Of these, the 5 largest universities graduate over 1,000 new teachers each year. The majority of teacher education programs offer art education coursework. However, as is the case in the United States, teacher education is a diverse and complex field that has idiosyncrasies both within and across provinces (Irwin, Chalmers, Grauer, Kindler, & MacGregor, 1996). Depending on the province, it is possible to be certified
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as an art educator by graduating from programs in art schools, universities, and colleges, or from specific teacher education programs within colleges or universities. However, unlike the United States, the vast majority of art education programs in Canada are in universities, and the grade point average required for entry into these programs is the equivalent to that of the other university professional programs.

In Canada, it is possible to be certified as a generalist teacher for K-12 or as an art specialist in either secondary or elementary schools. Some provinces, like British Columbia, for example, certify the art specialist to teach all subjects in K-12, and this certification is accepted in all jurisdictions in Canada and in most countries around the world. However, in British Columbia, elementary generalist teachers are only required to take art education courses in one of the province’s six teacher education programs, although art is a mandatory subject at the elementary level.

Like the United States, art education programs in Canada are typically housed in faculties of fine arts and/or faculties of education. Some are 3- or 4-year concurrent programs that grant a Bachelor of Education degree at the completion of course work and the student teaching practicum. Increasingly, fifth-year and postgraduate programs are becoming alternate routes for teacher certification. Future teachers entering these postgraduate degree programs must hold a Bachelor of Fine Arts or a Bachelor of Arts degree before admission. When they complete the program, they receive a second degree as well as certification. All the larger universities offer graduate degrees in art education, with the two largest graduate programs at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver and Concordia University in Montreal.

PRESERVICE AND PRACTICING TEACHERS

Preservice Teachers

Approximately 500,000 preservice teachers (Doyle, 1990) are enrolled each year in the 1,200 institutions that prepare teachers in general elementary teaching to secondary core subjects such as art, music, and mathematics within the United States. The number of preservice art teachers enrolled in art teacher education programs remains unknown (Hatfield, 2001, personal correspondence). Any existing data have been tabulated from individual faculty members who have reported data on their various programs (Galbraith, 2001).

It is unclear as to whether art education preservice teachers fit into the various national trends. Researchers have argued that studies of preservice teachers of all subject matter areas within the United States show uniformity in their demographic characteristics (Goodlad, 1990; Wenglingsky, 2000). Preservice teachers, in general, are mostly women (80%), and are less than 25 years old (87%). However, a good percentage of preservice students can be classified as nontraditional students in terms of both their age and when they chose to enter a degree or certification program (Wenglingsky, 2000).

Thompson and Hardiman (1991) found in their survey of art education programs that women art education students outnumber men by a ratio of 3:1 at all degree levels. However, their study did not focus entirely on students seeking certification; thus, some of the figures may not be accurate. However, Zimmerman’s (1997b) analysis of the demographics of art teacher education concluded that 98% of art education students are White, and 68% are women.

Data on students entering visual arts departments suggest that teacher education candidates who enter university or college to pursue an individual subject discipline have relatively higher Scholastic Aptitude Test scores than those who do not pursue a specific college major (Wenglingsky, 2000). Additionally, there has been a steady increase in the number of visual and performing arts degrees conferred between 1987 and 1998. In the 1997 to 1998 academic year,
over 50,000 degrees were conferred (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000). There are no specific data available, however, on how art teacher education candidates fare as they move through their teacher education programs in terms of their coursework and, perhaps importantly, in terms of whether they actually become certified as teachers. Darling-Hammond (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996) described, using national data, how of the 600 students who entered a large 4-year teacher education program early in their college years, only 180 completed the program and only about 72 accepted teaching positions. Of these, only about 30 or 40 remained in the profession several years later. Thus, the overall attrition rate from the beginning of a traditional undergraduate teacher education through about the third year in teaching is 75%. Although graduate teacher education programs are more successful at finding jobs for their graduates and in keeping them in the teaching profession, these programs are still the exception to the rule.

Other studies on preservice teachers comprise small-scale or case study research. A small cluster of case studies is beginning to map out a demographic picture regarding preservice teachers’ beliefs about art and teaching. Kowalchuk (1999), for instance, examined the beliefs of 37 preservice student teachers in a large teacher education program in the United States. She found that the preservice teachers were challenged not only by their discomfort with the technical aspects of teaching art especially in terms of classroom management and the use of pedagogical strategies but also by their lack of knowledge of art subject matter. In another example, Grauer (1998) examined the beliefs of preservice art specialists and elementary generalists in a year-long Canadian postbaccalaureate certification program. She concluded that preservice teachers’ beliefs about what art education comprises is a much stronger indicator of their willingness to learn about art education than of their actual knowledge about art subject matter itself. Other studies have examined preservice teachers’ beliefs and experiences through the use of journals, case studies, and personal stories and metaphors (see, for example, Grauer & Sandell, 2000; Roland, 1995; Zimmerman, 1994c).

This aforementioned research alerts art teacher educators and researchers to the ways in which subject matter content, instructional methods, and classroom management are shared preservice teacher beliefs, concerns, and experiences within and across art teacher education programs. Thus, demographic knowledge related to this population is valuable information when planning programs of study in teacher education (Myers & Grauer, 1994).

Preservice Elementary Classroom Generalists

There are no demographic data that examine the demographic characteristics of preservice elementary classroom teachers (Galbraith, 1991; Zimmerman, 1994a). Yet, teaching this population of preservice teachers is an essential component in the workloads of many faculty members and graduate teaching assistants (Galbraith, 2001; Jeffers, 1993). Jeffers (1993) surveyed members of the NAEA Higher Education Division in order to ascertain who taught elementary methods, but this study was related to the content and teaching of the methods courses. There is a small group of case studies that has examined elementary generalists’ beliefs and concerns about art subject matter and teaching art (see, for example, Galbraith, 1991; Smith-Shank; 1992).

Practicing Teachers

It is estimated that there are 50,000 practicing art teachers within the United States (Hattfield, 2001 personal communication), with an estimated total of 35,000 at the secondary level (NAEA, 2001; National Center for Education Statistics, [NCES], 1998). Of these 35,000 art teachers, 90% are White, and 71% are female (NAEA 2001). Teachers of color represent 10% of art
teachers. The percentage of art teachers who are women is above the national average within the United States, in that women teachers represent two thirds of the general K-12 teaching force (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996). However, the percentage of art teachers of color is below that of the national average in which teachers of color represent 13% of the general K-12 teaching force (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

The literature is sparse on specifically documenting how practitioners participate in art teacher education activities. As we began this chapter, we established that practitioners might be involved in art teacher education in a number of ways. For example, practitioners may be involved in the actual education of teachers, or they may be involved in their own teacher education, or they may be involved as research participants in related teaching and teacher education studies.

School practitioners are by necessity involved in the preservice education. They serve as cooperating or supervisory or mentor teachers when preservice teachers undertake student teaching or work in intern or field experience settings. There is, however, little demographic evidence about the role that art practitioners play in these clinical experiences. A review of the literature suggested that student teaching is a primary component of teacher education (Galbraith, 1997; Sevigny, 1987), yet it has rarely been documented within art education; although some teacher educators are trying both to make changes as to how student teaching has been traditionally conducted and to develop a better understanding of preservice teachers’ concerns during the experience (Galbraith, 1997; Zimmerman, 1994c, 2000). No published demographic data exist on why practitioners serve as cooperating teachers or as mentors for student teachers; or on their backgrounds in relation to their qualifications, their time in the classroom, and their approaches to art. Some practitioners also serve as instructors (possibly as adjunct faculty) for their local teacher education programs. Galbraith (2001) found that some school practitioners taught methods courses for their local teacher education programs. However, this topic has never been fully studied.

Practitioners are also involved in their own education. They may be furthering their education with additional university or college coursework (e.g., toward a graduate degree of some kind) or they may be taking advantage of various professional development activities (which are considered teacher education activities) that school districts and other educational organizations offer. In some cases, additional professional coursework is mandatory as teachers seek to renew their licenses, request salary increases and promotions, and pursue other career goals.

It is clear from some studies (Burton, 1998; NAEA, 2001) that art teachers are pursuing or have pursued master’s degrees or other forms of graduate-level course work. The NAEA survey of secondary art teachers reported that 52% of the respondents held master’s degrees (NAEA, 2002). In their survey of 124 graduate programs in the United States and Canada, Anderson, Eisner, and McRorie (1998) reported that K-12 certification continued to be “the bread and butter” (p. 11) of graduate study at the master’s level. A K-12 option for master’s-level students was available in 81 programs, and 14 programs reported that they had certification options for art specialists. Nine programs also allowed certification coursework in their doctoral programs. In another study, Brewer (1999b) surveyed the educational background, educational needs, and scheduling preferences of 141 practicing art teachers in Florida. According to his survey, 67% of the art teachers did not have master’s degrees; however, 55% were interested in pursuing one.

There is no large-scale data bank that has kept track of the types of professional development and teacher education courses available for teachers. Brewer (1999b) found in his survey of Florida teachers that most were more interested in taking studio courses, rather than courses in art education, aesthetics, criticism, or art history. However, the few research studies on inservice activities with teachers suggest that some practitioners have taken advantage...
of a wide spectrum of teacher education opportunities and offerings. For example, the Artistically Talented Program at Indiana University has provided art teachers with ways in which to develop their leadership skills in both their professional and their personal lives (Zimmerman, 1997c). From the mid-1980s to the 1990s, practitioners have benefited from in-service programs associated with the Getty Institute for Education in the Arts (formerly known as the Getty Center for Education in the Arts). The Getty’s grants for its regional institutes in California, Florida, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, and Texas totaled more than $24 million for arts-based research over 15 years (Duke, 1999). Wilson’s (1997) report, *The Quiet Evolution: Changing the Face of Arts Education*, highlights how the regional Getty institutes brought about new developments in discipline-based art education and changes in art education practices as practitioners collaborated with administrators, consultants, and researchers.

Another professional development opportunity for art teachers is certification with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1994; Goodwin, 1997). Day (1997) reported that during the 1994 to 1995 academic year, 44 teachers (of these, 84% were women) became national board-certified art teachers for early adolescence through young adulthood. As of the 1999 to 2000 academic school year, the number increased to 305. These teachers represent 11 states. As Day (1997) argued, these standards identify highly accomplished teachers, and the implications for preservice and in-service art teacher preparation are many. As yet there are no demographic data on these implications.

Third, practitioners have served as research participants in various ways, such as responding to surveys, allowing researchers in their classrooms, collaborating with researchers, or by conducting research themselves. In a national survey of instruction in secondary visual art education, Burton (2001) identified the instructional strategies that secondary teachers prefer to use. He found that teachers relied primarily on studio-oriented instructional strategies (direct instruction, demonstration, one-on-one conversations) rather than on strategies that encouraged self-inquiry and group work. Lampela (2001) surveyed elementary and secondary art teachers within the United States about their knowledge of and attitudes about including lesbian and gay artists in their curricula. She concluded that art teachers want to learn more about the lives and works of gay and lesbian artists, and that curricular materials and resources also are needed to help art teachers discuss the subject of sexual identity. In their nationwide survey, Mims and Lankford (1995) examined ways in which art is taught in elementary schools in the United States. One of the study’s findings demonstrated that many teachers perceived themselves to be undervalued in the school curriculum. Considered together, results from these three demographic surveys alert us to the need for in-service (and preservice) teacher education and professional development coursework that address pedagogical practices; curricular resources about gays, lesbians, and other underserved groups; and the differences between how elementary and secondary art teachers are perceived in both art education and the teaching profession in general.

Additionally, the NAEA (2001) survey of art teachers in secondary schools within the United States found that the most performed professional activity by art teachers was planning art exhibits and events. The findings also indicated that about 60% of art teachers do not attend state art education association meetings, and 79% do not attend NAEA meetings.

A growing body of research is also emerging, as practitioners allow themselves to be observed and researched (see, for example, Anderson, 2000; Bullock & Galbraith, 1992; Galbraith, 1996; Hafeli, 1999; Stokrocki, 1988; Wolfe, 1997; Zimmerman, 1991, 1992), and not only provides the field (especially preservice art educators) with examples of the art educational practices of teachers but also provides practitioners (as research participants) with opportunities for professional and reflective growth as they work with researchers.
TEACHER EDUCATORS

There are few demographic studies of colleges- and university-level teacher educators—the teachers of teachers—within art education. Faculty work has rarely been examined and analyzed in terms of both art education (Galbraith, 1995, 2001; Hutchens, 1997) and general education literature (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1996; Lanier & Little, 1986).

It is difficult to assess, however, how many art education faculty members are directly responsible for preparing teachers, partly because few faculty members identify themselves as “art teacher educators” (Galbraith, 2001) and partly because specific data that relate to teacher preparation must be teased out of more general research on higher education and faculty issues within art education (see, for example, the research of Anderson et al. 1998; Thompson & Hardiman, 1991). Thus, it cannot be assumed that all postsecondary art education faculty teach preservice or inservice and professional development courses, although teacher education in the form of K-12 certification is the mainstay of many graduate-level programs and coursework (Anderson et al., 1998). Moreover, it should not be forgotten that teacher education, in its broadest designation, is the responsibility of not only all art educators (whatever their teaching interests and research specialization) but also other faculty campuswide (Howey & Zimpher, 1989).

Faculty members teach at various levels (e.g., instructor, assistant, associate, and full professor) within colleges and institutions. Some faculty members are tenured or are on tenure-track lines, whereas others are adjunct or have part-time status. Some instructors are also graduate teaching assistants who are working on degrees at the master's and doctoral levels. Thompson and Hardiman (1991) in their survey on art education programs found that 49% of the respondents were full professors, 28% were associate professors, and 23% were assistant professors. There were more women in the associate- and the assistant-level ranks, with more men in the full-professor ranks. Galbraith (2001), in her study of faculty working lives, also found that females are employed more in the associate and assistant professor ranks than at the full professor level. She also found that most of the part-time and adjunct faculty members are women, and in some cases, full-time secondary school teachers run art education programs on a part-time basis.

Galbraith’s (2001) study involved surveying 500 faculty members who worked at a variety of institutions (e.g., research, teaching, liberal arts, religious, professional art school, private, public, large, small). The return rate of surveys was 33%, and of this percentage, 19 questionnaires were unusable because art education was no longer taught at that institution. Thus, she examined 148 faculty questionnaires representing 129 institutions and 43 U.S. states. Galbraith found that faculty members hold varying academic qualifications. Only 66% of the respondents held doctorate degrees in art education or in a related field such as curriculum and instruction or secondary education. Of the 34% respondents who did not hold doctorates, 7% taught art education without any graduate degree, whatsoever. The remaining respondents taught with master’s level degrees, with 16% of the respondents holding a Master of Fine Arts degree.

The respondents who held doctorates (e.g., PhD or EdD) earned them from 34 different educational institutions, ranging from well-known art education programs such as The Ohio State University (16 respondents) and Pennsylvania State University (six respondents) to lesser known institutions such as Nova University (one respondent) and United States International University (one respondent). In their study, Thompson and Hardiman (1991) reported that 53% of faculty held doctorates. Thus, given these collective findings, a doctoral degree is not a requirement for teaching in many art teacher preparation programs, and in some cases, preservice teachers are taught by persons who do not hold any graduate degrees.

Faculty teaching loads are diverse in terms of numbers and types of courses taught. In some colleges or universities where teaching is valued more highly than research is (these
tend to be smaller and less research-oriented institutions), loads of three to four courses per academic semester are typical, with some faculty teaching as many as four to five courses each semester (Galbraith, 2001). In the larger research and doctoral-granting institutions, the amount of faculty time assigned to teaching differs, although these teaching responsibilities are considered heavy by many faculty, given the research, institutional, and national service expectations (Thompson & Hardiman, 1991; Zimmerman, 1997b).

Most art education faculty members teach art education courses of some kind. However, not all faculty members teach courses directly related to teacher education (e.g., courses that involve teaching preservice teachers). Some faculty members teach studio coursework, as well as art history, art appreciation, and other art-related courses (and in some cases, professional education coursework). A large number of faculty are responsible for supervising student teaching and other field-based and clinical experiences. Galbraith (2001) reported that 61% of the respondents in her study taught elementary and secondary art education methods courses, and of this percentage, 34% were responsible for teaching methods coursework for elementary generalists.

There is little information available on the research and scholarly activities of faculty members. Many of the faculty members who prepare teachers (especially those faculty who work in more teaching-oriented institutions) tend not to pursue research on teacher education matters (Galbraith & Grauer, 1998; Hutchens, 1997). Their intellectual work primarily involves course design, professional and institutional service commitments, and local and state presentations or workshops; although some faculty members create and exhibit artwork (Galbraith, 2001).

However, interest in faculty perspectives on art teacher education is an important component of art teacher education. In a recent publication, renowned art education scholars have described “in their own words” the development of doctoral study within selected institutions (see Hutchens, 2001). These stories, along with other reflections on the role of art education in faculty lives (Eisner, 1998), are exciting to see and provide some understanding of teacher preparation philosophies and practices within higher education.

### OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND ISSUES

There is a myriad of other demographic issues that need to be considered as we examine the state of the field of art teacher education today. For example, there are issues regarding alternative and certification and licensure measures for art teachers, the demands of recent education reform movements, and the effects of the teacher shortages at both K-12 and faculty levels.

#### Certification and Licensure

DiBlasio (1997) completed a comprehensive research on state requirements for art teacher certification and licensure in 1995. As she noted, changes have probably taken place since this time, given the wide disparity of teacher certification policies. Additionally, the teacher shortage at the beginning of the 21st century has brought about additional changes and modifications. Certification is given when candidates have met all of the coursework requirements and so forth required by their teacher education programs. Licensure is issued by each individual state when a teacher candidate has met all of the competency requirements for teaching (e.g., certification requirements, state teacher exams, probationary periods of teaching). However, as Sabol notes in his chapter in this volume, the terms certification and licensure are used interchangeably.

Schools of education usually recommend their preservice candidates for licensure (Darling-Hammond, 2000); thus, at some level, standards for certification vary in that some programs are
not as good as others, given the education they offer in terms of coursework, faculty competencies, and adherence to various professional standards. In more than 40 states, alternative routes exist for teacher education beyond the traditional undergraduate teacher preparation program (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Some of these programs are sequential and planned postbaccalaureate options, whereas other options exist for emergency hiring. In some states (Arizona is an example), 2-year colleges now are able to offer teacher education courses and certify teachers; thus, some teachers hired on emergency certificates are seeking preparation programs that allow them to certify as quickly as possible.

Only 11 states (Alabama, California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, and West Virginia) license or certify teachers based on state standards specific to arts education (The Council of State Chief School Officers, 2001). At the time of this writing, two other states (Connecticut and Indiana) are developing licensure requirements based on their individual state arts standards.

Darling-Hammond (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996) pointed out that nearly one fourth (23%) of all secondary teachers do not have a college minor in their main teaching field, and this is especially true for more than 30% of mathematics teachers. However, the percentage in art and music is higher and more encouraging, in that 77.9% of K-12 teachers have a state license in their main field of art or music. The NAEA survey of secondary teachers (NAEA, 2001) concluded that the majority of teachers (93%) held bachelor’s degrees in education and art, although the remaining percentage (7%) held degrees in other subject matter disciplines, including, English, language arts, dance, and music. Among teachers, nationwide, who teach a second subject, 36% are unlicensed in the field and 50% lack a minor (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996).

Standards and Quality

Recent reform movements in teacher education in the United States (see, for example, Holmes Group, 1986; National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996) have argued not only for the development of new approaches and standards within teacher education programs but also for the incorporation of standards that exemplify what potential teachers should know. Various U.S. states are developing standards for examining and licensing teachers.

The push for teacher education standards is not solely the province of national reform movements or only a part of recent educational endeavors. The NAEA has had in place a set of voluntary teacher education standards for over 20 years (Day, 1997; NAEA, 1979). These standards have allowed teacher educators to work from a set of common assumptions about what qualities art teacher education might comprise. The standards were revised and rewritten during the late 1990s by an ad hoc committee of the NAEA. The new set of Standards for Art Teacher Preparation was subsequently published in 1999. These standards again reflect the NAEA’s commitment to quality teacher education, and propose standards for teacher education candidates, teacher education programs, and teacher education faculty. The art standards also define the knowledge and skills that all beginning arts educators should possess in the visual arts for use in state teacher licensing and certification systems. Moreover, the revised standards are aligned with the National Visual Arts Standards (1994) and the Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood/Art: Standards for National Board Certification (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1994). The teacher preparation standards also augment the NCATE and NASAD Standards. Copies of the teacher preparation standards were distributed nationwide to various campus and school administrators, deans, department heads, and officials.
Teacher Education as a Campuswide Endeavor

In a document entitled *A Move Forward: An Affirmation of Continuing Commitment to Arts Education* (2001), the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, the International Council of Fine Arts Deans, and the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations challenge all campus leaders to become involved in teacher education. Members of the consortium not only endorse standards for K-12 arts teacher education but also argue that teacher preparation is an all-faculty and all-campus responsibility. There are unfortunately no data on how art teacher preparation is viewed on college campuses, and particularly in the schools or colleges in which art education programs are housed (e.g., visual art, fine arts, education, etc.). There are “stories,” though, of art educators’ experiences with studio faculty members and the historical divisions (and isolation) that have been created between studio and art education units. The pedagogical and curricular influences of studio, art history, and education faculty members on prospective art teachers remain unexamined.

In addition, as Lanier and Little (1986) noted, faculty members involved in teacher preparation are accorded less status in the hierarchy of college or university campus life than are their colleagues in arts and sciences, humanities, and other professional schools. However, most preservice teachers are taught not only by art education faculty but also by faculty in the arts and sciences, and in professional education; yet there are no demographic data on how these faculty members either instruct their classes, or serve as models (both positively and negatively) for potential teachers.

Teacher Quantity and Quality

A key issue within teacher education at the beginning of the 21st century is a consideration of how many teachers should be prepared (given the anticipated teacher shortage) and of the quality of these teachers (Wenglingsky, 2000). There are no demographic data that inform the field as to whether the anticipated teacher shortage in the early 21st century will seriously affect art education. Art education has always been hindered by the fact that not all school districts and/or states are willing to hire art teachers, especially when they are restricted by tight budgets.

Thompson and Hardiman (1990) predicted that there would be a number of retirements in terms of higher education faculty at the end of the 1990s. A cursory look at the job applications for art education postsecondary positions seems to indicate that faculty are indeed retiring and/or new positions are being filled and created. However, demographic research has not been conducted on this topic. Also, recent world events (e.g., September 11, 2001, and the ups and downs of the stock markets internationally) may have some long-term economic affects on university and college faculty and K-12 art teacher retirement and pension plans. Additionally, at the time of this writing, some states with the United States are reconsidering state funding for education and other resources, and some state-supported institutions are subject to hiring freezes.

A FEW REFLECTIONS

Demographic issues and concerns related to programs, teachers, and teacher educators are closely interwoven. One cannot understand the complexities of preparing teachers without addressing the nature of the teacher education programs in which they learn to teach. In turn, these programs are reflective of the working conditions of faculty art teacher educators, as well as of their backgrounds, understandings, and approaches to and beliefs about teaching art education.
There is a need to look more carefully at the various programs that prepare art teachers and help shape their development. It would be valuable to find some means that would allow for development of baseline data about teacher education programs. This task is enormous in scope, and as Day (1997) argues, some programs are more successful than others; yet it is important to differentiate between them. There is also the need to examine more thoroughly what is taught within these programs. Cochran-Smith (2000) reminds us that teacher educators have a responsibility to make sure that preservice teachers not only know their subject matter but also develop some understanding of the knowledge base of teaching and learning. This line of thinking aligns with the need to examine and describe not only the kinds of curricular and pedagogical approaches that are being taught within teacher preparation but also how future and current teachers (and teacher educators) can be informed about and introduced to alternative instructional and pedagogical practices and diverse art curricular resources. Murray (1996) referred to teacher education as the sharing of a collective body of knowledge about teaching. With this in mind, it is important that we begin to know more about the intellectual work and activities undertaken by the many faculty members who are responsible for preparing teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

As highlighted in this chapter, there is limited research on preservice programs, preservice and practicing teachers, and teacher educators. The demographic picture of art teacher education is incomplete. Associated with this partial research portrayal are growing societal and economic demands for change within teacher education. The challenge for art teacher education is to keep abreast of these developments and, at the same time, to keep core understandings related to art content and pedagogy central to the task of preparing teachers. Nonetheless, the potential for demographic research is exciting. It can only serve to enhance the ways in which art teachers are prepared and thus contribute to the evolving knowledge base within the field at large.
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