INTRODUCTION

Calls for Educational Reform


Three Waves of Educational Reform

These and other publications focused national attention on public education. Ultimately, they led to examination of the nature and quality of education in the United States. Collectively, they contributed to three waves of reform that changed general education and art education. Curriculum content in most disciplines was a morass with minimal agreement among educators and stakeholders about content, knowledge, skills, and processes. The standards movement focused on identification of a common core of learning compatible with content of a discipline and best practices in a field.

Agreement was minimal among art educators about the fundamental structure and content for what should be taught in visual arts education programs. Visual arts education content lacked uniformity and largely reflected individual art educators’ preferences. Numerous additional
factors contributed to these differences including local funding, resources, facilities, staffing, enrollments, and the like. The Consortium of National Arts Education Associations developed national voluntary fine arts education standards (Day, 1997). In 1994 (Music Educators National Conference), and visual arts education content standards were published. The emergence of discipline-based art education in the mid-1980s and the publication of national fine arts standards acted as catalysts for restructuring state frameworks and proficiency guides and local visual arts curriculum guides. Peeno (1995) reported exemplary state and local adaptations of the national visual arts standards.

Calls for educational accountability and increasing concern about improving the quality of education in schools launched the second wave of educational reform. Stakeholders demanded proof that national and state standards were being met and to what degree. As a result, many state departments of education developed and implemented state-level assessments of learning in visual arts education (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1985, 1998; Olson, 2001; Peeno, 1997; Peterson, 1991; Sabol, 1990; Shuler & Connealy, 1998). Relationships were identified between content on these assessments and state and national visual arts content standards (Sabol, 1994, 1998a). After arts education was added to the national education goals (U.S. Department of Education, 1994), and Congress stated that “the arts are forms of understanding and knowing that are fundamentally important to education” (H. R. 6, 1994, p. 2), the fine arts were included in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). In 1969, Congress established the NAEP for the purpose of surveying and monitoring changes in educational accomplishments of U.S. students. Previously, visual arts achievement was assessed on the 1974 and 1978 NAEP. Findings from the 1997 NAEP report in visual arts (Persky, Sandene, & Askew, 1998) and secondary analysis of its data (Burton, 2001; Diket, 2001; Sabol, 2001) focused attention on assessment of achievement in visual arts education. Established research agendas for visual arts education (Goals 2000 Arts Education Partnership, 1997; Goodwin, 2001; National Art Education Association 1994, 1995, 1996; The National Endowment for the Arts, 1994) included continued study of assessment and its impact on visual arts education.

The standards movement and intense attention on educational assessment provided impetus for the third wave of educational reform—teacher licensure and certification. Assessment results raised questions about why students were not meeting content standards. The business community demanded better prepared and better educated employees (Getty Education Institute for the Arts, 1996, 1997; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 1994). Governing bodies raised concerns about threats to the welfare of society caused by inferior education (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 1994). A range of contributing factors were identified. The pivotal roles of teachers came under close scrutiny. Stakeholders rightly perceived that the quality of instruction students received crucially influenced their learning. Calls were made for rigorous teacher licensure standards and assessment of teachers (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1999; National Art Education Association, 1991; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). Bodies responsible for teacher certification used energy from this wave to initiate reforms of state certification policies and procedures. Models for teacher preparation and certification standards were designed and published (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1992; National Art Education Association, 1999a). Peeno (1997) studied certification of art teachers and found variation among states’ structures and requirements. Standards, assessment, and certification reforms raised a myriad of issues for teacher preparation programs, recruitment, and retention of teachers that remain today.

A Painting of the Current Landscape

Waves of educational reform occur in a landscape colored by larger forces that act to shape them. These forces combine to act as a backdrop against which recruitment, certification, and retention
of teachers reforms can be examined. They bear directly on the field of visual arts education, though grounded in the larger picture of general education. For this reason, significant amounts of the remainder of this discussion will include references to and illustrations of themes and issues from the field of general education. Interpretations for visual arts education will be included when possible. Because visual arts education is a fundamental component in the broad definition of general education, it should be kept in mind that trends and developments in general education directly apply to visual arts education as much as to any other discipline.

Public school enrollment is projected to set new records every year until 2005 (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The National Center for Education Statistics (Nathanson, 2001) projected increased enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools from 43.2 million students in 1999 to 44.4 million students by 2006. Reports of increasing enrollments suggested a need for increasing numbers of teachers in the coming years (Gerald & Hussar, 2000; Henke & Zahn, 2001). Without more teachers, student to teacher ratios may increase dramatically (Hussar, 2001). An estimated 3.3 million elementary and secondary school teachers engaged in classroom instruction in the fall of 2000, with 2.0 million at elementary levels and 1.3 million at secondary levels (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The pool of available teachers is rapidly decreasing as the post-World War II baby-boom generation approaches retirement. Proportions of teachers who retire each year are expected to rise (Goodnough, 2000; Henke & Zahn, 2001). Hussar (2001) predicted that approximately 759,000 teachers will retire from 1998 through 1999 to 2008 through 2009. The National Center for Educational Statistics (Hussar, 2001) reported an annual demand for 150,000 new teachers. The projections for the number of newly hired teachers needed by the 2008 to the 2009 range are from 1.7 million to 2.7 million (Hussar, 2001). “ Newly hired teachers” includes not only first-time teachers but also returning teachers and people who were formerly teaching in private schools (Hussar, 2001). Some of these newly hired teachers will be needed to replace those leaving the profession, and others will be needed as enrollments continue to increase. Inexperienced teachers are replacing retiring teachers from the baby-boom generation. The attrition rate for these teachers is higher than that for teachers in midcareer (Archer, 1999; Baker & Smith, 1997; Grissmer, & Kirby, 1997; Henke & Zahn, 2001).

This picture raises numerous disturbing questions yet to be answered. Challenges on the horizon may be viewed with foreboding or they may be embraced with optimism. Without question the future of education will be greatly influenced by directions taken in the recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers.

Arts education professional associations, state departments of education, colleges and universities, and arts schools should undertake efforts to attract capable students to arts teacher preparation programs, including minorities. (National Endowment for the Arts, 1988, p. 26)

People commit to the teaching profession for numerous and varied reasons. Teachers cited a “sense of calling,” contributing to society, doing work they love, and having time with family as the most common reasons they entered the teaching profession (Wadsworth, 2001). Haselkorn and Harris (2001) suggested that the American public has high regard for contributions teachers make to society. Despite perceptions about problems with education, Americans ranked teaching as a profession that provides the most benefits to society, ahead of doctors, nurses, business persons, and public officials.

If teachers were guaranteed a salary of $60,000 a year, more than 8 in 10 Americans (82%) say they would recommend teaching as a career of choice to a member of their family. Indeed, 6 in 10 Americans (61%) would consider a teaching career themselves at these salary levels. (Haselkorn & Harris, 2001, p. 21)
Recruitment of students is influenced by an array of factors working in combination to draw students to preservice education programs and the profession or to block their participation in them. Discussion of a sampling of these will provide a foundation for understanding a number of issues related to recruitment of individuals to the field of art education.

In the fall of 2000, there were 3,252,000 public and private elementary through secondary teachers in the United States (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). They taught 52,989,000 public school and private school prekindergarten through grade 12 students (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). In 1993 to 1994 there were 144,119 art and music teachers in public schools and 26,381 in private schools (Whitener, Gruber, Lynch, Tingos, Perona, & Fondelier, 1997). Carey, Sikes, Foy, and Carpenter (1995) reported that 85% of public elementary schools offered visual arts education. In those programs, visual arts instruction was provided by specialists (43%), specialists and classroom teachers (29%), and by classroom teachers (28%). If numbers of students continue to grow, the need for trained teachers will increase and recruiting students for preservice programs will take on additional urgency. Researchers predicted teacher shortages for the past 2 decades (Darling-Hammond, 1984; Henke, Choy, Chen, Geis, & Alt, 1997; Olson & Hendrie, 1998). Ominous signals suggest that difficulties in hiring teachers are increasing. Often teacher shortages occur in selected fields rather than across fields (Bradley, 1999). Complicating matters further, particular states and localities are finding it harder than others to staff classrooms (Carey et al., 1995; Henke et al., 1997; Hussar, 2001; Whitener et al., 1997), and the number of teachers retiring continues to grow annually (Goodnough, 2000). In the fall of nineteen ninety-eight, 14,549,000 students were enrolled in institutions of higher education up from 12,097,00 in 1980 (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). In nineteen ninety-seven to nineteen ninety-eight, 105,968 bachelor’s degrees, 114,691 master’s degrees, and 6,729 doctoral degrees were awarded in education (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). During this same period, 1,545 bachelor’s degrees, 668 master’s degrees, and 25 doctoral degrees were awarded in art education (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The increasing need for teachers places an increased burden on colleges and universities to recruit students for preservice preparation programs.

Broughman and Rollefson (2000) studied career patterns of newly hired teachers. They grouped newly hired teachers from 1993 to 1994 (the latest year for which data are available) into four clusters including newly prepared teachers, delayed entrants, transfers, and reentrants. Newly prepared teachers were defined as those first-time teachers who attended college or had earned their highest degree in the previous year. Delayed entrants were considered as employed in fields outside education or in jobs related to education, such as teacher aids. Transfers were defined as teachers who were teaching in another school in the other sector (public or private), in another state, or within the same state and sector but in another school system. Reentrants were defined as individuals who had taken a break from teaching and were employed in nonteaching professions or were caring for family members. Of the newly hired public school teachers in 1993 to 1994, twenty-nine percent were newly prepared, 17% were delayed entrants, 31% were transfers, and 23% were reentrants. Broughman and Rollefson (2000) reported that within these groups the percentage of minorities hired in 1993 to 1994 increased slightly from 1987 to 1988. Across groups newly hired teachers were virtually the same in terms of degrees earned; however, 45% of delayed entrants were determined to be in need of alternative teacher training programs. Differences in the average age of newly hired teachers ranged from 27.6 years for newly prepared teachers to 31.9 years and 39.7 years for delayed entrants and reentrants, respectively.

Reforms of the 1980s and 1990s included focus on preservice teacher education programs. Among K-12 teachers working in 1994, nearly all reported that their jobs were related to their undergraduate field of study (97% among full-time teachers), whereas graduates who worked in other professions were less likely to report that their jobs related to their professions (62% or less in various professions) (Henke & Zahn, 2001). This high relationship between preservice
education programs and employment illustrates that to a significant degree the quality of preservice programs contributes to recruitment of students.

Although the form and content of preservice teacher education programs experienced unprecedented change, teacher education programs have become more rigorous. The nature of these reforms has implications for recruitment of students for preservice education programs. The National Art Education Association published *Standards for Art Teacher Preparation* in 1999. This publication included standards for (a) art teacher preparation programs, including content for college and university art education programs; (b) higher education art education faculty in which competencies were delineated for faculty who have responsibility to prepare art teacher candidates; and (c) standards for art teacher candidates including detailed delineation of skills art teacher candidates should possess. These standards were written to be compatible with higher education accreditation standards from the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Similar to NASAD and NCATE standards, *Standards for Art Teacher Preparation* (National Art Education Association, 1999a) consisted of guidelines for art teacher preparation. Art teacher candidate standards focused on understanding of the content of art, knowledge of students, curriculum development, instruction, assessment, and professional development. Separate standards were included for art education programs in higher education. These standards recommended that art education programs provide art teacher candidates with knowledge of content of the visual arts and knowledge of theory and practice of art education. Standards, such as these, have the power to improve preservice art education programs. In turn, these improvements can positively influence recruitment of students for preservice education programs by providing better quality training of future art educators.

Hutchens (1997) suggested strategies for improving preservice preparation programs to make them more attractive to students. He reported that few universities include teacher education in their mission statements. To make teacher education more attractive, he suggested that university policymakers must commit to teacher education and its reform. Those in higher education should communicate with university administration about the significant changes in theory and practice in teacher preparation that discipline-based and other forms of comprehensive art education can bring. Second, the research–teaching nexus in art education must be improved by stronger emphasis on needs of prospective teachers and through use of collaborative research teams, rather than remain on the idiosyncratic specialization and curiosity of faculty. Third, the disciplinary and conceptual entrenchment of faculty must be overcome. Reform initiatives have created a need for a closer community of educators. Adversarial perspectives among faculty can impede program development and leave faculty isolated in their own departments. Finally, development of a stronger constituency for art education must be built in state departments of education, university governing boards, and in business and private sectors. Alliances with members of these groups hold significant importance for influencing their decision making. Taylor (1992) identified four conditions needed to implement changes in preservice programs making them more attractive to students. The first of these conditions is a collective will to risk change. Preservation of outmoded programming and thinking prevents restructuring of preservice programs to meet demands of the changing field. A sense of collegiality in which cooperation and collaboration preserve individual identities is the second condition. Collegiality personalizes changes and provides assurances of support from colleagues. Third, administrative support is pivotal in implementing change. Continuous and vigilant efforts must be made to educate administration and cultivate productive relationships that favor art education preservice education programs. Finally, energy is required to work on several different fronts at the same time to rethink pedagogical issues, learn the inner politics of the institution, achieve interdependence within the working team,
and develop necessary communication networks both within and across an institution and community.

Preservice education program reformers should design programs that are attractive to students while encompassing national teacher preparation standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1992; National Art Education Association, 1999a; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1996, 2000), state certification and licensure standards, discipline content knowledge and skills, and technology. There is a great potential to enhance the attractiveness of individual programs and contribute to recruitment of students for them by using strategies—such as those recommended by Hutchens—and meeting conditions—such as those identified by Taylor—to build teacher preparation programs that are more responsive to the needs of future teachers.

The public has demanded that new teachers be more knowledgeable and skilled. State teacher licensing boards, administrators in higher education, and other decision makers reasoned that more demanding admission standards would draw more highly able students into preservice education programs. Consequently, the bar was raised for admission into preservice education programs at many colleges and universities. It remains to be seen whether raising admission requirements will encourage more highly able students to enter preservice education programs. Higher admission standards including increased grade point averages, SAT scores, and use of standardized tests such as the PRAXIS tests, the National Teacher Examination (NTE), or state proficiency tests have become commonplace. Tests such as these are routinely used for admission to teacher education programs (Feistritzer, 1999a). They also are used as gatekeeping devices for advancement through programs or at the completion of programs to measure knowledge and skills (Feistritzer, 1999a). In addition, they are used by state departments of education to assess qualifications of certification and licensure candidates. The public strongly supported passing a teacher competency test as a means of measuring capabilities of teachers (Haselkorn & Harris, 2001). Although assessments of these sorts may be seen as restrictive or exclusive, in fact, they act as mechanisms for measuring portions of the competencies and skills of those wanting to become teachers. A commonly held belief by those who advocate testing is that use of assessments positively affects recruitment both by attaching a quality of professionalism to teaching not previously achieved and by attracting more highly skilled and knowledgeable people to the profession. By contrast, increased emphasis on assessment may in fact be detrimental to recruitment efforts by eliminating people with potential to become accomplished teachers before and after they enter a field.

Recruiting students for preservice education programs is further complicated by the realization that teaching salaries are not commensurate with demands of the profession. Students are aware that teachers’ salaries are not comparable with salaries of many of those who graduate in other areas of study. The average salary for public school teachers in 1998 to 1999 was $40,582 (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The median annual income in 1998 for year-round full-time college graduates with bachelor’s degrees was $51,405 for men and $36,559 for women; median annual income for graduates with master’s degrees was $62,244 for men and $45,283 for women (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). Figures like these combined with the booming economy of the late 1990s made teaching even less attractive. Archer (2000) reported the average salary for nonteachers with master’s degrees increased by $17,505 from 1994 to 1998, after adjusting for inflation. The average salary for teachers with master’s degrees rose by less than $200. Olson (2000) reported that 39% of teachers were working a second job to make ends meet. Gerald and Hussar (2000) projected an increase of only 6.9% in the average teachers’ salary from 1998 through 1999 to 2009 through 2010. Low salaries, coupled with an understanding that opportunities for salary growth are limited and gender biased, pose particular barriers for recruitment of students.

During the past 2 decades, recruitment of students for preservice education programs has been of increasing concern and in all likelihood will continue to be a focus of attention for
Smith (1995) raised a particularly unsettling question with important implications for recruitment of preservice education students. He concluded that as preservice education programs become more lengthy and include more rigorous standards, and while at the same time state departments of education set more rigorous certification and licensure standards combined with eroding school conditions and low salaries for teachers, potential art teachers may very well ask, “Is the cost of schooling worth it?” The demands of preservice education programs combined with harsh realities of the teaching profession have made the field of education less appealing than in decades past. In the end, the quality of teacher education may not be measured by the ideal of providing better preservice training to students but by students’ answers to the question posed by Smith.

Some Issues Related to Recruitment for Preservice Education Programs

The field of education is concerned with a number of recruitment issues. Many of these issues have implications for the recruitment of teachers to the field of art education. In presenting these issues two caveats must be considered. First, issues selected represent a limited portion of those that could have been presented. This sampling of issues is not intended to be exhaustive. Second, details of implementation and specific procedures for operationalizing solutions to questions or problems they raise would be cumbersome and are beyond the specific province of this discussion.

States and school districts should become aggressive in their recruiting efforts. Recruiting teachers is complicated by the reality that teachers gravitate to schools with larger proportions of higher achieving students, nonminority students, and more affluent students (Archer, 2000). Wendy Kopp, the founder of Teach for America stated:

"We don’t have a setup where our school districts believe and understand that it’s up to them to develop an effective, aggressive recruitment strategy. In any other sector, this would be just bizarre. Corporations, law firms, whatever, spend so much on recruiting and developing effective people because they all know that people are everything." (Archer, 2000, p. 34)

The field of art education needs to develop recruitment strategies, as do all other fields of education. Archer (2000) recommended such strategies include marketing programs and media campaigns complete with public service announcements and advertisements similar to those in the business sector. He recommended training programs for personnel officers to make them more effective recruiters and designing hiring practices that provide free access to employment information and quick responses to employment queries. He reported that 27 states recruit teachers by providing job announcements on Web sites and that 9 states provide job applications online. Melville and Hall (2001) and Simmons (2001) recommended development of cadet teaching programs in high schools for recruitment purposes. Such programs provide opportunities for high school students to teach while helping them determine if teaching is a career they want to pursue. Approaching recruitment as a critical task for improving education may furnish much needed motivation for implementing these strategies.

Recruitment of minorities into the teaching profession is another concern art educators should address. Teachers from minorities represent 9% of U.S. public school teachers, and this number is expected to decrease to 5% in coming years (Feistritzer, 1998, 1999b; Jorgenson, 2001). The student body in public and private schools and in colleges and universities has become increasingly heterogeneous over the past quarter century. Pratt (2000) reported that minority enrollments have increased from 17% of all undergraduate students in the fall of 1976...
to 26% in the fall of 1995. Feistritzer (1999a) specified that 8 out of 10 teacher candidates were White, 10% were Black, 6% were Hispanic, 3% were Asian or Pacific Islander, and 2% were American Indian. Newly hired public school teachers included slightly increasing numbers of minority teachers. In 1987 to 1988 minorities constituted 10% of newly hired teachers, whereas in 1993 to 1994 hiring of minorities increased to 16% (Broughman & Rollefson, 2000). Students from minority backgrounds constitute 40% of the total student body in the United States (Jorgenson, 2001). Recruiting minority students is compounded by the failure of the K-12 system to produce enough minority graduates (Archer, 2000). Minority groups are less likely to succeed in school and are equally less inclined to pursue teaching as a career according to Jorgenson (2001). Sabol (1998b, 1999) studied the ethnicity of urban and rural art educators in the Western Region of the National Art Education Association. Both studies revealed a predominance of Caucasian teachers in the field including 91% in urban settings and 97% in rural settings. African American art teachers were more common in urban settings (4%) than they were in rural settings (1%). Hispanic or Latino art teachers also were more common in urban settings (3%) than they were in rural settings (0.2%). American Indian and Asian art educators represented equal percentages in both urban and rural settings (1% each). In every category, nearly duplicate findings were produced in a study of secondary art educators conducted by the National Art Education Association (2000). Ethnic patterns, such as these, are generally comparable to ethnic distributions of teachers in public schools (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). Findings from these studies suggest that teachers the field of art education are not ethnically diverse. Art education policymakers should aggressively develop recruitment strategies to improve ethnic diversity of the field. Various strategies for accomplishing this task were recommended by Jorgenson (2001). They included prioritizing the recruitment of ethnic educators, considering nontraditional sources of recruitment, expediting the application of ethnic applications, understanding how ethnically diverse employees perceive a school district, and creating a support network for educators of color. Policymakers and administrators should evaluate the merits of these strategies and implement those most appropriate for their school districts.

Olson (1998) contended that American schools are in the midst of an educational crisis of monumental proportions. Many school problems are influenced by site-specific factors (Williams & Newcombe, 1994; Williams & Woods, 1997). National attention has focused on problems in rural and urban schools. In the field of art education, Blandy and Congdon (1987) suggested that rural schools reflect traits, folkways, and learning styles that are different from other educational settings. Jones and Southern (1992) and Manifold (2000) studied the influences of rural values and beliefs on education and art education in rural schools. Clark and Zimmerman (2000) identified local rural history, cultures, traditions, and interests in rural art education curricula. Clark and Zimmerman (2000) and Sabol (1999) identified social problems and school-related factors that influenced art education in rural schools. Similar studies have identified factors and influences on education in urban schools. Ayers (1994), Meier (1997), Williams and Newcombe (1994), and Williams and Woods (1997) identified combinations of urban students’ cultures, motivations, competencies, and opportunities. Sabol (1998b) identified social problems and school-related factors that influence art education in urban schools. Although the rural and urban school contexts are unique, they share common problems and deal with similar issues (Dorn, 1997; Olson, 1998, 1999; Shen, 1997a).

Teacher shortages are a common problem in rural and urban school districts (Feistritzer, 1999a; Haselkorn & Fideler, 1999; Olson & Hendrie, 1998; Olson & Jerald, 1998; Sabol, 1998b, 1999, in press; Tell, 2001; U.S. Department of Education 1991). New education graduates do not want to teach in urban or rural areas (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feistritzer, 1999b). New teachers are less inclined to teach in urban schools where minorities comprise 43% of students and where 35% of students live in poverty (Olson & Jerald, 1998). They are less interested in
teaching in rural and urban schools that on average are older than schools in towns and in the urban fringe (Pratt, 2000). Olson and Jerald (1998), Darling-Hammond (2001), and Ingersoll (2001) reported that newly hired teachers in urban schools are more likely than those in rural and suburban districts to have no teaching licenses or emergency or temporary ones. They stated that roughly 60% of urban new hires had emergency teaching licenses. Rural schools are plagued with the problem of hiring teachers who do not have a degree in the discipline they teach (Scherer, 2001). These are disturbing facts. The need for trained and licensed teachers in rural and urban schools is likely to keep pace with increasing enrollments and retirements. Because the field of art education mirrors general education in numerous ways, it is likely that recruitment problems for rural and urban schools are occurring in art education as well. However, research must be conducted in the field to explore these issues. Currently, such research has not been conducted.

The number of men in the teaching force is another ongoing recruitment issue. Education is predominantly a women’s profession (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). The percentage of men in the teaching force has steadily declined from a high of 34% in 1971 to 26% in 1996 (Pratt, Pfile, Conner, & Livingston, 2000; Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). In the field of art education men represent a slightly lower percentage of the teaching force and constituted only 17% of art educators at all teaching levels in both rural and urban schools (Sabol, 1998b, 1999). Of those teaching at the secondary level, 29% were men (National Art Education Association, 2000). Recruitment of men into the teaching profession is made problematic by low salaries, poor working conditions, lack of job satisfaction, limited opportunities for advancement, low job status, lack of interest for involvement with students, and student discipline problems (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Finn & Madigan, 2001; Whitener et al., 1997). Although conditions are even more challenging for women art teachers, they often bring supplementary income to their families and are not primarily responsible for providing family incomes. The NAEA and state art education associations must work with legislatures, the business sector, colleges and universities, local school districts, and other stakeholders to address these problems and to create policies and programs that will attract increasing numbers of men to the profession.

Increased use of teacher tests has contributed to recruitment problems for the profession. Increasingly, states, colleges, and universities are requiring teacher candidates to pass teacher competency tests for certification (Nagel & Peterson, 2001). Most teacher tests are technically sound and provide important information about content-related knowledge (Blair, 2001). Tests designed to measure teaching competency have been criticized for not measuring the range of knowledge and skills teachers need or to adequately predict classroom success (Blair, 2001; Nagel & Peterson, 2001; National Research Council of the National Academies, 2000, 2001; Scherer, 2001). Concerns about using a single teacher test to evaluate teacher competency were raised by Scherer (2001). Teacher tests, as in all assessments of learning, should be part of assessment programs that include multiple measures to determine teacher candidate competency (Nagel & Peterson, 2001; Scherer, 2001; Zimmerman, 1997). Blair (2001) reported that states are required by Congress to rank institutions by passing rates of teacher candidates on state teacher tests and, based on requirements of Title II of the Higher Education Act, authorized in 1998. According to this act, the federal government could limit funding to state and teacher preparation programs based on students’ performances on state teacher tests. As a result some students may be highly successful in college, but if they do not pass the tests, they cannot enter the teaching profession. No one wants incompetent teachers in any classroom; however, teacher-testing programs have contributed to discouraging some from pursuing teaching as a career (Scherer, 2001). Studies of passing rates of art education teacher candidates on teacher competency tests have not been conducted. Such studies have great potential to contribute to understanding the impact this issue has had on recruitment of students to the field of art education.
An additional issue related to testing has contributed to recruiting problems. The current emphasis on adhering to standards and testing in the classroom has driven people out of the profession (Scherer, 2001). Teachers feel an increasing lack of control in planning curriculum and other aspects of their teaching because of pressures caused by national, state, and local testing programs. Testing programs have acted to determine what and how teachers teach. This takes away significant characteristics that define for teachers what it means to be a professional and acts to complicate recruitment of students by discouraging some who may want to become teachers. Sabol (1998b, 1999) reported that emphasis on state testing in the visual arts and in other disciplines was an increasing concern for art teachers in rural and urban schools. Teachers in both studies suggested that testing programs were distracting, time consuming, lacked sufficient scope to measure the full range of visual arts learning, and served to direct curriculum content. Stakeholders who demand accountability for learning in public schools should be made aware of the negative impact testing has had on students and teachers. Full understanding of the drawbacks of testing programs and their influences on learning may enable stakeholders to reevaluate demands for testing programs and tests’ form and content.

Numerous and complex factors contribute to recruitment of teachers for the field. Researchers must actively engage in research that will provide information needed by policymakers and stakeholders to respond to recruitment needs in visual arts education.

**TEACHER CERTIFICATION**

About 2.8 million public school teachers are working in the United States (Olson, 2000). All states require teachers to possess licenses to teach in public schools. Ninety-three percent or 2,604,000 teachers are certified, whereas 7% or 196,000 teachers hold provisional, probationary, temporary, or emergency or waiver licenses (Pratt, 2000). Some states place the subject and grade level on a teacher license or certificate, whereas others award teachers generic licenses or certificates but allow or require them to attach “endorsements” related to specific grade levels or subjects. Teacher credentialing has no common set of terms. Some states require teacher candidates to obtain a “license,” whereas others use the term “certificate” or “credential” (U.S. Department of Education, 1995). DiBlasio (1997) defined *certification* as completing the requirements (course requirements, competencies, internships, etc.) set by teacher education programs within institutions of higher learning. She defined *licensure* as recognition by the state as confirmation that all requirements have been met for competence in teaching. She goes on to say that the distinction between these terms becomes blurred when state professional standards boards or state boards of education defer to the judgment of teacher-training programs in granting licenses in a particular state. Review of the literature in the field revealed that these terms are used interchangeably, and for purposes of this discussion, the terms *certification* and *licensure* will be used as such.

The public depends on state Departments of Education to create, implement, enforce, and monitor certification of teachers in public schools. As a result certification systems are idiosyncratic with each state having its own criteria and procedures. Numerous calls for higher standards for teacher certification have been voiced over the past 2 decades (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1996, 2000; National Commission for Excellence in Education, 1983; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 1994). Public concern about teacher quality has led a growing number of state Departments of Education to restructure certification policies, standards, requirements, and procedures. Sweeping certification reforms in states like Connecticut and Indiana (Indiana Professional Standards Board, 1997) served as models for certification restructuring in other states. In addition to revising art teacher standards, Connecticut, Indiana, and 11 other states license teachers based
on state art standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000; Hatfield, & Peeno, 2001; Indiana Professional Standards Board, 1997). Collaborations between states and professional organizations to restructure teacher licensing is ongoing.

The National Commission on Teaching and America’s future is working with a dozen states to improve teacher preparation, licensure, and assessment, by raising standards, encouraging more professional preparation, and providing more support for novices. (Olson, 2000, p. 18)

Reformation of teacher certification systems is currently being done in 35 states working with INTASC; 47 states have policies defining requirements for continuing professional development of teachers in order for teachers to be licensed by the state; and legislatures in 14 states have created autonomous Professional Standards Boards with jurisdiction to govern teacher training and licensing programs in their states (National Art Education Association, 1999b). Some states have developed career ladders with changing certification requirements at various points in the span of teachers’ careers (Wall, 1997). These programs may award certificates at the completion of preservice preparation, after an induction period, and repeatedly during continuing professional development. Some states created licensure systems that award certificates for instructional levels or for developmental levels. Teacher testing is one of the most widely embraced school improvement initiatives of the past 15 years and it has become a lightning rod for controversy. In 1988, the National Endowment for the Arts recommended testing of teacher qualifications as a condition of teacher certification with inclusion of art content and pedagogy related to art teaching.

State certifying agencies should develop tests to evaluate teacher preparation and teacher preparation programs. Such tests should assess the general (liberal arts) preparation of teachers, their knowledge of art in the context of history and culture, their ability to analyze art, their performance and skill competencies, their knowledge of issues in arts education, and their skill in lesson planning and pedagogy. (p. 26)

Haselkorn and Harris (2001) suggested that 70% of the American public felt it was very important for teachers to pass a teacher competency test. Many states require teacher candidates to pass tests of basic skills before they may be certified (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). Tests such as PRAXIS I, a basic skills test, and PRAXIS II, tests of subject matter and tests of general and subject-specific knowledge designed by Education Testing Service, are widely used. PRAXIS III, a test of on-the-job skills is being piloted at this time (Bradley, 2000). Currently, 39 states require teacher candidates to pass a test of basic skills; but of those, 36 allow candidates to begin teaching without having passed the exam (Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Jerald & Boser, 2000; Olson, 2000). Twenty-six states require candidates to pass pedagogical knowledge tests (Blair, 2001). Prospective high school teachers in 29 states are required to pass tests in the subjects they plan to teach to earn a beginning teaching license (Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Jerald & Boser, 2000; Olson, 2000). Determining cutoff or passing scores is an issue of concern in most states. Low cutoff scores have been chosen in several states with high demands for teachers. In some states teachers can earn passing scores by correctly answering less than half of test questions correctly (Bradley, 2000). Most teacher tests include multiple choice items, but, depending on the subject, from 5 to 15 states also include essays or other performance measures (Jerald & Boser, 2000). High school teachers who fail to pass certification tests generally require annual renewal of permission to continue teaching; however, 11 states allow teachers hired on that basis to remain in the classroom indefinitely (Jerald & Boser, 2000).

Most people approve the concept of teacher certification reform, but there is disagreement about the effects that raising standards and making certification requirements more rigorous
have on improving the quality of teaching or on improving student achievement. Making certification more demanding in a time of reported teacher shortages, increasing enrollments, and accelerating teacher retirement rates are viewed as unwise by some. Many current certification procedures have been viewed with skepticism by others. Still others question whether certification requirements can effectively identify high-quality teaching or predict classroom success (Blair, 2001).

“The paucity of solid evidence pointing to the effectiveness of teacher licensure is striking: There is little connection between licensing requirements and high-quality teaching,” the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation concludes in a 1999 report, The Quest for Better Teachers: Grading the States. (Olson, 2000, p. 18)

Additional criticism focused on the adequacy of teacher candidate testing programs. (Blair, 2001; Nagel & Peterson, 2001; National Research Council of the National Academies, 2000, 2001; Scherer, 2001). Critics suggested that tests should match the grade level at which the teacher will teach; thus, specialized knowledge and skills needed for successful teaching at a specific level could be examined (Nagel & Peterson, 2001). Tests should be designed to measure a broad range of content knowledge and other pedagogical knowledge (Scherer, 2001). Use of authentic measures is advocated by some who recommend teaching portfolios with videotaped samples of instruction, journals, measures of student learning, visits by independent assessors, written peer and principal assessments, reflective essays, and other authentic assessments (Nagel & Peterson, 2001; Zimmerman, 1997).

Holding teachers accountable for student learning and improving quality of teaching in classrooms fueled education reforms of the 1980s that led to national certification of teachers. The structures and processes of state teacher certification programs were scrutinized. Wide variation among these programs was found (DiBlasio, 1997). Inconsistencies in practices and incomprehensible policies painted a portrait of confusion and contradiction for teacher certification in the field. Recognition that unified standards for teacher preparation, teacher certification, and teaching were needed by the teaching profession led to reflective examination of the nature of teaching. Questions about the fundamental essence of teaching and qualities accomplished teachers possessed were raised. Discussions about what highly effective teachers know and do were at the core of these examinations. Reformation of teacher certification culminated in creation of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) in 1987 (to be discussed in detail later).

State teacher certification bodies have created an array of policies and regulations. Certification programs in each state are idiosyncratic and represent unique approaches to credentialing teachers within the state. Some programs have been characterized as ranging from inventive to obsessive-compulsive (DiBlasio, 1997). With current demands for restructuring these programs, many states are at various stages of designing or implementing systematic changes in their programs. The state of flux that characterizes these programs has contributed to confusion and uncertainty about requirements and policies regulating certification.

In 1997, DiBlasio studied certification and licensure of visual arts teachers in the United States. The study consisted of a survey of state teacher licensing bodies and tabulation of licensing requirements. Detailed reports of requirements for general certification, art-related certification, professional education, and testing were produced. The report of art-related requirements for certification included descriptions of required numbers of semester hours; courses and course work; detailed requirements for certification; competency-based requirements; and listings of studio, art history, art criticism, art theory, or aesthetics requirements. The report of professional education requirements included art education methods requirements, general foundations requirements, and clinical experience requirements. The report
of testing requirements was divided between general professional testing requirements and content-specific requirements. This landmark study provided a cogent foundation for comprehending the complexities and idiosyncrasies of certifying visual arts teachers in the United States at the end of the 1990s. Due to the rapid pace of change, maintaining accurate up-to-the-minute information about certification is challenging to say the least. This study, however, provided a foundation for identifying current trends and the nature of change in certification of visual arts teachers.

The NAEA conducted a complementary study of teacher certification in visual arts, music, theater, and dance in 1997. The study also included review of the status of state visual arts standards revisions, arts assessment, and arts requirements for high school graduation. The report of arts teacher certification, compiled in September of 1996, included listings of instructional level certificates for the visual arts. For example, some states certify visual arts teachers only for elementary or secondary instruction, whereas others issue K-9, 7-12, or K-12 certificates. In addition, the report included lists of visual arts instruction alternatives, such as states granting permission for elementary classroom teachers to teach art and music and alternative certification in visual arts instruction. Finally, the report detailed pending proposals for changes in certification of art teachers that included proposed policies, procedures, and requirements under consideration at the time of the study. This study provided a status report from which comparisons of state licensure structures could be made. Additional ongoing studies designed to track licensure changes and to identify current visual arts licensure status in the states are needed. Findings from these studies and postings of current certification information should be made easily accessible to the field of art education through electronic and printed means.

In 2000, the National Art Education Association published findings from a study of secondary visual arts educators in the United States. The study involved 1,520 secondary art teachers from 878 schools. A total of 672 (44%) secondary visual arts teachers from 520 (59%) schools responded to a questionnaire designed to elicit information about art education in secondary schools. The report, National Survey: Secondary Art Education focused on demographics, schools, curriculum, instruction, professional development, and teacher evaluation. The study revealed that 85% of respondents held standard teaching certificates in art education. The remaining 15% held elementary, history, supervisor, principal, or administrator certificates. Probationary and provisional certificates in art education were held by less than 4% of the respondents. Further information about certification structures, procedures, or requirements was not available. Similar studies of middle school and elementary school art educators are necessary along with longitudinal studies of art teacher certification.

In 1986 the Carnegie Corporation Task Force on Teaching as a Profession published A Nation Prepared: Teachers of the 21st Century. This report recommended creation of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). The NBPTS was founded in 1987. It is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization governed by a 63-member board of directors, the majority of whom are teachers. The missions of the NBPTS include (a) establishing high standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do, (b) developing a voluntary national system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards, and (c) advancing related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2000). All NBPTS standards are grounded philosophically in the policy statement What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). This statement identified five core propositions about accomplished teachers: (1) Teachers are committed to students and their learning; (2) teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students; (3) teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning; (4) teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience; and (5) teachers are members of learning
communities (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1989). The NBPTS has developed standards for nearly 30 fields. The NBPTS certification standards Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood/Art were published in 1996. The Early Childhood and Middle Childhood/Art standards were published in 2000. A unique aspect of National Board standards is that they were developed by practitioners from the field. The NBPTS represents an effort by the teaching profession to define its own high standards and to create a credential recognizing practitioners who meet those standards (Goodwin, 1997). The visual arts standards identified skills and understanding that teachers need in order to be effective facilitators of learning. These skills and understandings are related to student learning and understanding art. Goodwin (1997) wrote:

The National Board promotes the role of the teacher as one who takes responsibility for providing an appropriate environment that encourages and supports student learning. The National Board also promotes an approach to teaching that transcends the classroom and extends to informing outside influences. The National Board encourages teachers to contribute to education reform beyond the classroom. (p. 112)

Harman (2001) reported that the National Board certified 10,000 teachers in the past 14 years and expects to certify 100,000 by 2006. Certificates are awarded by the developmental level of the students and the subject or subjects being taught. Developmental levels include early childhood, ages 3 to 8; middle childhood, ages 7 to 12; early adolescence, ages 11 to 15; and adolescence and young adulthood, ages 14 to 18+. Certification candidates must submit an application fee, currently $2,300, and a portfolio of required artifacts providing evidence that each standard has been met. Finally, candidates must complete assessment center exercises that match the certification standards, subject area, and developmental level for each certificate. In its effort to promote National Board certification of art teachers, the National Art Education Association published NBPTS Board Certification for Art Teachers (1998). This summary of National Board certification provided a foundation for understanding the background, procedures, and requirements for certification of art teachers. Since its publication, revision and restructuring of certification procedures and requirements have taken place and are likely to continue on a routine basis.

Teachers have received encouragement to achieve National Board certification in 40 states. Incentives such as fee reimbursement and salary supplements are currently available and vary from state to state. Some states offer a one-time bonus to National Board-certified teachers. Others have created National Board certified teacher pay categories and still others have added as much as 15% annual salary increases for the 10-year life of the certificate (Podgursky, 2001). Goodwin (1997) identified additional incentives for achieving National Board certification. He suggested that National Board certification provides much needed recognition for accomplished teachers in the field of art education. He cited National Board certification as a meaningful professional development opportunity that causes art teachers to closely examine what they do as teachers and to evaluate their knowledge and skills as visual arts teachers. Goodwin intimates that National Board certification standards and assessments could be used as models for restructuring teacher preparation programs, thereby producing visual arts teachers of higher quality. Finally, Goodwin predicted that National Board certification would positively impact state certification and standards by suggesting how they could be made broader and more rigorous. Additional incentives were identified in a case study of National Board certified teachers by Bohen (2001). The study suggested that the process of National Board certification positively influenced candidates teaching processes. Certified teachers reported greater professional confidence, improved analysis of instruction, clearer focus on student outcomes, greater commitment to professional growth, and increased prestige. Bohen also reported that
National Board-certified teachers claimed the certification process was the most intense and rewarding professional development opportunity they had experienced.

Since its inception, National Board certification has been the target of criticism. Podgursky (2001) detailed a number of points of contention about National Board certification. He suggested that the National Board certification process should be self-sustaining. Beginning in the early 1990s, the board began receiving federal funds. In recent years, Congress has appropriated roughly $20 million annually to this private, not-for-profit teacher organization. He raises the questions of why public tax dollars should be spent to support a private enterprise and why the $2,300 application fee does not enable the NBPTS to be self-sustaining. Criticism is leveled at evaluation of written work candidates must submit. Candidates are not penalized for grammatical or syntax errors in any of their written work, and artifacts are evaluated by part-time teacher evaluators who may not have requisite skills themselves. Podgursky cited training programs for certification evaluators in other professions, such as those in law and medicine, that provide rigorous and extensive training to evaluators of certification materials. He suggested that training of evaluators in those professions does not favorably compare with minimal training received by National Board evaluators. The certification process does not include input from parents, school supervisors, or principals; people, who Podgursky suggested, may be better able to evaluate candidates than National Board evaluators. He suggested that there is no evidence the costly and time-consuming process of National Board certification is any better at identifying superior teachers than assessments by supervisors, principals, and parents. Because the process depends on candidates independently creating and documenting their teaching, Podgursky contended that opportunities for cheating are inherent in the process.

He suggested that parents, supervisors, or principals should be included in the collection and documentation process. Podgursky perceived a potential threat to authority of local school administrators in the National Board certification process. Podgursky was equally concerned about the long-range impact of National Board certification on the field and on graduate education programs in colleges and universities. He suggested that as the number of National Board teachers grows, National Board standards and processes will act to dictate state certification standards and procedures as states attempt to fall in line with the surge toward National Board certification. Graduate teacher education programs will be forced to restructure to be compatible with National Board guidelines in order to draw top-quality students. Complications of restructuring graduate programs may act to undermine the goals of graduate programs and diminish the appeal of these programs. Implicit in these concerns are questions of who controls the National Board and to whom is the National Board accountable? Since its inception in 1987, the National Board has received nearly $100 million in federal support; yet, no rigorous study has been undertaken to determine whether students of National Board-certified teachers actually learn more or perform better on state achievement tests or other standardized measures than students of noncertified teachers. Podgursky concluded that National Board certification tells us candidates know how to be good teachers; but whether they do it on a consistent ongoing basis is questionable. Further criticism was leveled at National Board certification when Podgursky suggested that National Board certification fosters elitism and contributes to divisiveness in the profession. The cost of certification may contribute to preventing some accomplished teachers from pursuing certification. Podgursky contended that a significant amount of teacher interest in National Board certification is based solely on salary rewards, and he questions further whether state funds should be used to reward teachers who achieve certification. Finally, he suggested that National Board certification can have double-edged impact on hiring and retention practices. Some school districts may actively seek National Board-certified teachers for various reasons while excluding applicants who are not certified. By contrast, in a time of diminishing funds for education, National Board-certified teachers may find themselves being excluded from teaching openings or removed from teaching
positions because of higher salary paid to National Board-certified teachers in many states. The NBPTS launched an ambitious program to create national standards for teachers in various disciplines. National Board certification of teachers continues to be embraced by a growing number of leaders in the federal government, state legislatures, state Departments of Education, local school boards, and business. The long-term impact of National Board certification on the teaching profession remains to be seen. At this point in time, it has provided a model for state Departments of Education in restructuring licensing and assessment of teachers.

Some Issues Related to Certification of Visual Arts Teachers

A number of certification issues in the field of general education hold relevance for the field of art education. Discussion of a limited number of these will follow. In-depth examination of the selected and related issues is beyond the scope of this report. Implementation of solutions to problems and answers to associated questions may be under the direct auspices and legal control of state teacher-certification bodies. However, visual arts educators should monitor teacher certification and contribute to the dialog that shapes change in art teacher certification and the issues discussed here.

If predictions of teacher shortages become reality, making teaching more attractive as a profession will involve a number of significant certification changes. In the eyes of some, teaching is viewed as a profession with little appeal. Hussar contended that the supply of qualified teachers can be increased or decreased by changing certification requirements. “The certification requirements could be adjusted to favor more new or old college graduates for teaching positions” (Hussar, 2001, p. 12). Haselkorn and Harris (2001) reported that Americans strongly favored (88%) elimination of the practice of hiring unqualified teachers and also favored (76%) strengthening state requirements for becoming a teacher. Although intentions of advocates suggesting more rigorous standards for certification of teachers can potentially improve the quality of teaching and student achievement, harsh realities of supply and demand for teachers needed to fill classroom vacancies may dictate action and policies needed to meet these demands. Hussar (2001) predicted that 2 million newly hired public school teachers and 500,000 newly hired private school teachers will be needed between 1998 and 2008. He suggested that continuation rates of teachers, which are directly related to teacher projections, can be influenced by education policymakers and economic factors. To illustrate the point, Hussar stated that school districts can increase continuation rates among teachers by enacting incentives, such as increases in salary and benefits, which may encourage teachers to retain their positions rather than to retire, or they can enact policies to recruit people older than new college graduates into the teaching profession. Also, an economic downturn might make teaching positions more attractive because of their perceived stability. Job security associated with teaching holds power to draw numbers of people to the profession in times of economic uncertainty.

Teacher shortages in economically deprived settings and in rural and urban schools have caused school districts to hire teachers who may not meet state certification standards. Jer-ald and Boser (2000) studied state licensing requirements and identified “loopholes for bypassing minimum requirements.” With the exception of New Jersey, each state provides a range of exceptions that permit teachers to enter the classroom without meeting full licensure requirements; these include waiving basic skills tests, subject-area tests, or subject-area courses requirements. Teachers permitted such exceptions are granted various credentials from emergency licenses and limited standard licenses to probationary certificates and hardship or out-of-field assignment licenses. These credentials remain valid for periods from 1 year to unlimited periods of time.

Art education is being provided at the elementary level by classroom teachers who may not be required to meet state art teaching standards (Brewer, 1999; Carey et al., 1995; Council
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of Chief State School Officers, 2000; Hatfield & Peeno, 2001; National Association of State School Boards of Education, 2000; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). In elementary art education classrooms, over half (57%) of instruction is provided by specialists and classroom teachers (29%) or solely by classroom teachers (28%) (Carey et al., 1995). It is doubtful that all of these teachers possess adequate training in art education, because only 15 states certify teachers based on art standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000; Hatfield & Peeno, 2001). Contributing to lower certification requirements for art education is the finding that only five states require statewide student assessment in art (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2000). Lack of these assessments frees school districts from being held accountable for maintaining quality art education programs or from providing visual arts education taught by certified visual arts specialists. All of these factors combine to lessen the need for school districts to seek, hire, and retain certified teachers for their art education programs.

Current teacher shortages and predicted shortages of 2 million teachers (Hussar, 2001) over the next decade have fueled calls for alternative certification programs for teachers in all disciplines. Findings from a national study of public attitudes toward teaching, educational opportunity, and school reform conducted by Haselkorn and Harris (2001) revealed that the American public strongly favors (83%) attracting more people currently working in other careers into teacher preparation. Development of alternative certification procedures for teachers has been recommended over the past 2 decades (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988; U.S. Department of Education, 1991, 1994). In 1988, the National Endowment for the Arts called for states to:

develop and implement flexible procedures that provide for special testing and certification of experienced practicing artists and arts professionals who can demonstrate a comprehensive background in the arts and substantial knowledge of the issues and methodologies of K-12 arts instruction.

Feistritzer (1998) defined “alternative teacher certification” as,

every avenue to becoming licensed to teach from emergency certification to very sophisticated and well-designed programs that address the professional preparation needs of the growing population of individuals who already have a baccalaureate degree and considerable life experience who want to become teachers. (p. 2)

In coming to grips with the teacher supply issue, states have allowed teachers to become certified through specially designed programs and procedures that differ from those traditionally used (Feistritzer & Chester, 1991). People are now entering the teaching profession after careers in other fields. Today, alternative certification programs are available in 43 states (Berry, 2001; Broughman & Rollefson, 2000; Finn & Madigan, 2001; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Olson, 2000). In 1998 to 1999, alternative teaching credentials were issued to 24,000 teachers in the 28 states that keep these data, and during the past decade over 80,000 alternative licenses were issued (Berry, 2001). Evidence is emerging that minority candidates are attracted to alternative certification programs (Kwiatkowski, 1999).

A variety of alternative preparation and certification programs exist and contradictory and conflicting claims have been reported about them. Berry (2001) reported that two thirds of the 1,354 colleges and universities that prepare teachers have at least one teaching program for midcareer professionals. Finn and Madigan (2001) suggested that alternative certification programs commonly require a candidate to possess a bachelor’s degree, pass a competency test and background check, and complete a compressed training program that includes hands-on experience. Graduates from many of these programs receive support from a supervisor or
mentor teacher. Berry (2001) stated that typically preparation programs at these institutions last from 9 to 15 months. He suggested alternative preparation programs cannot be viewed as equal to traditional programs in terms of content, duration, rigor, and support for learning how to teach. To illustrate his point, he reported that “shortcut” programs typically include 4 weeks of training in classroom management, simplified instruction on developing lesson plans, and an introduction to the complex world of teaching. By contrast, Berry reports the existence of numerous high-quality programs and provided a listing of characteristics of these programs. They include strong academic and pedagogical course work, intensive field experience, requirements that candidates meet all state standards for subject matter and teaching knowledge for a standard teaching certificate; and guarantee that new teachers meet all state quality standards, including passing the same assessments given for traditional certification.

Candidates entering alternative certification programs often lack (a) a wide range of knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching; (b) understanding of subject matter in ways that allow them to organize it and make it accessible to students; (c) understanding how students think and behave; and (d) recognizing student differences that may arise from culture, language, family background, and prior schooling (Berry, 2001). In a national study of 14,000 alternatively certified teachers, Shen (1997b) suggested that alternatively certified teachers had lower levels of educational accomplishment and higher out-of-field teaching assignments. By contrast, Berry (2001) reported that alternatively certified teachers have grade point averages that meet or surpass national averages of traditionally certified teachers. In fairness, it should be kept in mind that due to the higher numbers of teachers who have entered teaching through the traditional means, the grade point average of those teachers may be negatively skewed. Outcomes of studies have indicated that teachers from alternative certification programs have more difficulties with curriculum development, teaching methods, classroom management, and student motivation than traditionally prepared teachers (Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1990; Grossman, 1989). Contrary to these reports, Goldhaber and Brewer (1999) suggested that students of alternatively certified teachers produced results on assessments of learning that were comparable to those of teachers with conventional licenses.

More conflicting evidence is found in reports of studies of alternatively certified teachers and retention rates. Feistritzer (2000), Finn and Madigan (2001), and Klagholz (2000) suggested that teachers prepared through alternative routes have lower attrition rates than do conventionally certified teachers. However, they did not report specific retention percentages or rates for this group with which comparisons to conventionally certified teachers can be made. Darling-Hammond (2001) reported that nearly 30% of traditionally licensed new teachers and about 10% of teachers prepared in extended 5-year programs, which include a full year of student teaching, leave the field within 5 years with even higher rates in districts with disadvantaged student populations. Berry (2001) and Darling-Hammond (2001) reported that 60% of individuals who enter teaching through alternative certification programs leave the profession by the third year.

Alternative certification programs are an established part of the education landscape in the United States. Clearly, they provide a means of access to teaching that appeals to a particular group of individuals with interest in contributing to the education of students in American schools. For the foreseeable future, alternative certification programs are likely to continue providing teachers to meet increasing demands. Calls for federal and state assistance and support of these programs abound (Feistritzer, 1999b, 2000). Issues and controversies raised by alternative certification must continue to be examined and addressed by those in general education and art education. Despite a wide variation in alternative strategies, educators and policymakers should insist that all teachers meet the same high standards no matter how they enter the profession. The U.S. Department of Education (1995) identified encouraging signs
that suggested reforms in education in the early 1990s were beginning to take hold. Teacher quality has been improved through reforms in certification policy, requirements, standards, and assessments. Pratt (2000) reported that 92% of teachers had regular or standard state certificates or advanced professional certificates, and the numbers of teachers with these certificates generally increased with years of teaching experience. Continued tracking of the results of these reforms is needed to determine their long-range effects.

**RETENTION OF TEACHERS**

Mark Twain once said, “Sometimes keepin’ a good thing is harder than gettin’ it.” This witticism has significance for understanding issues and questions related to maintaining a viable teaching force. Startling figures continue to surface about the rates at which teachers leave the field. Archer (1999) and Grissmer and Kirby (1997) suggested that as baby-boomer teachers retire they will be replaced with younger teachers whose attrition rates are higher than those in midcareer. Haselkorn and Fideler (1999) reported that 20% of new teachers leave the classroom within 3 years and nearly 10% leave in the first year alone. Darling-Hammond (2001) stated that nearly 30% of new teachers leave within 5 years with even higher rates in disadvantaged districts. Olson (2000) found that over 50% of new teachers quit teaching after 5 years. Over the period from 1988 through 1989 to 1994 through 1995, the percentage of public school teachers leaving the field rose from 5.6 to 6.6% of all teachers in the United States (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). Olson and Jerald (1998) reported that 58% of urban schools have at least one teacher leave before the end of the school year compared with 27% of nonurban schools. Among teachers who left during that period, the percentage of men rose by .5%, whereas the percentage of women who left rose by nearly 1.5 percentage points (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). Also during that period, the percentage of teachers with minority backgrounds leaving public schools rose nearly 2.5 percentage points (Snyder & Hoffman, 2001). In the field of art education during the period from 1988 through 1989 to 1994 through 1995, the percentage of public school art teachers who left the field rose sharply from 4.2% to 7%; in private schools that rate dropped dramatically from 17.7% to 10.9% (Whitener et al., 1997). Olson (2000) reported that teachers who score in the top quartile on college entrance examinations were nearly twice as likely to leave the teaching profession as those from other quartiles. Teachers up to the age of 50 in private schools were more likely to leave teaching than those in public schools (Hussar, 2001; Rittenhouse, 1999).

Studies raising alarms about teachers leaving the field seem to suggest that the profession is in turmoil with an unstable population. Nothing is further from the truth. Henke and Zahn (2001) studied retention rates in various professions and found that among those who were employed as full-time K-12 teachers in 1994, eighty-two-percent were still teaching in 1997. Furthermore, none of the other occupations studied for this time period, including law enforcement (73%), engineers (71%), scientists (71%), business support (66%), financial services (66%), legal professionals (57%), computer and technical (53%), sales and service (45%), blue collar (39%), and clerical occupations (25%), proved more stable than teaching. Those least likely to leave the teaching profession were graduates of 5-year preservice programs (Darling-Hammond, 2001). Studies of teachers in this group have found that they are more satisfied with their preparation, they are more highly rated by their colleagues and principals, and are as effective with students as more experienced teachers (Andrew, 1990; Andrew & Schwab, 1995; Baker, 1993; Darling-Hammond, 2001).

Teachers left teaching for a range of reasons. Stress, working conditions, class size, low salaries, low prestige and lack of recognition, teacher burnout, discipline problems, governance of schools by legislatures and the courts, poor student motivation, lack of mentorship programs,
difficult assignments, poor opportunity for professional development, and inadequate admin-
istrative support were the most common reasons teachers left the teaching profession or failed

to consider teaching as a career option (Archer, 1999; Baker & Smith, 1997; Henke & Zahn,
2001; Goodlad, 1987; Hussar, 2001; Olson, 2000; Whitener et al., 1997). The two main reasons
former teachers left teaching in 1994 through 1995 were retirement (27.4%) and pregnancy

or child rearing (14.3%) (Rittenhouse, 1999; Whitener et al., 1997). New occupations of for-
mer teachers in 1994 to 1995 were self-employment or with private companies, businesses,
individuals, or federal, state, or local government (Whitener et al., 1997).

Some Issues Related to Retention of Teachers

Retention of a quality teaching force poses a wealth of issues and questions for stakeholders
to consider and address. The following is a sampling of some of them. Discussion of the
selected issues is not intended to be exhaustive. As in previous sections of this discussion,
the selected issues are approached from the standpoint of general education. However, the
generic nature of these issues has direct implications for visual arts education. Specific themes
related to these issues having special implications for art education will be discussed when
appropriate. An essential point to keep in mind is that for each of these issues local school
districts and state or national agencies can promote policies that affect retention and continua-
tion rates for all teachers. Closer examination of opportunities, resources, and levels of support
needed to do so is essential in making an impact on the retention of all teachers including art
teachers.

Working conditions were cited among common reasons teachers left the field (Baker &
Smith, 1997; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Henke & Zahn, 2001; Scherer, 2001; Whitener et al.,
1997). Working conditions may include an array of factors. Class size, discipline problems,
age of school buildings, lack of equipment and supplies, difficult assignments given to inex-
perienced teachers, and other contributing factors may make teaching conditions intolerable.
Often these factors are related to funding limitations or the absence of policies designed to
address them. The everyday stresses of teaching contribute to magnifying these factors to
make them an irritant to teaching and learning. Improving working conditions requires contin-
uous collaboration among teachers, administration, business and community leaders, parents,
state education agencies, and professional associations. Students and teachers should be in-
cluded in identifying factors that contribute to poor working conditions and provided with
opportunities to suggest solutions for improving them. Policies should be enacted by deci-
sion makers that account for maintaining and improving favorable working conditions in all
schools.

Low salaries was the second most common reason teachers left teaching (Archer, 2000;
Darling-Hammond, 2001; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Jorgenson, 2001; Whitener et al., 1997).
The tension between wanting to provide high-quality education for all students and provid-
ing funding for salaries to draw well-prepared and skilled teachers has long been an issue
in education. Because public schools are supported with tax dollars, the public is hesitant
to approve increases in taxes to provide funds for increasing salary needs of teachers. Stud-
ies of comparisons of salaries of teachers with those of equal educational qualifications in
other fields reveal startling discrepancies. Average salaries of teachers compared with those
in other professions dramatically illustrate the inequities of income. Salaries of teachers at
the middle and senior levels of their careers should be increased. These individuals represent
the knowledge and experience bases of the profession. Unfortunately, these groups are most
affected by lowered incremental salary increases and salary compression (Archer, 2000). In
other professions, people at these stages are sought after and rewarded. It is a common adage
that “No one goes into teaching for the money”; however, training and demands of teaching
coupled with the importance sound education has in all walks of life in our society still has not convinced the public to provide compensation commensurate with that importance. Clearly, increasing salaries of all teachers provides significant incentives that can affect teacher retention rates.

Entering the teaching profession is a daunting task no matter how rigorous teacher preparation programs may be. Naïveté, idealism, misconceptions, lack of information about policies and procedural requirements, curriculum development, assessments, classroom management, and a host of other factors converge on new teachers. Newly hired teachers frequently left teaching because of the absence of teacher induction programs despite reports that 50% of first-year public school teachers participate in some type of induction program and 60% of new teachers in urban schools participate in them (Haselkorn & Fideler, 1999). New teachers who left teaching felt isolated and bewildered by the lack of a means to support them during their “novice” period in the profession. Studies recommended that development and expansion of teacher induction programs hold particular potential for improving teacher retention rates (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Haselkorn & Fideler, 1999; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Henke & Zahn, 2001; Jerald & Boser, 2000; Olson, 2000; Olson & Hendrie, 1998; Whitener et al., 1997). Olson (2000) reported that 28 states currently have teacher induction programs. These programs consist of mentorship strategies, inservice training, administrative support, or support groups of other newly hired teachers. Providing induction programs designed with the needs of teachers in various subject areas in mind, such as those in art education, holds particular power to help teachers acclimate themselves to the demands of the profession while providing support and guidance in adjusting to them.

The teaching profession is in a constant state of flux. Teachers at all levels of experience need ongoing professional development to keep abreast of changes. New technology, laws, teaching materials, instructional methods, and other developments influence teaching in ways teachers must understand and learn. Lack of support for meaningful professional development opportunities has contributed to attrition rates of teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Whitener et al., 1997). Repeated calls for professional development of teachers have been made (Goodwin, 2001; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Longley, 1999; Nathanson, 2001; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988; Pratt, 2000; U.S. Department of Education, 1995; Whitener et al., 1997). Art teachers reported that less than half (44%) of urban school districts (Sabol, 1998b) and slightly over half (52%) of rural school districts (Sabol, 1999) provided professional development activities. The three most common forms of support for urban art teachers were professional leave days and substitute teachers (63% each) and conference registration fees (47%) (Sabol, 1998b). Rural art teachers reported substitute teachers (78%), professional leave days (75%), and conference registration fees (68%) as most common professional development support (Sabol, 1999). Art teachers complained that professional development opportunities related to their needs were scarce and mandatory attendance at professional development activities unrelated to their needs was widespread (Sabol, 1998b, 1999). Teachers need to invest in themselves through their ongoing professional development. Participation in such activities has great potential to contribute to improving their knowledge and skills as professionals and their students will reap the dividends. Decision makers and policymakers need to understand the long-term importance of professional development to teachers and students alike. They need to make decisions, create policies, and use resources that foster the professional development of all teachers. Such policies and decisions can positively influence retention rates of teachers by creating more knowledgeable and skilled teachers who are better able to deal with changing demands of the field.

A significant factor in successful teaching is support from administration. School administrators control power that affects both teaching and learning. Lack of administrative support contributes to the deterioration of both. Former teachers reported lack of administrative
support as a contributing factor in their decisions to leave teaching (Darling-Hammond, 2001; Haselkorn & Fideler, 1999; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Henke & Zahn, 2001; Olson, 2000; Olson & Hendrie, 1998; Whitener et al., 1997). Teachers depend upon administrators to provide guidance and assistance in meeting the goals of their programs. Creating positive relationships with faculty is a goal administrators and supervisors should strive to achieve. Sabol (in press) suggested critical factors for supervisors and administrators to consider in providing positive administrative support for art educators. Among them were involving teachers in administrative decision making; holding teachers accountable; setting high standards for teachers and maintaining them; working to provide increased funding for art programs; providing manageable schedules; improving student teacher ratios; being supportive of art education; supporting demonstrations of students’ art achievement; and cultivating open dialog with teachers through active listening, constructive criticism, and positive involvement with the visual arts program.

Administrative support for teachers is the product of long-term commitment and mutual respect for art and teachers.

Teaching provides its own set of incentives. However, retention of teachers may be improved by a group of incentives that would make teaching more appealing to those entering the profession and to those who have been in it for extended periods of time. Various researchers have concluded that offering teachers opportunities that are widely available in other professions requiring comparable education and training, such as signing bonuses; forgiving education loans; providing tax credits to teachers; awarding merit bonuses; raising salaries; improving fringe benefits; providing scholarships for professional development, advanced training, and degrees; and making housing allowances for mortgages or rent and moving expenses, would significantly raise retention rates (Archer, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2001; Haselkorn & Harris, 2001; Henke & Zahn, 2001; Whitener et al., 1997). Members of other professions routinely change jobs in pursuit of improvements in any of these. Job applicants conscientiously investigate these factors in selecting jobs. Teachers are beginning to see opportunities of these kinds as becoming more commonplace. Olson (2000) found that 27 states currently have loan forgiveness programs, but only 10 states aim their programs at candidates willing to teach in hard-to-staff schools or regions. Isolated reports of other incentives designed to lure teachers to the profession or to retain them are beginning to become more widespread. Unfortunately, these incentives are financial in nature and most school districts cannot offer such enticements. If predictions of teacher shortages materialize, incentives such as these may become requirements for maintaining a high-quality teaching force rather than luxuries provided to a few.

Retention of teachers will continue to be a thorny issue in education. Unforeseen factors may give rise to new issues that will shape the teaching profession in the future. Teachers will need to become more circumspect about evaluating the rewards of teaching and the practical needs of living in a complex society of the 21st century in order to make judgments about the merits of teaching as a profession. In the future, the merits of teaching may increasingly depend on responses to some of the issues suggested here.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RECRUITMENT, CERTIFICATION, AND RETENTION OF TEACHERS

The previous discussion provided a brief summary of an increasing array of developments and issues for the recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers. It is uncertain if or how any of these issues can be resolved. However, it is reasonable to speculate about some possibilities they suggest. The following discussion will include a forecast based on conjecture about the future of some of them.
Some General Future Directions for Recruitment, Certification, and Recruitment of Teachers

The future of recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers will be affected by three dominant forces. The first is the continued emphasis on the standards movement. Standards needed for recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers will continue to be developed and revised to reflect future needs of the profession. The public will continue to require evidence that teachers are meeting these standards and they will demand that such standards continue to become more rigorous. An ongoing problem will be creation of means of holding teachers accountable to these standards while allowing others who fail to meet the standards to continue to teach due to possible teacher shortages.

A second force that will affect recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers will be assessment. There is great possibility that public dissatisfaction with schools and student achievement will grow and assessment will gain in power as an accountability measure. Assessment of teachers will become more comprehensive and more frequent. Teachers will be required not only to pass various assessments of their competence at all stages of their careers, but also to provide evidence of continued improvement in their students’ achievements. In the future, employment of teachers may hinge on assessment results more than on any other single factor.

Technology is the third factor that will influence recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers. There are strong indications that local school districts and states will depend on technology to hire, certify, and retain teachers. Web sites that include job listings, applications, and interactive interviews will become commonplace. Certification of teachers also will be done with the aid of technology. State and national credentialing bodies will establish electronic methods for certification. Teachers will apply for teaching credentials and renew them through technological means. Teacher candidates will rely on technology by creating Web sites with their credentials, portfolios, and digital interactive examples of their classroom performances as teachers. Personnel directors and administrators will access teacher candidates and teachers through use of technology and evaluate their competencies. Further, use of technology in teaching will continue to expand. Teachers will use technology to expand their capabilities as teachers and their knowledge of subject matter content and pedagogy. Technology will become essential to recruitment and retention of teachers by creating professional development opportunities through distance learning.

Prognostications about the future may provide an agenda for possible action. Occasionally, predictions about the future become realities. Often they fail to materialize. If nothing else, they provide food for thought and contemplation. They encourage reflection and evaluation of the present while enticing the thoughtful to consider possibilities for the future. What the future of visual arts education holds is uncertain, but actions taken today can influence outcomes in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Research will play a critical role in the future of recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers. Fundamental questions that bear directly on issues in these areas must be answered. Questions posed in this discussion were couched against the backdrop of general education. Each question and issue that is pertinent to general education must be explored and investigated in the field of art education. Unfortunately, relatively little research pertaining to recruitment, certification, and retention of art teachers has been done in visual arts education. Researchers
from all levels of experience should consider investigations in these areas. The need exists for longitudinal, empirical, qualitative, philosophical, historical, ethnographic, case study, and other types of research. Findings from such research contribute to understanding and development of the field.

The previously discussed overview of some of the literature and studies of recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers raises a number of research questions for the field. These questions provide suggestions for an agenda for art education researchers that should foster awareness, clarify and describe situations, extend current knowledge, and contribute to translating research into practice.

The content areas of recruitment, certification, and retention of teachers are presented as an agenda for research. Examples of some general questions researchers may pursue in each of these areas are included.

In the area of recruitment of teachers, researchers may consider investigating the following questions:

Who is entering the field of visual arts education?
Why are people entering visual arts education?
What factors influence decisions to enter visual arts education?
What characteristics, knowledge, and skills do successful visual arts teachers possess?
At what instructional level(s) are teacher shortages likely to occur in visual arts education and when?
What are current enrollments in visual arts education preservice programs?
Will there be enough new art teachers produced by these programs to meet projected needs for the next decade and beyond?
What recruitment strategies have been successful in general education and other professions, and how can they be implemented in visual arts education?
What art teacher hiring practices currently exist?
What art teacher recruitment policies currently exist?
What art teacher recruitment policies will be needed in the future?

In the area of certification of teachers, researchers may consider the following questions:

What has been the historic development of visual arts teacher certification?
How has the nature of certification of visual arts teachers changed or remained the same over time?
What current certification requirements exist (standards, tests, portfolios, etc.)?
What alternative certification programs exist for art teachers?
What is the quality of alternative certification programs?
Do alternative certification programs produce quality art teachers for the field?
What impact has National Board certification of art teachers had on the field?
What numbers of art teachers have been certified by the National Board?
After receiving National Board certification, what effect has certification had on the teaching of those art teachers?
How have roles of National Board-certified art teachers changed after certification?
What incentives have been provided for National Board-certified art teachers?
Are these incentives equal to those provided to teachers in other subject areas?
What art teacher certification policies currently exist?
What art teacher certification policies will be needed in the future?
In the area of retention of art teachers, researchers may consider the following questions:

What factors contribute to art teachers’ decisions to leave the field?
What factors encourage art teachers to remain in teaching?
At what rate do art teachers prepared through alternative certification programs leave the field?
How does this rate compare to retention of art teachers prepared through traditional means?
How do art teacher retention rates compare to those of teachers from other disciplines?
What are projected retirement rates for art teachers in the next decade and beyond?
What reduction in staff policies currently exist and how do they affect art teachers?
What art teacher retention policies currently exist?
What reduction in staff and retention of art teacher policies are needed?

Each question in this list of possible research questions may be investigated from local, state, and national perspectives. Most of the questions should be studied through a variety of research methods and methodologies. The meaning of findings from research related to any of these questions, as well as from their relationships to the recruitment, certification, and retention research contexts, can be interpreted. Baseline research in each of the content areas is needed to inform policymakers, direct preservice preparation of art teachers, and assist decision makers concerned with making judgments related to the field of art education.

CONCLUSION

Art teachers, like nearly everyone else, occasionally make judgments about the relative merits of entering or continuing in their chosen profession. Teaching art possesses a unique assortment of incentives. The intrinsic rewards for teaching are palpable to teachers. The desire to help students learn, pride in contributing to the education of fellow human beings, joy of watching students learn, love of teaching, and, for some, the satisfaction of answering a “call” are reasons enough to enter and continue teaching. But, the realities of the world in which art teachers live force some to make more weighty judgments about what they have chosen to do. Often they are driven to enter or leave teaching for practical reasons. These reasons may be related to character, financial, family, personal, or other concerns.

Demands for art teachers, as in those for all subject areas, will increase in the future. Recruitment of students for visual arts preservice preparation programs will increase proportionately, as will recruitment of art teachers. Restructuring efforts for certification of visual arts teachers will continue and, out of necessity to meet increasing demands for art teachers in the future, will become more broad in their design permitting a wider array of avenues through which individuals can enter the teaching profession. The need to retain art teachers will become critically important and new incentives will need to be creatively pursued.

Research focused at investigating recruitment, certification, and retention of visual arts teachers can inform the field about how visual arts teachers perceive themselves and understand their roles in the education of all students. Answers to research questions can help all art educators better understand and address issues of importance to the field. Findings from research can provide information and guidance in making decisions and in taking actions that will affect the field. Creating a research base for art education has great potential to provide a foundation upon which art education can be built and from which it can be judged in the future.
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