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ABSTRACT

In this study, the researcher investigated visual arts teacher preparation programs at universities in Louisiana with particular emphasis on the curriculum component. The research was designed to survey teacher training programs and to compare the findings with delineated National Art Education Association standards.

This study included only public institutions of higher education in Louisiana with visual arts education teacher preparation programs. The researcher conducted interviews at each of the 13 universities. Two of the universities worked together in a joint art education program. An interview guide was prepared and used to facilitate the interviewing process. Records and documents were also examined to collect data about each of the programs.

The researcher used the data collected to prepare profiles for the universities. Each of the programs was then compared to delineated standards to determine discrepancies in the programs.

Important findings of the study included: (a) the curricula in the 12 art education programs varied significantly in the major content area, (b) each of the visual arts teacher training programs had discrepancies in their art requirements when compared to the National Art
Education Association standards, (c) Louisiana state guidelines for visual arts teacher preparation programs varied from delineated National Art Education Association standards, (d) the number of visual arts education graduates in the past decade varied substantially from the number of visual arts education students being certified, and (e) the number of visual arts education students has declined in the past ten years.

After examining the data and findings, the researcher recommended that visual arts teacher preparation programs in Louisiana work to comply with the National Art Education Association standards. It was also recommended that programs address the specific shortcomings in course requirements, course offerings, and faculty competencies.
CHAPTER I

Introduction

In recent years, citizens and professionals have showed growing concern and national interest in education in the United States. One area where constructive change can take place is improvement of teacher preparation programs. Whether there is one definitive answer or several possible courses of action, potential exists for improving teacher education programs.

Teacher training programs in college and university education departments that prepare teachers for certification can assume leadership positions in educational reform. As needs for refocusing and redirecting education are identified, teacher education and certification requirements are logical starting points for constructive change (Broudy, 1986). As Adler (1982) and others have pointed out, the teacher is essential to reform, and Adler has stressed the importance of teacher training at both pre-service and in-service stages.

Visual arts teachers are one segment of the composite of teachers and administrators trained to educate the youth of the nation. Through various activities, such as conferences, research projects, and task forces, visual arts educators are involved in the search for excellence
within their field (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988; Louisiana State Department of Education's Superintendent's Task Force on Arts Education, personal communication, 1989; National Endowment for the Arts, 1988). This study contributes to the body of information about visual arts teacher preparation by examining existing programs for educating art teachers in Louisiana public universities.

Statement of the Problem

In this study, the researcher investigated current practices of visual arts teacher education programs in public universities in Louisiana. The goals of the study were to describe teacher preparation programs in visual arts education in Louisiana public universities and to analyze the programs for possible discrepancies when compared to contemporary national standards by the National Art Education Association (Wygant, 1979). In the field of art education, discrepancies between theory and practice have been significant (Dorn, 1989). With new developments and debates about curriculum in art education, a growing need to examine existing practice has emerged. Differences between theory and practice have increased as developments in visual arts education have focused on art content in aesthetics, art criticism, and art history as well as art production.

This research was conducted to analyze art education
programs in Louisiana to determine whether they are consistent with contemporary art education goals and policies. The researcher gathered data about Louisiana's visual arts teacher preparation programs and evaluated the information in light of National Art Education Association standards (Wygant, 1979). The theory development of the J. Paul Getty Trust (Getty Trust), the recommendations of the Holmes Group, the standards of the National Art Education Association (NAEA), the criteria of the National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and certification standards of Louisiana were also examined.

The researcher used the Standards for Art Teacher Preparation Programs (Wygant, 1979) established by the National Art Education Association (NAEA) as the basis for determining discrepancies in each program's curriculum. The NAEA is a national professional organization for teachers of art. The association focuses concern on professionals teaching art in elementary and secondary schools and on art teacher preparation (National Art Education Association and National Association of Schools of Art and Design, 1982). The literature supports the use of the NAEA standards. Other studies have used the NAEA standards, and they are widely accepted in the visual arts education field (Ammar, 1987; Frattalone, 1975; Rogers, 1988). The NAEA standards are thorough in their coverage and encompass the goals and criteria of other
organizations reviewed. Their adaptability allows for expansion when policy dictates. Thus, their application for this study was considered a logical choice.

In this study, the researcher scrutinized the art education and art components of the teacher preparation curriculum in an effort to determine what the existing programs included and what they did not include in required course work. The results of the study were based on information available about each of the programs in Louisiana as of the Spring of 1988.

**Rationale**

Recent years have produced new directions in education and visual arts education as well as an increasing public concern about education (Adler, 1982; Bell, 1984; Bennett, 1985; Boyer, 1983). As a result, it is vital at this point to know if current teacher education programs are consistent with these new focuses and if they are providing effective preparation for future visual arts teachers. Eisner (1972) recommended research in art education to answer questions germane to the field. He described research as an act to stimulate inquiry to gain understanding that would become the "cornerstone to action" (p. 238).

An initial step in research designed to improve art education is to identify strengths and weaknesses of current visual arts education preparation programs.
Little published research exists analyzing the consistency of existing programs with standards for teacher training that have been delineated by national organizations. This research is a partial response to that need.

**Assumptions**

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. Visual arts are an important part of each person's inclusive education.
2. Qualified visual arts teachers should be teaching the visual arts in all schools, kindergarten through college.
3. Visual arts teacher preparation programs should be well grounded in contemporary educational theory and practice.
4. Application of appropriate standards for visual arts teacher preparation programs can help build the best possible programs.

**Visual Arts Teachers in Louisiana**

Estimates of visual arts teachers employed in Louisiana vary substantially. They range from a high of 1,000 to a low of 361. The highest figure was cited in a national document containing visual arts statistics reported from most of the states (Mills & Thomson, 1986). The lowest estimate of 361 is the number of public secondary schools in Louisiana and was used as the figure for art teachers in the recent Louisiana State of the Arts
Survey (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1986-87). This survey was conducted by the Louisiana State Department of Education in a cooperative project with the Louisiana Alliance for Arts Education and the Louisiana Division of the Arts. In addition to these two estimates, a state department official (M. Kerr, personal communication, September, 1989) estimated the number of art teachers in Louisiana to be between 400 and 500.

The first total of 1000 appears to be inflated. Not only is it much higher than the other two estimates, it also estimates the number of visual arts teachers employed full-time in Louisiana to be greater than the number of visual arts teachers in a majority of the 50 states. The second estimate of 361 is probably too low in that it allows for only one art teacher for each secondary school and does not include teachers at elementary or middle schools. This estimate does not even allow for more than one teacher at any secondary school in Louisiana. The 361 estimate should be even higher if art teachers in private schools were included.

 Optimistically, the need for qualified visual arts teachers will grow as school systems enhance their curricula by increasing visual arts instruction on all levels. Qualified visual arts instruction in the schools will often be a student's first formal opportunity to learn about visual arts in our culture, and full advantage
needs to be taken of each opportunity to educate students about the visual arts.

Recent events in Louisiana concerning the arts suggest a more promising future for visual arts in the state. The Superintendent's Task Force on Arts Education, which was established by the Louisiana Department of Education, has been working on arts in Louisiana education. The state Department of Education has recently conducted an arts survey (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1986-87), and the Arts Alliance has been visibly active in establishing workshops and conferences. Efforts have been directed to bringing public attention to the arts in Louisiana.

This potential for visual arts teachers offers Louisiana universities opportunities and responsibilities to provide the highest quality teacher preparation for future teachers. Visual arts education students are aspiring to become certified teachers. The nature and quality of influence that these art teachers will have on the education of the nation's (and Louisiana's) youth begins with the scope and sequence of their own education. The teacher preparation programs are a pivotal aspect of education reform.

**Visual Arts Teacher Preparation Programs in Louisiana's Public Universities**

Thirteen public universities currently offer teacher
preparation programs in visual arts education (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1985-86). Table 1 on the following page lists the thirteen public universities in alphabetical order. The present study analyzed their programs in relationship to National Art Education Association standards for effective training of art teachers.

According to this researcher's review of the literature through manual and computer searches, no one has previously conducted and documented a survey and analysis of Louisiana visual arts education programs. This study is an initial step toward establishing a plan for excellence in visual arts teacher preparation in Louisiana.

Related Studies

In a recent study, Rogers (1988) surveyed Alabama visual arts education programs. Rogers sent questionnaires based on the National Art Education Association standards to each institution of higher education that had an art education teacher training program for certification. He found the following serious problems in Alabama art education programs: lack of methods courses in the content of art education; lack of full-time art educators; insufficient requirements in art studio, art history, and advanced work; lack of breadth in studio offerings; and lack of preparation in related arts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities Included in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Public Louisiana Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Approved Programs Leading To Teacher Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grambling State University  
Louisiana State University  
Louisiana State University in Shreveport  
Louisiana Tech University  
McNeese State University  
Nicholls State University  
Northeast Louisiana University  
Northwestern State University of Louisiana  
Southeastern Louisiana University  
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College  
Southern University in New Orleans  
University of New Orleans  
University of Southwestern Louisiana  

(Louisiana State Department of Education, 1985-86, pp. 316-319, 324)
fields. He recommended that the Alabama State Department of Education upgrade its requirements in consideration of the National Art Education Association Standards and that the art education programs "should be required to remove the discrepancies between their programs and the [National Art Education Association] recommendations" (p. 106). In addition, Rogers recommended that an approved program should have a full-time qualified art educator and that art teachers should be prepared to use art materials safely.

Detailed analyses of programs in individual states can help to provide a perspective on visual arts education teacher preparation and certification. This and other state studies will provide a national composite on art education programs.

In other studies, researchers have analyzed visual arts teacher preparation, but none have addressed themselves to these questions as they apply to Louisiana programs. Sevigny (1987) discussed the status of visual arts teacher education and discipline-based art education (DBAE) focuses. He noted how the new directions of DBAE had affected the curriculum of teacher education. According to Sevigny, "teacher education in the visual arts is at the threshold of significant opportunity" (p. 121). He has advocated uniting discipline-based art education theory with teaching practices. Another scholar
has recently mailed questionnaires to selected university art education programs nationwide (Stankiewicz, personal communication, 1985), but the results have not been documented at this time. A comparison study of midwestern state visual arts teacher training programs was conducted and reported in a doctoral dissertation (Frattalone, 1975). A doctoral student at the University of Arizona conducted a study of art education at Al-Fateh University in Al-Jamahiriya, Libya (Ammar, 1987).

Since this study began, the Louisiana State Department of Education has established a Superintendent's Task Force on Arts Education (personal communication, 1989). It has recommended a three-year plan with five major objectives. One of the major objectives of the plan calls for strengthening "competency programs in the arts for teachers and administrators" (Louisiana State Department of Education's Superintendent's Task Force on Arts Education, personal communication, 1989). The task force offered the following specific recommendations to support this objective:

(a) Ensure that existing curricular standards for all presently required arts subjects (music and visual arts) be fully implemented by qualified teachers. 
(b)...[U]pgrade existing standards for visual arts and music teachers to reflect sequential instruction, including the elements of production, history,
aesthetics and criticism. Evaluate existing standards for music and visual arts. Based on first year assessment, develop and present revised music and visual arts standards to BESE for consideration.

(c) Develop state arts in-service programs and institutes for administrators and teachers.

(d) Offer incentive programs to encourage collaboration between higher education and school districts for arts program enhancement. (personal communication, 1989)

The task force was established for three years and is continuing to conduct its work. The task force's recommendations for qualified arts teachers and upgraded standards plus the need for in-service education and universities working with the teachers in the classrooms are consistent with a number of recommendations that are made in this study. The findings of this study provide data and analyses that could help implement plans that call for modification in teacher preparation.

Focus of Issues

The following questions have evolved through studying the problem and reviewing pertinent research and literature. Even though the researcher has not attempted to provide specific answers to each of the following questions, they have provided direction and order for the study and have helped formulate procedures to obtain
essential information through on-site research.

1. National standards

What criteria, goals, and standards for visual arts teacher education are established by the J. Paul Getty Trust's Getty Center for Education in the Arts ( Getty Center), National Art Education Association (NAEA), National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), and National Council on Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)?

2. State standards

What are the art education standards established by the Louisiana State Department of Education with regard to teacher education and certification?

What evaluative criteria have been established for evaluating art education programs?

Who evaluates art education programs in Louisiana colleges and universities?

When are art education programs in Louisiana evaluated?

What is required by the Louisiana State Department of Education for teacher certification in art education, kindergarten through high school?

3. State programs

Which Louisiana colleges and universities offer undergraduate art teacher certification (kindergarten through high school) programs?
What department (art/education/other) in each college or university directs the art education degree programs? Who is in charge? Who makes decisions governing these programs and their directions?

What courses are students in art education required to take?

Who teaches visual arts teacher preparation courses in Louisiana art education programs?

What are the credentials of the professors or instructors who teach visual arts teacher preparation courses?

4. Discrepancies and recommendations
What discrepancies can be identified in the current practices of art teacher preparation programs in Louisiana when analyzed and compared with delineated national goals and state standards?

What new directions are possible and desirable in light of the information gathered and analyzed about art teacher preparation in Louisiana?

Limitations of Study

In conducting this research, the following limitations constituted the parameters of the study:

1. This study included universities from only one state, Louisiana.

2. This study included only data from public universities.
3. This study focused on the curriculum component of visual arts teacher education programs.

4. The study depended upon the willingness and ability of individuals at each university to meet with the interviewer and answer specified questions.

5. The study depended upon thorough and accurate recording of responses from interviews.

Definition of Terms

Art education or visual arts education. Art education and visual arts education are used interchangeably to refer to the study of the visual arts and learning how to teach them to others.

Arts education. Arts education is not limited to the visual arts; it also encompasses dance, drama, literary arts, and music, i.e., visual, performing, and literary arts.

Certification. Certification is a procedure whereby teachers are licensed according to established state criteria. The requirements for teacher certification vary from state to state.

Discipline-based art education. Discipline-based art education refers to an approach to teaching art education which emphasizes sequential activities to help students develop abilities for making art, examining art, and reading and talking about art. Discipline-based art education incorporates the following four content areas
for art instruction: aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production.

**Getty Center For Education in the Arts.** The Getty Center for Education in the Arts was created by the J. Paul Getty Trust in 1983 to revitalize education in the arts so that it has a respected place in general education (Duke, 1984).

**J. Paul Getty Trust.** The J. Paul Getty Trust is a private operating foundation with one of its goals focused on improving the quality of arts education (Duke, 1984).

**Teacher preparation or teacher education.** Teacher preparation and teacher education are used interchangeably to refer to programs offered in some colleges and universities for students who want to become certified teachers in various areas of study.

**Visual arts.** Visual arts encompass artistic expressions that result in visible compositions. Visual arts are not limited to drawing, painting, and sculpture, but include all two-dimensional and three-dimensional art work.

The names of the following organizations and terms are often referred to by the indicated acronyms or abbreviated names:

**Discipline-Based Art Education.** DBAE

**Getty Center for Education in the Arts.** Getty Center

**J. Paul Getty Trust.** Getty Trust
Summary

This research project was designed to contribute to reform in education, particularly visual arts education, by focusing on the preparation of teachers. Borg and Gall (1983) propose that the major reason to conduct educational research is "to develop new knowledge about teaching and learning and administration...because it will lead eventually to the improvement of educational practice" (p. 4).

This chapter has introduced the study and defined its focus. The chapters that follow describe the study and its recommendations. Chapter II contains a review of literature concerning educational reform with particular focus on visual arts teacher preparation and how the research literature can inform practice in Louisiana. Chapter III contains a description of the methodology used in the study. In Chapter IV, the findings of the study are presented. Chapter V is focused on recommendations.
based on the findings as well as recommendations for future investigations.
CHAPTER II
Review of Literature

This review of research and literature focuses on issues in education, visual arts education, and teacher certification as these relate to visual arts teacher preparation. The emphasis of this review is on the current visual arts education movements with some historical influences noted. The review begins with a focus on national issues in general education and then addresses national visual arts education issues. In the review, the researcher examines recommendations and policies from both national and state sources to gain insight into the status of current reform movements in visual arts education. The purpose of this examination of the literature and research is to examine theories and practices as they influence visual arts education programs in Louisiana.

Education in General

Leaders in the United States are seeking ways to improve the quality of education in schools of the nation. Concerned citizens as well as national leaders are searching for what is deemed to be both the right answers and the right questions (Adler, 1982; Boyer, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).
Not only are elementary and secondary school programs being assessed, but education of teachers for those schools is also under scrutiny (Cetron, Soriano, & Gayle, 1985). Various sources (e.g., Boyer, 1983) document that the people of the United States are concerned about education and how it affects the quality of life.

The concern for education in the United States has grown as the status of the country has been detrimentally influenced by the technological and economic successes of other countries (Bennett, 1985; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Leaders and citizens in this country who are concerned about educational problems as they relate to economic success are calling for greater emphasis on education (Boyer, 1984). The hopes are that reforms will improve education and that the United States will regain what is perceived as loss of status as a world leader (Bell, 1984). Bennett (1985) and others have drawn attention to the loss of cultural heritage.

Boyer (1983), President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, claimed that education should be a federal governmental priority if it is a national concern and has made strong recommendations in his presentations. He has suggested that educators could look at teaching situations where students succeed. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) also recommended looking at schools in light of successes.
According to Adler (1982), Chapman (1982), and Sizer (1984), teachers are the key to the educational picture, inasmuch as teachers are the guides to learning. Insight into how to train teachers can be gained by knowing what contributes to well-prepared teachers who succeed in classrooms. Sizer (1984) recommended that teachers as classroom leaders should be role models for students and that they should possess a sense of order and sound judgment that inspires students. In addition, he suggested that high levels of subject matter knowledge be accompanied by strong teaching skills. In *Academic Work and Educational Excellence* (Tomlinson & Walberg, 1986), the editors emphasized that teachers need to master the subject matter in their areas of teaching. These authors also stressed teacher communication skills and management skills as essential to teacher effectiveness. Eisner (1972) pointed out the importance of the teacher's ability to communicate and work with students.

Recently, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a), the Holmes Group (1986), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1985), to name a few, have been developing proposals with recommendations about improving teacher education in this nation. These groups have been investigating teacher preparation in view of the impact this research can have on educating the children and youth in our schools.
The Holmes Group (1986) was a "consortium of education deans and chief academic officers from the major research universities in each of the fifty states" (p. 3), whose goal was to reform teacher education. By critical analysis of teacher education, the Holmes Group aimed to find ways to improve teacher preparation programs in universities. The Holmes Group proposals called for research in education and for research to be closely linked to educational practice. The Holmes Group also advocated improvements in teacher training and in the schools where teachers will practice.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is an authorized accreditation agency in the field of school personnel preparation. In 1985, it prepared a new proposal for accreditation standards. The NCATE Redesign (1985) was not as controversial as other reform proposals. However, it has been noted that research and scholarly activities were emphasized and that these changes could be problematic for some institutions (Association of Teacher Educators, 1986). The NCATE proposals also called for changes in admission and exit requirements that could create problems for colleges or universities that previously met NCATE criteria. However, in Visions of Reform (Association of Teacher Educators, 1986), the NCATE Redesign was described as causing fewer compliance problems than either the Carnegie Forum on
Education and the Economy (1986a) or the Holmes Group (1986) proposals.

The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a) is a program of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It published a report, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, which was issued by the Forum's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. The report presented recommendations on restructuring schools and on raising standards for teachers and students. In a subsequent study commissioned by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986b), citizens of the United States were surveyed to measure public opinion on issues in education. In the survey, public opinion supported emphasis on raising teachers' standards and accountability and on stressing improved student performance.

Scholars have also supported reforms in education programs. According to Cetron, Soriano, and Gayle (1985), teacher preparation has been inadequate. These authors interviewed David Imig of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education who is quoted as saying, "'teacher education is and ought to be the next focus of those trying to improve the schools'" (Cetron et al., p. 113). Lansing (1985) has advocated changes in teacher education as a first priority in educational reform. Goodlad (1986) has also called attention to issues in teacher education. He advocated "enlarging [the]
teacher's repertoire of pedagogical skills" (p. 13) and noted the importance of teacher preparation and the impact role models have on the way teachers teach. He called for close working relationships between universities and the schools in the communities.

As leaders in education and national organizations seek to modify current practices for educating teachers, institutions training the teachers who work in American schools are being investigated (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). It is necessary and timely to assess current practices and current goals of university teacher preparation programs.

National Education Recommendations

In an effort to begin focusing on the standards for teacher education which have appeared in the literature, the summaries from some of the recommendations are presented. This section addresses the proposals and standards of the Holmes Group (1986), the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1985), the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a), and the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). Recommendations of leaders in education are also presented.

A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) recommended assessment of teacher preparation programs. The report also recommended that
the preparation of teachers be improved and that the status of the teaching profession be elevated. The Holmes Group (1986) has called for making improvements in the work environment and for instituting levels of professional competency in the teaching profession.

Most of the groups have recommended the importance of competency in the content area of teacher preparation. One controversial proposal has been to extend teacher education programs for more than four undergraduate years. Boyer (1983) and the Holmes Group (1986) have both recommended a curriculum for teacher preparation that includes a fifth year.

Reform recommendations from the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a), Holmes Group (1986), and NCATE Redesign (1985) have common focuses as well as some differences. These three proposals were compared in a report prepared by the Association of Teacher Educators (1986). According to this report, all three organizations recommended the following: (a) recruiting minority teachers, (b) requiring basic skills and liberal arts background, (c) ensuring subject-matter competence, (d) developing clinical experiences and demonstration schools, (e) promoting internships and residencies, (f) supporting teacher induction, (g) encouraging multiple evaluations, (h) implementing a systematic knowledge base, (i) developing a coherent professional curriculum, and
(j) providing additional resources for teacher preparation.

In pointing out other similarities, the Association of Teacher Educators report (1986) noted that seven additional items were supported by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, but not in NCATE Redesign: (a) increasing teacher responsibilities and authority, (b) requiring a bachelor's degree prior to professional study, (c) extending formal preparation and certification period, (d) admitting novices contingent upon testing, (e) differentiating career opportunities, (f) improving teacher salaries and working conditions, and (g) eliminating undergraduate education majors.

The Association of Teacher Educators report (1986) also noted several distinctive aspects of the three proposals. Only the NCATE Redesign (1985) proposed that experimentation and innovation be encouraged. Both the NCATE Redesign (1985) proposal and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a) proposal recommended developing school technology. The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986a) proposal was the only one suggesting that student performance be related to teacher incentives and that a national board be created for education.

The proposals of the Carnegie Forum on Education and
the Economy (1986a) and the Holmes Group (1986) both supported their position of extending the teacher preparation program into graduate studies by explaining that there is inadequate time to accomplish mastery in specialty areas and also in teaching skills in an undergraduate degree program alone. This proposal has advocated a strong background in the subjects that the prospective teacher will be teaching.

NCATE's (1987) Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units established standards in five categories: (a) knowledge bases for professional education, (b) relationship to the world of practice, (c) students, (d) faculty, and (e) governance and resources. When presenting the criteria for compliance for the standards, NCATE called for general education, specialty studies, and professional studies to complement one another.

In NCATE (1987) literature, concerns are expressed regarding education students attaining high academic competency in their specialty areas in which they plan to teach and work. These concerns about teacher competency in special content areas reinforce the significance of, and need for, a study that focuses on Louisiana visual arts teacher training. NCATE (1987) lists criteria for compliance for each of the standards. However, relevant to the focus of this study, the criteria for the specialty
studies are as follows:

(1) The specialty studies component is a well-planned sequence of courses and experiences that includes academic, methodological, and clinical knowledge necessary for professional competence in teaching or other professional education assignments.

(2) The guidelines and standards of professional learned societies are used in the development of an appropriate sequence of courses for each specialty area.

(3) The specialty studies provide education students with a mastery of the structure, skills, concepts, ideas, values, facts, and methods of inquiry that constitute their fields of specialization.

(4) Faculty in the professional education unit and faculty who teach the specialty studies from other academic units collaborate in program planning and evaluation of specialty studies. (NCATE, 1987, p. 39)

The second criterion refers to the guidelines and standards formulated by professional organizations, such as the National Art Education Association (NAEA) standards (Wygant, 1979). The component of the field of specialization relies on the expertise of educators and the policies embraced by the leadership within the field. The NAEA standards and policies are used as criteria in evaluations by NCATE and others.
Boyer (1983) recommended a five-year curriculum for teacher preparation. He recommended that the freshman and sophomore years be focused on the core curriculum and that at the junior and senior levels a student be admitted to teacher education programs on the basis of faculty recommendations and a B average. Students would also pursue their academic major and begin making classroom observations early in their teacher preparation programs.

According to Boyer (1983), students will continue classroom observations and participate in student teaching in the fifth year. He further recommended professional career courses in the fifth year which will cover the following topics: (a) schooling in America, (b) learning theory and research, (c) teaching of writing, and (d) use of technology. Boyer prescribed this five-year program for teacher certification.

NCATE's (1987) criteria for compliance in the general education component would be comparable to Boyer's core curriculum. NCATE literature has contained concerns that the sequence of courses be well-planned and that they include "theoretical and practical knowledge gained from studies in communications, mathematics, science, history, philosophy, literature and the arts" (NCATE, 1987, p. 38). NCATE literature further stated that the general education courses (core curriculum) should provide "an intellectual foundation in liberal arts and general studies...that are
appropriate to the background of individual students" (1987, p. 38).

Orlich (1989) discussed educational reform and the inclination for reform to fail. He noted the preponderance of task forces, books, and reports in the 1980s on educational reform. Orlich (1989) described most school reform as political by nature and short-lived. He cautioned educators to attend to the "limitations, assumptions, and omissions" (p. 513) when considering reform issues.

In the history of art education, reforms have met similar problems. The authors of *Visions of Reform* (Association of Teacher Educators, 1986) noted that reform is a difficult process requiring the making of tough choices. Moreover, the Association of Teacher Educators' report has also pointed out that one of the strengths of the United States has been diversity and the ability to adjust to and create change.

**Visual Arts Education in General**

Reform movements are also evident in visual arts education. Art educators are raising issues and seeking answers. Philanthropic organizations, government agencies, state departments of education, and universities involved in visual arts education are struggling with curriculum issues and ways to implement the best possible arts programs.
Gough (1989) has admonished professionals to examine their knowledge bases periodically and has cautioned against prejudging the outcome of the examinations. She also indicated that modification in practice would result from and follow after open evaluation.

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Getty Center) has assumed a leadership role in art education reform issues (Duke, 1984). Discussions about the proposals of the Getty Center have dominated art education since the publication of Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools in 1985. In this publication, the Getty Center (1985) described and identified what they considered to be "serious visual arts programs" (p. 4) and outlined plans for developing disciplined-based art programs. Hausman (1987) has noted that one of the helpful aspects of the Getty Center's leadership in the arts has been the focus on certain questions "that reach to the heart of what art education is all about" (p. 58).

As change has been recommended in art education, opposition has also quickly surfaced (Hamblen, 1985c; Lansing, 1986; London, 1988b). If thorough examinations of issues and of past experiences can be accomplished, then perhaps the reform and the change that is implemented will meet with less opposition. Change has been taking place in visual arts education even though there have been different avenues for reform. Art education leaders have
recommended diverse courses of action.

**Historical Overview**

In discussing histories of art education, Hamblen (1985b) indicated that written "histories help to create what we are able to consider in the future" (p. 8). Gaining understanding of or knowing about past conflicts, reforms, and curricula can help interpret present visual arts education movements and controversies. Soucy (1985) warned that the historical reports of art education often tend to cite the "best" aspects of past practices which in effect has created a history of past successes. He noted that this bias presents a limited history. In an effort to understand current theory and practice in art education, this review of literature will now focus on a brief historical survey of events and movements in visual arts education.

**Early History of Visual Arts Education.** Visual arts education has been in the rigors of change and evolution since the beginning of its history (Chapman, 1978; Efland, 1987; Logan, 1955). Efland (1987) described the general movements in art education as they varied from the late 1800s until the mid-1900s. In the late 1800s, art education in America was based on modifications of England's model of industrial drawing. Walter Smith, who came to the United States from England, was instrumental in implementing industrial drawing in art education in
Massachusetts during this time (Wygant, 1983). Chalmers (1985) called Walter Smith "the founding father of American public school art education" (p. 108). According to Chalmers, Smith's position was being challenged through historical research, and his subsequent influence in Canada was even more substantial and less controversial. In addition to Walter Smith, Soucy (1985) cited other major nineteenth century art education leaders such as D. R. Augsburg, William Bartholomew, William B. Fowle, and Horace Mann.

Efland (1987) indicated that after an emphasis on the practical industrial application for art education, the cultural aspects of art became the focus of art education around the turn of the century. Efland explained that art appreciation also began to appear in the content of art education. Economic situations in the country directly influenced the art education curriculum, and during economically depressed times, such as during the 1930s, art educators turned toward everyday application of design principles and toward using art in an integrated approach to help teach other subjects.

Lowenfeld Era. During the 1950s, Viktor Lowenfeld was a leader in child-centered art education (Eisner, 1972). Lowenfeld was well-known as the advocate for a studio, hands-on, experiential approach to teaching art (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1968). Lowenfeld and supporters of
his theories have been the impetus behind many commonly held assumptions for visual arts education. Eisner (1987) reported that Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth*, which was originally published in 1947, "has had the single most important influence on the teaching of art in American schools" (p. 51). The child-centered Lowenfeld paradigm supported an art environment where freedom to be creative, original, and spontaneous was encouraged (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1968). Such instructional characteristics were considered tantamount to Lowenfeld "law." Lowenfeld advocated art instruction for creativity, individualism, self-expression, and its therapeutic value. These Lowenfeld values are still very much a part of the traditions in visual arts education (Eisner, 1987); however, proposed changes in visual arts education since Lowenfeld's death in 1960 have focused on other aspects of art education. Leadership in art education began to call attention to art as a discipline with content, in addition to art experiences through production. Efland (1987) indicated that new focuses in art education theory, which had shifted away from child-centered to subject-centered, were beginning to receive attention from art education leadership as early as the 1960s.

After the disappointment experienced in the United States over Soviet success in space science in the late
1950s, concerned leaders began to search for ways to reform education. The perception of scientific inferiority was a shock which brought about urgent investigations into educational practices. Science was a key target of examinations, but some of the science curriculum reform proposals were linked with arts education (Efland, 1987).

The Woods Hole Conference (Bruner, 1960), held in 1959 at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, was focused on the issues of academic subjects and their purposes. Bruner and Zacharias were leaders of the conference. Postman and Weingartner (1973) have reported that the two leaders "embraced the idea that the purpose of studying a subject was to learn how to think" (p. 6). That also called attention to Bruner's earlier introduction of the concept of "the structure of a discipline," which indicated that professionals in each subject or discipline had a "unique way of asking questions and finding answers" (p. 6). This structure constituted the content of what the student should learn. Moreover, Bruner considered that students would learn best by doing and recommended that they should be engaged in problem solving and inquiry procedures (Bruner, 1960).

Recent Developments. Due in part to science and general education reform efforts to focus education strongly on the basics, curriculum changes in visual arts
have been similarly influenced. In theory, visual arts education began turning toward a more subject-centered and discipline-oriented approach through the concerted efforts of leadership in the field (Efland, 1987).

The work of Barkan, Eisner, and others, focused on aesthetic education as the discipline of art education (Efland, 1987). Aesthetic education encompassed teaching art through not only art production, but also art criticism and art history. Eisner and Barkan made presentations at A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development at Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania in 1965. Their curriculum proposals have been essential aspects of aesthetic education. This 1965 conference has come to be known simply as the Penn State Conference.

Barkan (1963) explained that art education could become a discipline if it developed a definitive structure for instructional content. He indicated that art education lacked strategy and approach, and he called for "greater clarity and adequacy" (p. 9) to gain control of art education as a discipline. Barkan described art history, art criticism, and aesthetics as disciplines "rooted in and dependent upon the disciplines of art and philosophy" (p. 5). According to Barkan, the main concern of art education was "the teaching of art" (p. 6), in which he included: making art, art history, art
criticism, art philosophy, and people involved with the arts.

Barkan's proposals and other similar and supportive ideas presented at the conference constituted what has been called aesthetic education. According to Broudy (1981, 1987), the purpose of studying art as a discipline was to become aesthetically knowledgeable. The professional role models of artist, art critic, art historian, and aesthetician, and their attendant disciplines, provide access to knowledge and experiences that result in an aesthetically educated citizenry.

McFee (1984) has cited the ideas presented at the Penn State Conference as instrumental in essentially all art education theory and research subsequent to 1965. McFee noted that the key purpose of the seminar was "to generate quality research in art education" in the content areas, which included "the philosophy, history, criticism, production, and the social contexts of art and design" (p. 276). McFee also indicated that, in the 1960s, art education was operating from a position of strength with financial support for research. She described the Penn State Seminar as providing "a comprehensive interdisciplinary base that sets art education within the broad subject of art, as it is operant in the psycho-social, philosophical and curricular base of education, as education fits within the workings and
functions of society and culture" (1984, p. 280). McFee concluded that the seminar was extremely important but that it failed to influence practice significantly. She advocated holding similar conferences regularly every five years in order to examine theory and translate it into practice.

In theory and research efforts, during the 1960s "visual perception, art history, and aesthetic development emerge[d] as co-partners with the making of art" (Kern, 1985, p. 49). Kern explained that creativity had lost its place of dominance by the 1970s and that the major subjects in the art curriculum were: (a) visual perception, (b) art production, (c) art history, and (d) art criticism.

After 1965, art education theory shifted away from Lowenfeld and moved toward emphasizing the "importance of content and an educated understanding of art itself" (Smith, 1987, p. 3). Smith listed the same disciplines for art education as Kern, except that he used the category of aesthetics instead of visual perception. Smith has credited art educators in the 1960s with initiating thinking and writing which was aimed at a systematic approach to art as a discipline which would constitute aesthetic education. Smith credited Barkan, Eisner, Feldman, and Lanier as leaders in the 1960s who were establishing aesthetic education as the new focus of
art education. According to Smith (1987), in the 1970s, Chalmers, McFee, and others were stressing the sociological and anthropological aspects of art as a parallel to aesthetic education and the subject-centered focus. The attention on cultural and social foundations for art education has continued into the present decade (Chalmers, 1987).

In his book, *Becoming Human Through Art*, Feldman (1970) acknowledged that he was writing during a time of turmoil in education. In support of aesthetic education's focus, Feldman noted similarities with his theories. He defined the nature of art through three dimensions: (a) anthropological and historical, (b) creative and psychological, and (c) social and cultural. Feldman presented four stages of art criticism which have been widely used in art education. These four stages are: description, analysis, interpretation, and judgment. He encouraged dialogue and responding to art through art criticism. He de-emphasized the studio art approach, and his work reflected new areas of concern in the field of art education. Feldman (1970) advocated responsive activities in teaching the visual arts, especially art criticism activities.

In the late 1970s, Hurwitz and Madeja (1977) authored a text on art appreciation. These authors noted the shift in art education away from a child-centered approach.
toward an emphasis on content. They advocated art appreciation and the critical analysis of art objects, in addition to art history and art production.

In recent years, the new, content-focused approach to art education has been designated as discipline-based art education (DBAE). Clark, Day, and Greer (1987) provided the following summarized definition of discipline-based art education:

a major shift in theory and practice in the field of art education that had its beginnings a quarter century ago...a contemporary orientation to art education that presents a broad view of art and emphasizes art in the general education of all students from kindergarten through high school. This approach integrates content from four art disciplines, namely, aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production, through a focus on works of art. (pp. 130-131)

Smith (1987) has indicated that DBAE theories have been founded on "recent developments in the field of art education" (p. 4) and "that the understanding and appreciation of works of art are as educationally valuable as creating art; or...that experiencing works of art aesthetically is as significant as producing them" (p. 4).

Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE)

Efland (1987) credited Dwaine Greer for coining the
term discipline-based art education (DBAE), but Efland also traced the early elements of this curriculum theory back to seminars and conferences in the late 1950s and 1960s, one being the Penn State Conference of 1965. Efland stated that, in addition to Greer, the following art educators have been key participants in the evolution of art education curriculum reform from the 1960s and 1970s: Manuel Barkan, Harry Broudy, Laura Chapman, Elliot Eisner, Frances Hine, Guy Hubbard, Stanley Madeja, and Mary Rouse. These art educators focused their efforts on aesthetic education. In recent years, efforts to implement these modifications in visual arts education have been stronger and more focused, due in part to the powerful leadership of the J. Paul Getty Trust through the Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Duke (1984), who is the director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, explained that curriculum studies have recognized the importance of "subjects that nurture creative thought and expression, develop understanding of diverse cultural values, and foster the ability to communicate nonverbally" (p. 612). Duke also reiterated the importance of including the arts to provide curriculum balance. According to Duke, the Getty Center was founded on these premises:

First, because the arts are a repository of culture, study of the arts is a principal means of
understanding human experience and transmitting cultural values; a human being is never adequately educated without having studied the arts. Second, if a significant change is to occur in the way the arts are perceived by the public and taught in the schools, we need a more comprehensive understanding of which arts are taught and how. (p. 612)

The Getty Center report, Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America’s Schools (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985), identified three stages in the future implementation of DBAE programs. The first stage was development and included five steps: (a) stating the conceptual base for the program; (b) gaining understanding for the conceptual base; (c) involving school administrators, teachers, and principals; (d) utilizing art advocates; and (e) establishing outside resources through funding and professional expertise.

The second stage focused on implementation. It included these steps: (a) specifying instructional goals; (b) formulating a written, sequential curriculum that includes content from the disciplines of art history, art production, art criticism, and aesthetics; (c) gaining support from superintendent and school administrators; (d) expanding the role of the art supervisor; and (e) establishing concrete, ongoing training for teachers. Implementation of DBAE programs was to be done on a
district-wide basis, not by individual schools or classrooms.

Maintenance of DBAE programs was the third stage explained in Beyond Creating. It called for: (a) the principal's commitment to sustaining a strong program, (b) strategies for program review and development, and (c) ongoing training for new teachers and staff.

The 1985 report from the Getty Center recommended further study and research. Getty leadership specifically called for investigation into the number of postsecondary institutions engaged in training in visual arts education and into details about course work in art education available to art teachers and general teachers. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Getty Center) and the National Art Education Association (NAEA) have been investigating ways to improve art education and have been gathering information about the art programs offered in American schools. They have also begun initial investigations of ways to evaluate and to modify teacher training in art education.

Getty Center, Snowbird Conference. Duke (1984) has also called for research into the training of teachers. The Snowbird Conference in 1988 was a result of 3 years of study focused on preservice art education. The seven-day seminar was held in 1988 in Snowbird, Utah in order "to respond to the need for strengthening preservice teacher
education programs in art in relation to DBAE" (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988, p. ix). The 60 participants were invited as interdisciplinary teams from 15 institutions. The Getty Center for Education in the Arts' (1988) seminar proceedings, *The Preservice Challenge: Discipline-Based Art Education and Recent Reports on Higher Education*, is a compilation of ideas generated about teacher preparation in the arts.

Each institution was asked to send representatives from art education, studio production, art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. Universities were selected to attend the seminar on the basis of: "(1) the strength of the preservice arts education program at the institution, coupled with the extent to which the program was already involved with discipline-based art education; and (2) geographic diversity" (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988, p. x).

The director for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts stated that discipline-based art education "is being accepted as a new paradigm for teaching children how to create, understand, and respond to art," and that "it is incumbent on teacher education institutions preparing future art specialists and classroom teachers to enable them to teach art in this more comprehensive and substantive way" ( Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988, p. vii). The proceedings noted the universities
that attended but did not identify the universities that were unable to accept invitations.

In the Getty Center seminar document, the present climate was described "as one of major changes in preservice education" (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988, p. ix). In the introductory remarks, the director explained that one of the special concerns of the Getty Center was "preservice education, the long-term professional preparation of teachers who are qualified to offer instruction in art" (p. vii). It was further explained that it was important to Getty that the art education programs "reflect content from four foundational art disciplines" (p. vii). The Getty document also made reference to numerous recent reports that are cited in this paper. Concern was expressed about the fact that the Holmes Group recommendations proposed increasing the criteria for teacher preparation without any guarantees about compensation in increased salaries for these prospective teachers. Administratively, the financial resources and implications of implementing DBAE were noted to be problematic.

As a key contributor to the proceedings, Feldman (1988) recommended the following for teacher preparation in the visual arts: (a) adding faculty capable of teaching the content areas (with critics, philosophers, and historians that were very knowledgeable about the
visual arts); (b) adding new courses, particularly in philosophy of art and aesthetics; (c) adding a fifth year to the visual arts program; (d) ensuring that looking at art and experiencing art are the foundations for integrating the arts and talking about the arts; and (e) finding ways to gain faculty cooperation about what is taught and how it is taught.

Sevigny (1988) reviewed reform reports as part of his contribution to the Getty Center seminar. He proposed 15 goals that addressed a broad spectrum of reform issues.

Sevigny's first eight goals focused on the potential for improvements in undergraduate teacher preparation programs. In the initial goal, he recommended that art educators "clarify the teaching competencies necessary to implement DBAE" (p. 149). The next two goals stressed the need to improve the quality of potential art educators. Specifically, Sevigny urged the Snowbird Seminar participants "to develop action plans to recruit more qualified candidates for implementing DBAE concepts" and "to raise the prerequisite requirement[s] and preadmission standards for art education degree programs" (p. 149). The next five goals focused on needed changes in undergraduate programs of instruction. Sevigny called for restructuring "the academic requirements in the four DBAE content areas," redesigning professional courses to "make better use of clinical and field observation," improving
"methods for the qualitative evaluation of teacher knowledge and competency," collecting "case-study models (protocols) that take into account critical and verbal skills and demonstrate the use of appropriate instructional resources to implement DBAE goals," and making better use and monitoring of "academic preparation in the liberal arts" (Sevigny, 1988, p. 149).

The remainder of Sevigny's goals focused on other institutions and agencies with which art educators interact. He urged explorations of "the potential of postbaccalaureate programs and extended programs;" efforts "to influence changes that favor DBAE in state-mandated requirements;" examinations of "the relationship of advanced research degrees and career-ladder doctoral study to improve on the professional standards for teacher certification;" the development of "participatory incentives for faculty in the art disciplines to better utilize them as alternative role models in art teacher preparation;" stronger "liaisons among the professional role models in the disciplines, art education faculty, the public schools, and personnel from state education agencies;" use of "collaborative teacher-training supervision teams--comprised of public school personnel, faculty from [the] four disciplines, and art education staff;" and improvements in "knowledge about the optimum conditions for sequencing learning and integrating the
four components of DBAE through increased support for
descriptive, evaluative, and experimental research" (Sevigny, 1988, pp. 149-150).

Changes in visual arts education like those in
general education have often been influenced by economic
interests (Bolin, 1985), and the state of the economy has
affected the implementation of art education in the
schools. Moreover, unlike some subjects that have been
considered academic basics, art education has often been
one of the first areas of education to be curtailed or
eliminated when the economy is depressed. Visual arts
education curriculum reformers have been attempting to
secure a place for visual arts in the core of general
education and to avoid fluctuations in support (Duke,
1984).

Boyer (1985) has strongly advocated for the arts to
be an integral part of each person's education. He has
also claimed that "aesthetic literacy is as basic as
linguistic literacy" (p. 8) and that art provides ways to
extend our language and communication. Boyer (1985)
warned against a fragmented, isolated treatment of the
arts.

General education goals plus visual arts education
goals result in a complex framework for art education
programs. It is further complicated by the broad range of
art education certification requirements. Teachers
prepared for art education generally obtain their undergraduate degrees in art education, with certification not just for elementary or for secondary but for all grades, kindergarten through twelfth.

In *Issues, Influences, Strategies, and Tactics in State Certification Policy Development* published by the National Art Education Association (NAEA) and National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) (1982), the two organizations indicated that some state certification standards are of serious concern. In addressing certification issues, the authors of this report expressed concern over proposals which threaten the visual arts component of the teacher preparation curriculum. They cautioned that prospective visual arts teachers need sufficient artistic competence to fulfill their role as art teachers (NAEA & NASAD, 1982). These authors further recommended that analysis of teacher preparation and certification be done which is "intensive, thorough, and sophisticated before workable and effective action plans can be drafted" (NAEA & NASAD, 1982, p. 7).

National Art Education Recommendations

This section of the review focuses on recommendations made by NAEA, individual art educators, Getty, and others that nationally address art education issues. This is not to imply that a consensus exists on one theory in art education. There have historically been conflicts over

the content of art education, and current events emphasize ongoing debates. The focus on a content, subject-centered approach represents a major shift that challenges what and how most teachers currently teach art. As a result, new problems need to be confronted to address the new directions in art education and conflicts that surface.

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has strongly advocated research in arts education. This organization has recommended that more support for research in arts education is needed and that improving instruction should be one major focus in research. Research is particularly important with the need for new focuses in teacher preparation in content areas. The authors of the NEA report, *Toward Civilization* (NEA, 1988), advocated curriculum positions similar to DBAE. However, they also strongly recommended that art specialists are needed in all schools, which has not been an emphasis for DBAE.

**National Endowment for the Arts**

*Toward Civilization* (NEA, 1988), a report on arts education, was commissioned by the United States Congress to study the arts and humanities education in public schools and to identify factors influencing the quality of education in the arts and humanities. In the report, the case was eloquently presented for the arts with supporting evidence cited from United States Presidents and numerous
national reports. This report was a treatise on the arts that stated how the arts contribute to life and the improvement of the nation.

According to the report's discussion of arts education, many of the challenges facing our children and youth will be cultural. In the report, the authors stated that the arts can help with these cultural challenges and decisions by teaching people "to see and [to] hear as well as [to] read and [to] write" (p. v). They also indicated that many art teachers need to be better prepared in the areas of art history and art criticism. The following was recommended for arts education:

Basic arts education must give students the essence of our civilization, the civilizations which have contributed to ours, and the more distant civilizations which enrich world civilization as a whole. It must give students tools for creating, for communicating and understanding others' communications, and for making informed and critical choices. (NEA, 1988, p. 13)

The visual arts and design are described as including painting, sculpture, photography, video, crafts, architecture, landscape and interior design, and product and graphic design.

The report also included a recommendation that the arts be "taught sequentially by qualified teachers" (NEA,
1988, p. 13) and that instruction include art history, critical theory, and ideas of the arts in addition to creation, production, and performance. The report also calls for testing of knowledge and skills in the arts. Future art specialists need to be enrolled in teacher preparation programs that provide "education in the art form with education in teaching methods and actual practice in the classrooms, and [that] employ professors of art education to teach pedagogy in such a way that methods are not divorced from content" (p. 29).

According to the recommendations presented in Toward Civilization, the curriculum for the K-12 arts specialists should include seven areas. Training is proposed in: (a) history and critical analysis of the art form, (b) art production and performance, (c) at least half of the university course work should be in art courses and these courses should meet standards and recommendations of NASAD, (d) methods courses in arts education as an integral part of substantive instruction in the arts (not separated out as recommended in the Holmes and Carnegie reports), (e) faculty ideas about arts teaching which have been tested in actual teaching situations in elementary and secondary classrooms, (f) teacher qualifications that are tested prior to teacher certification, and (g) teacher preparation programs that are evaluated.

The National Endowment for the Arts (1988) identified
these six components in which art teachers should be taught and evaluated: (a) general education (liberal arts), (b) art knowledge in the context of history and culture, (c) art analysis ability, (d) art performance and skill competencies, (e) art education issues, and (f) lesson planning and pedagogy skills.

Recommendations were made in Toward Civilization (NEA, 1988) that teacher preparation programs should emphasize the value of working with local artists and art institutions. Its authors further advocated the importance of recruiting highly capable students with special attention to the recruitment of minority students. They explained that the teacher training process should help prospective teachers understand professional advancement and career options, as well as professional organizations, conferences, publications, and literature.

NAEA and NASAD

The National Art Education Association (NAEA) is a national, professional organization for art educators. National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) is a national, professional accrediting agency for art and design education. Both NAEA and NASAD have cautioned against portraying a state of crisis to obtain public response. In Issues, Influences, Strategies, and Tactics in State Certification Policy Development, co-authored by NAEA and NASAD (1982), art educators were reminded to work
in a spirit of appreciation for "previous work, even as a building base for improvement" (p. 20). The NAEA and NASAD position was critical of reform that portrays the current art education system as a failure. They cautioned art educators not to abandon active involvement in the arts. The NAEA and NASAD warned against an emphasis that only deals with studying artists and neglects involvement in art production. They also argued against relying on general classroom teachers for art instruction and cautioned against justifying art instruction by using art to teach other subjects. Finally, NAEA and NASAD recommended "preservation and expansion" (p. 20) to build on the current strengths of art education as well as using professionally competent art teachers to continue implementing visual arts programs.

NAEA Standards

In Standards for Art Teacher Preparation Programs (Wygant, 1979), NAEA has outlined standards for visual arts teacher preparation programs. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has endorsed these NAEA standards and used them for criteria in their accrediting standards for teacher education in art (Wygant, 1979). According to Wygant (1979), these NAEA standards were to augment NCATE standards. They were also adopted by National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) with certain specifications.
The NAEA standards consist of detailed recommendations for the program of study for visual arts teacher preparation and were written according to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's Recommended Standards for Teacher Education. The NAEA standards encompass categories about curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities and equipment, student advisement, and program evaluation. This study focuses on the curriculum issues identified by NAEA.

Art Curriculum Component. The NAEA standards specifically address the major area of study, which is called content for the teaching specialty. Art as the teaching specialty is delineated with semester hour requirements specified. In the major area of study component of the curriculum, the standards provide that drawing, painting, printmaking, graphic communication, sculpture, photography, and crafts be included. The standards list "21 semester hours as an absolute minimum" and "30 hours as a more acceptable standard for studio courses" (Wygant, p. 4). In addition to the studio component, the standards also incorporate an art history component that includes aesthetics, art history, and criticism. This component is listed as 9 hours required as a minimum and "12-15 hours [as] a more acceptable standard" (p. 4). Finally, the standards on art content also contain an advanced (in-depth) art component. This
component requires "extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas" (p. 5) with an additional 6 to 9 required hours. This complete area of art foundations has a recommended minimum total of 51 semester hours; this minimum breaks down into 39 hours in studio and 12 hours in aesthetics, art criticism, and art history. However, if the maximum suggested hours in each of the categories are totaled, this figure reaches 54 hours.

**Supplementary Knowledge.** The second category of the standards is called supplementary knowledge in the art of the teaching field and allied art fields. This category includes: (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature; (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts; (c) psychology of art; (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, and art education; and (e) history of art education. The standards specify 12 to 15 hours in this area.

**Humanistic and Behavioral Component.** The next content area noted in the standards is the humanistic and behavioral component. This component consists of course work in sociology, psychology, anthropology, and education (philosophy, history, and curriculum), with 9 hours listed as the minimum. The lack of specific requirements in this portion of the standards could be a weakness for implementing the good intentions of the NAEA standards
similar to the supplementary component outlined above.

**Student Teaching Component.** The final area of curriculum is teaching and learning theory with laboratory and clinical experiences followed by student teaching. The standards contain extensive descriptions of content and approaches for this area of the prospective art teacher's curriculum. They stress that these practical aspects of the art teacher's training should be taught and guided by trained art educators. This section of the standards could be the outline for course work in this particular area of visual arts teacher training. However, no specific hours are required in the NAEA standards. The standards suggest early field experience on a variety of grade levels, kindergarten through secondary. Student teaching is required on both the elementary and secondary levels, and the standards indicate that the college supervisor should be trained in art education.

**Art Education Faculty.** As noted in the sections on teaching theory and experiences, the NAEA standards include a recommendation that art education faculty teach and supervise art education students. The standards do not contain a list of specific degree requirements for the art education faculty. It is indicated that faculty in art education should have previous successful teaching on one or more levels, but the standards provide no specification of subjects or levels for this prior
teaching experience (Wygant, 1979). Field experiences and faculty qualifications are thus less quantifiable than other components in the NAEA standards.

Art Educators

Art educators in the United States have addressed various aspects of visual arts education. Some have specifically made recommendations about teacher training in visual arts, while others have recommended changes which would, through their implications, influence teacher training curriculum needs.

The population of art educators in the United States can be divided into four general groups: (a) those that support DBAE, (b) those that oppose DBAE, (c) those that have some reservations about DBAE, and (d) those that claim a lack of understanding of the concept. In discussing DBAE, Hamblen (1985b) has noted that it "is perhaps the most discussed, promoted, and viable perspective in art education at this time" (p. 43).

DBAE theories have elicited strong advocates and strong dissenters. The impact of DBAE on visual arts education has been drastic, and reform in art education has primarily been in the context of DBAE. However, a number of art educators have been concerned about the DBAE focus for art education and have voiced their reservations about some aspects of the Getty Center's interpretation and implementations of the DBAE approach. London (1988a)
has pointed out that debate within the field of education had previously been constructive discourse among equals. He further explained that with the Getty Center's clout behind DBAE, art education debates have become unbalanced, and he cautioned against this distortion in the field.

The DBAE approach is drastically different than previous practices in art education. The focus on content areas in visual arts is extremely different from art education with a studio focus. There have even been interpretations of DBAE that appeared virtually to eliminate the making of art in art education. For example, Lanier (1987) has stated that "making art is an almost unnecessary activity in teaching art for general education" (p. 52). He has advocated a theory of aesthetic response and suggested that DBAE curriculum be similarly focused.

Wilson (1988) reiterated what most other art educators have pointed out, namely, that arts education has had a marginal position in education. He, however, reminded art educators that, even where local and state support were often missing, influential supporters cared deeply about arts in education. He cited some of the statistics on art teachers and classroom teachers in the United States, calling attention to the actual people who make curricular decisions about visual arts, i.e., 50,700 visual arts teachers and 576,378 classroom teachers.
According to Wilson (1988), "only 26 percent of the elementary schools in the United States are served full-time by visual arts specialists, 32 percent are served part-time, and 42 percent are not served at all" (p. 6). He indicated that "about half the districts had curriculum coordinators for the visual arts (51-54 percent)...at each level...in the visual arts only 26 percent of the school districts have full-time coordinators" (p. 7). Wilson stated that there has never been a national curriculum in art education and that local control of education decisions is greatly prized in the United States.

Wilson (1988) described art education as being "beset by stresses" (p. 10) and as having new focuses on subject matter and content. He has advocated using works of art to acquire literacy in the visual arts and has recommended that this approach should be the primary content of art education. Wilson expressed concern that teacher preparation programs have not prepared art teachers for the broader curriculum which includes aesthetics, criticism, history, and studio.

Kern (1987) explained that from his research on curriculum antecedents to DBAE it appeared that the teaching of art solely for creativity and self-expression is in decline--it no longer dominates the curriculum documents published by state
departments of education—and second, that the inclusion of study in art history and art criticism, in addition to studio art, is increasingly mentioned in the more recent curriculum documents studied....the field of art is adopting a more comprehensive and academic approach. (p. 53)

Kern has also commented that art criticism had only been found in state departments of education curriculum documents in the past 15 to 20 years and that "no educational attention has been given to the discipline of aesthetics" (p. 52). Kern called attention to the fact that even though aesthetic education "generated considerable interest in the art education field" it was a "minor" element which "never became a major factor in the curriculum" (p. 53).

A Rand Corporation study commissioned by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts tended to confirm Kern's findings. The study's "cross-district analysis showed that only two of...seven programs...fully embodied the [DBAE] model" (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985, p. 72). These two programs were the only ones identified with "the balance, the sequence, [and]...the prescriptive curriculum" (Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985, p. 72), required by the model. This study's findings document the difference between theory and current practice in art education. DBAE, for the most
part, is still a theoretical construct.

**Chapman: Teachers of Art.** Chapman, a highly respected art education researcher, has not been categorized as either a DBAE advocate or a dissenter. She is not easily placed in a category other than a category for the exceptionally capable. Chapman has proposed theories for art education in comprehensive writings about curriculum development and purposes for art instruction which could form the long-term foundation for art education. Chapman (1978, 1982) has provided depth and scope that is often missing in other proposals, and, for this reason, her work is presented in detail in this review of the literature. Chapman's work in art education would be recommended by this researcher as essential and of lasting value.

Chapman (1982) has offered a straightforward critique of the state of art instruction in the United States and has indicated that art education has not been supported and implemented to its full potential. She stressed the vital role of the teacher and the extreme importance of teacher preparation. Chapman (1982) stated that:

The teacher is the most important ingredient in education. Teachers of art, like all good teachers, must have a broad understanding of their field, be sensitive to individual differences in students, have excellent skills in communication, and be committed
to teaching. (p. 41)

Chapman has recommended that teachers of art develop curriculum planning skills and become familiar with resources for teaching art. "Teachers of the arts must emphasize issues and options in the world of art and serve as skilled, knowledgeable interpreters of art" (Chapman, p. 151). She stressed the importance of qualified full-time art teachers and recommended standards for ensuring that schools have qualified teachers. Chapman's framework has provided strong support and a basis for helping establish the key components for visual arts teacher training programs. In Appendix A, her recommendations for visual arts teachers are cited in more detail.

According to Chapman (1982), the functions of general education are to "encourage personal fulfillment, transmit the cultural heritage, and improve the social order" (p. 33). She has stressed that trained art teachers should be motivating children and youth to experience art by responding to art as well as by making art. Chapman (1982) has recommended three major goals for art education in her curriculum framework for basic education in art:
"encourage personal response and expression in art, promote awareness of the artistic heritage, and promote awareness of the role of art in society" (p. 33). Chapman has supported her major goals with detailed subgoals,
which are noted in Appendix A.

**Concerns For Teacher Preparation.** As educators and visual arts educators call for reform in visual arts instruction, teachers have to be prepared to provide instruction in the new competencies that are required of them. Dorn (1984) reminded art educators that teachers may be required "to learn new academic skills and develop new strategies for teaching in the classroom" (p. 19).

Erickson (1986) called attention to the fact that art teachers have not been trained to teach aesthetics. She has advocated conducting research and working to develop a curriculum for teaching aesthetics. Erickson reiterated that teachers need the skills and training to go with reform proposals.

According to Hamblen (1988), aesthetics is filled with ambiguity. She advocated using ambiguity itself to build ways to explore aesthetics. By incorporating debate and ambiguity, Hamblen has encouraged using what naturally occurs as part of aesthetics instruction. She has also explained that one way to teach aesthetics is to begin with personal beliefs and progress through discussions using the diversity that already exists in responses to art and definitions of art (Hamblen, 1985a). In discussing implications of DBAE implementation, Hamblen (1985b) has also noted that the training of prospective art teachers will require changes.
Gray (1987) has recommended that art teachers be trained in aesthetics so that aesthetics is a way of thinking that permeates all art thinking. According to Gray, art teachers should be prepared in art criticism, art history, art production, and aesthetics, but that the emphasis on aesthetics should be used to inform their teaching of art criticism, art history, and art making.

Bersson (1981) has called for caution in developing art education focuses that are elitist in philosophy and practice and has warned art educators against regression in "socio-cultural gains of recent years" (p. 35). Bersson (1984, 1986) has also advocated instruction in multicultural arts and strongly recommended a "socially relevant, multicultural approach to art education" (1986, p. 43). Finally, Bersson (1986) has supported his position with references to other socially oriented art educators, such as, Chapman, Degge, Feldman, Lanier, and McFee.

According to Bersson (1986), art education that is structured by DBAE criteria diminishes social relevance in the arts. "Such discipline-centered approaches are grounded in a specialized aesthetic perspective and high art cultural tradition" that ignore "applied, popular, ethnic, and folk art" (Bersson, 1986, pp. 41-42) and the everyday life experiences of people in multicultural environments. He has advocated that art education should
encompass making, viewing, and analyzing art through methods that encourage multicultural principles.

London (1988a) supported the value of reflective analysis and credited DBAE with providing the impetus for a great deal of debate and analysis in the field of art education. However, London has also stated that DBAE was "not a wise and thoughtful perspective on art or art education" (p. 3). London explained that the DBAE approach was "shallow in its appreciation of what art is, how art and artists serve society, what is entailed in the creative process, the significance of the creative process in art, art education and education in general" (p. 3). He expressed concern that DBAE does not fully appreciate the "actual thinking required of art critics, aestheticians and art historians and their important if uneasy relationships with creative artists" (p. 3).

London also indicated that the advocates of DBAE seem to have a poor understanding of "how the creative encounter can be nurtured, and what kills it" (p. 3).

Hausman (1988) has pointed out the importance and value of diversity and has advocated the acceptance of different approaches in the field of art education. He has called for a "balanced approach inclusive of traditional values" (p. 107), which will incorporate diverse principles. Hausman also advised art educators to work together by holding in esteem diverse professional
opinions.

Jackson (1987) has stated that the Getty Center's focus on art education has at least prompted attention and awareness on visual arts education and that this focus "may serve as much to spur our thinking about art in general as to promote a particular reform movement" (p. 41). He has supported the National Endowment for the Arts' position, which advocated the use of art specialists at all grade levels. Jackson pointed out that specialists are essential to implement DBAE even though the specialist approach is contrary to some of the implementation procedures of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Concerning the weaknesses of DBAE, Jackson has found a lack of clarity and of understanding about DBAE. He has also expressed concern about lack of teacher involvement in making decisions.

Madeja (1985) has described the conflict that is caused by roles of state departments of education and institutions of higher education. State departments of education are granting certification, and universities and colleges are awarding degrees. Madeja called attention to divisions between control and decision making, which create problems when improvements and changes in teacher training programs are attempted.

Louisiana Visual Arts Education Requirements

Louisiana employs a substantial number of full-time
art teachers (Mills & Thomson, 1986) and needs to realize their full potential through art education programs that prepare these teachers for their tasks. Optimistic plans for the state call for even more art teachers (Louisiana State Department of Education Superintendent's Task Force on Arts Education, personal communication, 1989). These future visual arts teachers need to be prepared to teach the content of art on all levels, elementary through secondary, and to be able to teach art content in aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production. Examining the education of future visual arts teachers for these and other teaching positions is the focus of this study.

**Louisiana Guidelines**

In Louisiana, art education students must meet certain requirements to be certified. These prospective art teachers must have a 2.5 grade point average on a 4.0 scale and be graduates of approved teacher education programs. The certification requirements in Louisiana are specified by the State Legislature and/or the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE). The State Department of Education coordinates the certification procedures. Prospective teachers are required to take the National Teacher Exam (NTE) and earn a composite score of 1,934. Art teachers are not required to take the NTE specialty area examination (Northeast Louisiana University
In order to apply for certification, a prospective art teacher must submit to the certification office of the Louisiana State Department of Education: (a) application for certification, (b) transcript from university, (c) NTE scores, and (d) fee for certification ($55.00) (Certification Office, Louisiana State Department of Education, personal communication, 1989).

According to Process Guidelines for Standards for Approval of Teacher Education Programs (State of Louisiana Department of Education, 1983), the state of Louisiana curriculum standards for art education dictate that the art education programs "require study and experience to develop ability as a teaching/producing artist with emphasis on basic concepts and skills and related to the ability to recognize and to structure original and expressive art forms in a wide variety of media" (p. 43).

Under the Louisiana State Department of Education criteria, these areas are evaluated: (a) certification requirements; (b) ability to work with students; (c) contemporary and past cultures; (d) ability to describe, analyze, interpret, and evaluate, programs of art education; and (e) related art areas. Each of these areas of criteria are rated and negative findings, commendations, limitations of the review, and suggestions for improvement are documented by the reviewer (State of
According to the minimum requirements (State of Louisiana Department of Education, 1983) for approved teacher education programs and for the specialized area of art education, K-12, the following course work in the areas of general education (core curriculum), professional education, and specialized academic education (art) is required:

**General Education**  A minimum of 46 semester hours of credit designed to develop a broad cultural background is required. The work must be taken in the following five areas:

1. English: A minimum of 12 semester hours, including at least three semester hours in grammar and three semester hours in composition

2. Social Studies (anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, sociology, psychology, other than that required in professional education, and survey of social science): A minimum of 12 semester hours, including at least three semester hours in United States History

3. Science: A minimum of 12 semester hours, including at least three semester hours in biological science and at least three semester hours in physical science

4. Mathematics: A minimum of six semester hours
5. Health and physical education: A minimum of four semester hours

Professional Education A minimum of 27 semester hours of credit in professional teacher education courses is required. The work must be taken in the following five areas:

1. At least three semester hours of history of education, introduction to education, foundations of education, and/or philosophy of education

2. At least three semester hours in educational psychology and/or principles of teaching

3. At least six semester hours of professional education appropriate to the secondary level, including three semester hours in child or adolescent psychology

4. Six semester hours in the teaching of reading

5. At least nine semester hours in student teaching in one of the principal subject fields for which the student teacher is preparing.

The student teaching shall be under the control and supervision of the institution in which the student teacher is enrolled. Whether or not the school in which the student teaching is done is administered by the institution, the regular teacher
under whose direction the student teaching takes
place shall be a representative of or approved by the
school of education or department of education of the
institution and shall be certified as a supervisor of
student teaching. Student teaching in the summer
shall be permitted only if the school has a 12-month
school year or a bonafide full school year.

The application for certification shall indicate
that the applicant has earned credit in student
teaching. The applicant shall have spent a minimum
of 270 clock hours in student teaching with at least
180 of the hours spent in actual teaching. A
substantial portion of the 180 hours of actual
student teaching shall be on an all-day basis. The
teacher education program shall include:
(1) practical experience in actual classroom
situations during a student's sophomore year,
(2) field experience in schools of varied
socioeconomic and cultural characteristics.

Specialized Academic Education The minimal
requirements for the various subjects, in addition to
the general education and professional education
listed above, are as follows:

Art The minimal requirements for certification
in art are a total of 36 semester hours.

1. Introduction to design (visual elements,
principles of organization, and the nature and dynamic of artistic content), 6 semester hours

2. Art Education (child growth and development in art K-12, content and structure of the art program), 6 semester hours

3. Applied Art (drawing, painting, sculpture, printmaking, and crafts), 18 semester hours

4. Art History and/or Appreciation, 6 semester hours (State of Louisiana Department of Education, 1983, pp. 31-32)

Discussion

In this section, the researcher summarizes current art education theory and practice. She then describes the fundamentals of a sound visual arts teacher preparation curriculum, thus providing the basis for selecting the standards used in this study.

Visual arts education teachers are expected to be prepared to be able to teach inclusively to cover many different areas of art (Chapman, 1982). Historically, the emphasis has been on teaching the studio aspect of art. However, aesthetics, art criticism, and art history are not suddenly considered new areas of art instruction. Aesthetic education, which was a major focus in art education in the 1960s, had components of the discipline-based approach but never had organizational and financial backing similar to the support given to DBAE by the Getty
Center (McFee, 1984). The Getty Trust has provided the financial and organizational strength to the DBAE movement. The DBAE approach emphasized using existing works of art as the basis for teaching visual arts rather than the actual creation of visual forms (Lansing, 1986).

Most teachers who have been trained in the studio mode are likely to find the new emphases on aesthetics, art criticism, and art history somewhat threatening. Hausman (1987) described this time in art education as a period of uncertainty and imbalance. New expectations are not compatible with the base of operational knowledge that has been the foundation of the teacher preparation programs for most visual arts teachers. These teachers have not viewed these different areas of art instruction as separate and distinct. Most visual arts teachers have probably been introduced to aesthetics and art criticism through an integrated approach in conjunction with art history and studio art production.

Barrett (1988) has described the strong influence of undergraduate studio instruction on prospective art teachers. Barrett has contrasted art criticism in art education classes to the studio approach to art criticism. In art education, the art criticism emphasis has been on talking about art, but in studio classes criticism functions as critiques for the purposes of judgment and of improving students' art works. Art criticism in art
education has been structured to delay closure and avoid judgment. Barrett (1988) has suggested that "harmony between studio art and art education curricula in the practice of art criticism would enhance the chance of success for the achievement of art education goals for the teaching of art and criticism" (p. 27).

Hausman (1987) indicated that there exists a need or desire to "return to a state of stability and lower levels of ambiguity" (p. 56). Current art teachers and prospective art teachers will function better and be more comfortable in their profession if they gain knowledge and understanding about visual arts education which encompass the whole discipline.

The visual arts teacher has been called upon to have a base of knowledge in the arts that is quite extensive (Hausman, 1987). The task of deciding what to add and how to make additions to the already substantial visual arts curriculum for teacher preparation has become difficult. However, if the optimum visual arts education program is a combination of components that are currently being shortchanged in university curricula, then changes need to be made. By careful implementation of the components of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production, the art teacher will be better prepared to help children create and examine art in the context of the world cultures of the past and present.
Even though research and testing will eventually be able to reveal a visual arts education "ideal," it is important to attempt to do the best possible job preparing prospective art teachers at the present time. To incorporate the various components of visual arts education, the art teacher preparation program needs to be structured to ensure that future art teachers are trained to teach the visual arts inclusively and to teach the visual arts well. In defense of DBAE, Eisner (1987) declared that if heightened awareness of arts in education and educationally substantive art programs were the major end products of DBAE, he would be satisfied. Furthering substance in visual arts education through evaluating teacher training is the purpose of this study.

Curriculum Foundations

New focuses in art education have given reasons and urgency for examining teacher preparation programs. The existing visual arts education programs, which are preparing future teachers, need to encompass the curriculum components for a comprehensive education. An inclusive program for teacher training in the visual arts will encompass various components. These include curriculum, faculty, students, facilities, and resources (Wygant, 1979). This study concentrates on the curriculum component in visual arts education teacher preparation. Each of the other factors are extremely important and
warrant investigation. However, one of the parameters of this study is to focus on curriculum issues. The other components are directly influenced by decisions which are made concerning curriculum.

As noted in the literature reviewed, the university teacher preparation curriculum should incorporate the best possible scope and sequence of courses to build a foundation for visual arts teachers. The faculty members need to be well-prepared in each area for which they are responsible. The physical facilities and material resources will need to be adequate and safe for the teacher preparation program (Wygant, 1979). The visual arts education students need to meet high standards and to have the personal attributes that are best suited to helping children and others learn about visual arts (Chapman, 1982).

Three parts of curriculum have been identified in the State of Louisiana Department of Education (1983) guidelines: (a) general education, (b) professional education, and (c) specialty area. The first part of the curriculum for visual arts teacher preparation consists of the core or general education courses which will enable future art teachers to understand art and to work in the world. Hausman (1987) reminded teachers of the need to have rich and varied life experiences. This liberal arts portion of the art education students' education can
greatly enrich the life experiences that will help contribute to superior visual arts teachers.

The second aspect of the curriculum is the content area of the visual arts. Prospective art teachers will get the opportunities to specialize in knowing and experiencing the world through the visual arts. The future art teachers study the arts of different cultures by examining sociological, environmental, and philosophical issues through the visual arts (Chapman, 1982). The art education students will be making art, looking at art, talking about art, and relating art to the world.

For the third aspect of curriculum, the prospective visual arts teacher will be involved in professional, preservice education course work. This curriculum component will include course work in the psychological and physical development of children as well as in the history of education and in pedagogy (Wygant, 1979). As recommended by the Holmes Group (1986) proposals, future teachers should be knowledgeable about research and active in research processes. The Holmes Group proposals have recommended that professional education courses be part of graduate studies. For the visual arts education student, this professional education component will also encompass child development and curriculum development as they pertain to the visual arts. In addition, it will include
studying the history of art education and the special skills for teaching and evaluating the visual arts. Classroom management and safety will be aspects of this component. Another major part of the professional education component for the visual arts education student will be observation and student teaching in multicultural settings on a variety of grade levels.

The faculty members training visual arts teachers will need to strive to inculcate in prospective teachers the desire to remain current in their professional field. Visual arts education is in a state of transition. The visual arts students need to be flexible and open to potential growth not only in their preparation program but also when they later work in the field. An extension of the visual arts teacher training could include other learning situations, such as team teaching, learning from supervision personnel, workshop participation, meetings, conferences, professional literature, and observation. Although in-service education is a very important part of a visual arts teacher's education, this study does not focus on the implications of continuing teacher education.

The faculty responsible for the future visual arts teachers need to be able to counsel students about curriculum options as well as career options. In an ideal situation, teacher preparation faculty members will remain up-to-date and involved in their professional development.
Keeping current in the content area will not only enhance the faculty members' teaching; it will also enhance their ability to plan and counsel students.

It is essential for art, art education, and education faculty members to have the necessary background for the areas in which they teach. Faculty members will need to enhance their own areas of expertise on a continuous basis with university support.

In addition, there are qualities which are admirable in a visual arts teacher and are somewhat harder to teach but are equally important to the success of teaching. The following are some of the desirable qualities that prospective teachers learn best by example: enthusiasm, creativity, problem-solving ability, flexibility, openness to students and situations, and confidence.

Standards for this Discrepancy Study

The NAEA (Wygant, 1979) standards, reviewed earlier in this chapter, have been used as the basis for comparison in this study. The NAEA standards were selected through examining the relevant issues and other studies concerning visual arts teacher preparation. The NAEA standards are suited to evaluating the programs in that they encourage high expectations and allow for flexibility. They are also commonly accepted in the field of visual arts education. They are used by professional accrediting organizations; for example, both NCATE
(Sevigny, 1987) and NASAD (Wygant, 1979) use the NAEA standards as part of their criteria for evaluating art education programs. They have also been used in other studies that have focused on teacher preparation programs (Ammar, 1987; Frattalone, 1975; Rogers, 1988; Sevigny, 1987).

This researcher has applied the components of the standards and their accompanying criteria for art education curriculum and art education faculty in this discrepancy study. Using the NAEA standards will enable this study to be reflected upon in light of similar studies in other states and regions. This study will also be able to be updated and extended as changes take place in the NAEA standards and in the Louisiana university programs.

**Summary**

What emerges out of the mass of general and specific recommendations from the literature is a need to work to implement theory into substantive visual arts education teacher training programs which include aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production. The nation needs well-qualified teachers in all areas, and this study particularly focuses on the specific needs in visual arts education. Even though there are numerous variations on recommendations for reform, the common goal is making education for the children and youth of the United States
the strongest it can be. Based on their broad acceptance and flexibility, the NAEA standards were chosen as the criteria against which to compare the art education programs at Louisiana's public universities.

In this chapter, education reform proposals and recommendations have been reviewed. Research and writing specifically addressing visual arts education has also been examined. Issues in art education have been in a state of transition and upheaval with the focus on DBAE dominating the literature. DBAE constitutes a paradigm shift that is creating interesting "history."
CHAPTER III
Methodology

In this study the researcher surveyed visual arts teacher education programs in Louisiana universities by conducting interviews at each of the universities and reviewing documents and records pertaining to their programs. The collected information describing each program was compared to NAEA standards and recommendations to determine where discrepancies exist. This chapter explains the research procedure incorporated for data collection and analysis.

Research Design

This study used survey methodology to gather data about the visual arts education teacher training programs in Louisiana as of Spring 1988. Cohen and Manion (1985) explained that survey research first describes "the nature of existing conditions," then identifies "standards against which existing conditions can be compared," and finally determines the "relationships that exist" (p. 94).

The method for this study incorporated personal interviews and research of printed records. For purposes of this study, the universities are referred to by letter designations (A through M) that reflect the order in which the interviews were conducted. Each respondent was
assured that the reporting would be anonymous. The researcher interviewed the professor in charge of art education at each institution when that person was willing to participate. At University M a nonteaching administrative staff member of the education department agreed to be interviewed. At University G the chair of the education curriculum and instruction department was the primary respondent. The interviews solicited current information about each visual arts teacher preparation program. The researcher also researched available records and documents for pertinent facts about each program in the state and then analyzed the data to discover discrepancies in the programs when compared to the delineated NAEA standards.

This study included several major components. The initial component involved identifying the universities to be surveyed. The study included all public state universities with visual arts teacher preparation programs. The next step was to develop and refine an interview guide through a pilot study conducted at two private universities that were not included in the final study. After the completion of that step, the subjects of the study were contacted. Then interviews at each university were conducted, and records were researched on each university's visual arts education program. The researcher then compiled the data for the programs into
profiles describing the actual status of each program in Louisiana. After the profiles were composed, they were compared to the NAEA standards to ascertain discrepancies. Based on the findings, the researcher proposed recommendations for future actions and additional research.

This research used survey methodology that was organized to collect data systematically. Of the survey instruments available, the study used three: interview schedule, telephone interview, and record examination (Borg & Gall, 1983).

In accord with research methodology recommendations, every effort was made to gain cooperation from all of the subjects identified for the study (Borg & Gall, 1983). Personal interviews were chosen for several reasons. The direct verbal interaction was adaptable and provided information immediately (Best & Kahn, 1989; Borg & Gall, 1983). The direct interview was also helpful in obtaining more data than would be received from most questionnaires, as well as providing more definitive answers (Borg & Gall, 1983). Best and Kahn (1989) indicated that "people are usually more willing to talk than to write" (p. 201). To gain the most complete data, the researcher used an interview guide and conducted personal interviews. In one situation a telephone interview was included to supplement a personal interview that had been conducted at an
The interview sessions were established to support accepting, nonhostile, nonthreatening interactions (Best & Kahn, 1989). The interviewer's goals were to establish rapport by avoiding judgmental behavior and by encouraging open, cooperative behavior (Cohen & Manion, 1985). The researcher made every effort to create relaxed interview situations where the interviewer was interested and unbiased as she related to each respondent.

The actual interviews were conducted after careful planning of both the interview guide and for the interview sessions. The interview guide was constructed to focus on the major areas of the study and to facilitate obtaining relevant data in each interview (Cohen & Manion, 1985). The interview sessions were based on recommendations about research gained from the literature (Borg & Gall, 1983), as well as discussions with a survey research professor at Louisiana State University, Professor Bifano. Further information and experience were garnered from a review panel who studied the interview guide and from the pilot study wherein pilot interviews were conducted.

The compilation of the materials into profiles evolved through organizing the data in the most logical format. The results were organized into profiles for each of the programs, and a set of questions that were generated from the standards were used in scrutinizing the programs for
discrepancies. The detailed profiles for each program are included in Appendix B.

**Procedure**

This study was conducted using the following steps:

**I. Instrument**

a. Development of interview guide

b. Discussion with survey researcher

c. Panel to review interview guide

d. Pilot study

**II. Subjects**

a. Public college and universities in Louisiana

b. Visual arts teacher education programs

**III. Data Collection**

a. Schedule interview appointments

b. Conduct and record interviews

c. Research records about each program

d. Compile descriptions of the actual status of programs preparing visual arts teachers in Louisiana public institutions

e. Recontact universities for their review of profiles

**IV. Data Analysis**

a. Compare data with standards

b. Identify discrepancies
V. Recommendations

a. Future actions

b. Further research

Instrument

The researcher developed an interview guide to elicit needed information concerning current practices in visual arts teacher preparation programs in Louisiana universities. The researcher used the interview guide during each interview to control the direction of the interview and to ensure equal treatment for each interviewee and institution. Where necessary, the questions in the interviews were open-ended to provide the opportunity to gather answers with the optimum amount of information. A copy of the interview guide is included in Appendix C.

Development of Interview Guide

The interview guide was constructed to facilitate careful collection of data from each university and to focus the interview session. In composing and modifying the instrument, the researcher drew upon general areas of concern in art education curriculum. The guide was developed to focus on the curriculum component of teacher preparation in art education. The guide addressed the population of students in the teacher preparation programs as well as the course requirements for the program of study. Questions in the guide were also constructed to
elicit information concerning faculty credentials in art education and student teaching options.

**Discussion with Survey Researcher**

Professor Bifano was recommended as one of the resident experts in survey research at Louisiana State University. This researcher met with Professor Bifano in the Department of Administrative and Foundational Services to discuss the proposed interview guide.

Professor Bifano made several general suggestions about interviewing procedures. The researcher incorporated the suggestions about limiting the time of the interview, contacting individuals before and after interviews, gaining permission to tape the interviews, taping interviews, and using efficient methods to record information. The suggestions were very helpful in preparing for and executing the actual interviews. Professor Bifano did not recommend specific changes in the interview guide.

**Panel to Review Interview Guide**

The researcher asked five art teachers—four, who were art education majors in graduate programs at Louisiana State University, and one, who was an administrator for the state—to evaluate the interview guide and to offer any suggestions for modifications. Each of these art educator's responses was weighed to determine applicability for the final interview guide. The panel
members were favorable in their reviews and recommended only minor changes. Some of the suggestions did not meet the needs of this study and were, therefore, not included in the interview guide.

Pilot Study

To conduct fact-finding and to practice interviewing techniques, the researcher selected two private university art education programs that were not included among the subjects for the final study which was limited to Louisiana public universities. The pilot study helped to refine the interviewing process and to test the interview guide. The pilot situation provided insight into the interviewing process and provided practice in using proper strategies to ensure gathering accurate, comprehensive data.

Subjects for Pilot Study. The researcher selected 2 universities in Louisiana for the pilot study. Both were private colleges with art education programs; neither was included in the 13 subjects for the study. The pilot situations were incorporated into the study for the purpose of testing the interview guide and the interview procedures.

Arrange and Conduct Interviews with Pilot Subjects. After identifying individuals in charge of the art education programs at each of the two pilot universities, the researcher conducted personal interviews with these
individuals at each institution in early Spring 1988. The researcher contacted the individuals by telephone and by letter prior to the in-person interviews and sent copies of key questions before the scheduled personal interview. Lead time was provided in order for the respondents to locate some of the information being solicited. The interviewer made every effort to give adequate preparation time so that the respondents could provide the information requested in the interview. The interviews were conducted with members of the art faculties that were in charge of art education. At the first university in the pilot study, the chair of the education department also agreed to discuss the art education program.

The pilot study interviews were helpful not only in testing the interview guide and the interviewing procedures, but also in finalizing the decision on the type of tape recorder to use. A small, inconspicuous tape recorder was purchased. The key features in selecting a recorder are: capability of the microphone to pick up the conversations; inconspicuous size; small, built-in microphone; ease of operation; and reliability. Automatic reverse would probably be an advantageous feature. This project was conducted without that advantage. The recordings of the interviews were for the purpose of supporting the notes taken during interview sessions. The tapes were not transcribed.
In addition to validating interview techniques and methods, these two pilot interviews also served an additional purpose. They helped build research interviewing skills and confidence in executing the procedure.

Refine Interview Guide. The pilot study produced very few changes in the interview guide (see Appendix C). However, the guide was developed into two variations. One version was the full, expanded instrument to be used in interviewing sessions. Another version was condensed into a set of preparatory summary questions to be sent to each respondent prior to the interview (see Appendix D). The summary questions or lead questions of the shorter version were presented to help the respondent prepare for the interview.

The actual document used during the interviews was physically different from the one appearing in Appendix C. Generous spacing was added for the actual document used in the interviews to provide ample room for writing responses. The pilot study helped determine the spacing and format of the interview guide. Each of these preparatory events helped refine the procedures for the interviews conducted for the actual study at the public universities in Louisiana.

Subjects

The subjects included in the study consisted of visual
arts teacher education programs in Louisiana public colleges and universities. As described below, the individuals in charge of visual arts education programs, as well as others involved in the teaching and administration of visual arts teacher preparation at these institutions, were identified. The researcher contacted key art education individuals who were willing to participate, and the researcher conducted interviews with the aid of the planned interview guide.

This study examines only the public universities in Louisiana that offer teacher education certification programs in visual arts education. Through the Louisiana School Directory (Louisiana State Department of Education Bulletin, 1985-86), the researcher identified 13 universities that offered programs meeting this criterion (see Appendix E for listing). The 13 universities identified for inclusion in the survey were Grambling State University, Louisiana State University, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Louisiana Tech University, McNeese State University, Nicholls State University, Northeast Louisiana University, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, Southeastern Louisiana University, Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Southern University in New Orleans, University of New Orleans, and University of Southwestern Louisiana.
When the researcher contacted the key art education faculty member by telephone, she discovered that two of the universities were cooperatively offering a single art education teacher preparation program. This cooperative program reduced the actual number of the visual arts education programs in public universities to 12. The researcher nonetheless included all 13 of the institutions in the survey to obtain a clear understanding of the cooperative program.

Data Collection

Schedule Interview Appointments

The task of locating the individual or individuals in charge of each art education program involved extensive investigation. Each of the art departments at the 13 universities was contacted by telephone to identify an art education director and to arrange a convenient interview date and time. A letter confirming the interview was mailed to each of the potential respondents after successful telephone calls were completed (see Appendix F for a copy of the letter). Each potential respondent was also sent a preinterview guide (see Appendix D).

Arranging the interviews with each of the 13 program leaders required patience and perseverance. This part of the process required numerous calls to locate the appropriate person for the interview and also a willing respondent. Schedules were adjusted to accommodate all
parties. Gradually interview appointments were made. There was some difficulty in locating the correct individual at University M, but that problem was eventually resolved. Obviously, one of the drawbacks to setting up interviews is that the interviewee has to agree to arrange the time to meet. However, one of the drawbacks of using questionnaires is that frequently the recipient does not respond. Fortunately, the researcher was able to find cooperative respondents at all universities surveyed in the study.

After arranging a convenient time for each of the meetings, the researcher conducted the interviews in person and utilized the interview guide for each interview (see Appendix C). Interviews arranged ahead of time allowed the respondents appropriate time to gather necessary information. Additional information was obtained through documents and public records.

Conduct and Record Interviews

The interviews were conducted in the Spring of 1988 except for one interview which took place in August 1988. The last interview was delayed due to appointment scheduling problems. The interviews at the 2 universities for the pilot study were conducted earlier in the Spring semester of 1988 prior to the interviews at the 13 universities.

Each of the interviews was conducted by the researcher
in person and on-site at each university, except for one of the two individuals interviewed at University D. At University D, the second person interviewed was only available for a telephone interview.

Each of the interviews was recorded on cassette tape, except for the one telephone interview mentioned above and the interview at University G. At University G, the individual being interviewed declined the researcher's request to record the interviewing session.

The interviewer requested the art education curriculum outline at each university, and these requests were honored except at University G. The respondent at University G referred the researcher to the university catalog. The information about numbers of graduates in the programs was not readily available in all of the university art or education departments. Additional and more comprehensive information was obtained through examining state records to determine the statistics on art education graduates over the last ten years.

In the process of arranging interviews, the researcher discovered that two of the universities in close geographical proximity had a joint art education program by order of the United States District Court. In the state of Louisiana, as of Spring 1988, there were 13 public universities and 12 art education teacher preparation programs. University H and University I have
the joint program. The researcher decided to conduct interviews at both of the universities to determine the extent to which the universities interacted with each other in this joint art education degree program.

The researcher conducting the interviews resided in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The locations of the universities are spread throughout the state. Traveling to and from each of the 13 sites was an interesting but time-consuming part of this study. As often as possible, the researcher grouped the universities in geographic areas and attempted to schedule the interviews in those areas within 24 hours of each other. The researcher determined that one interview per day was preferable. When two interviews were attempted in one day, the researcher had more difficulty keeping the questions and procedures focused and fresh.

At the conclusion of the interviews, the researcher wrote a note of acknowledgement to each of the respondents, thanking them for their assistance. This aspect of follow-up was stressed as part of successful interviewing procedures by Professor Bifano.

Research Records and Documents

As the researcher perused programs of study for each art education program, she found that the format of the program of study from University C was particularly easy to use (see Appendix G for a copy of the format). This
researcher would recommend that each of the programs in the state adopt the same format for program requirements inasmuch as it would facilitate ease of use and ease of comparison for state evaluation purposes.

In an effort to locate the factual data about individuals graduating from programs in the state and data on certification in art education, the researcher also looked at the statistical data on file at the Louisiana State Department of Education, Teacher Certification, which is located at 626 North 4th Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The records on certification numbers were available for the last 9 years. In addition, documents of the Board of Regents were studied to find the statistics on the number of graduates from each of the universities in art education over the last 10 years. The office of the Board of Regents is located on Riverside Mall in downtown Baton Rouge. The personnel at the office were particularly helpful in making the records available for this researcher. Also, each of the universities' catalogs was studied for information about curriculum and entrance requirements and number of total faculty at the universities as well as number of faculty in education and visual arts departments.

Compilation of Descriptions for the Thirteen Universities

Information available as of Spring 1988 was obtained from interviews, records, and documents for the 13
universities and the 12 art education programs. The data were compiled and organized to facilitate the determination of the discrepancies. The profiles of each of the universities were constructed for maximum information presented in a logical format (see Appendix B). Each respondent was mailed a copy of the university profile accompanied by a letter requesting any corrections (see Appendix H). None of the universities noted any corrections in the profiles concerning the 1988 data.

**Data Analysis**

The researcher analyzed the data for discrepancies between the status of the programs and the delineated standards. The goals of analysis were to describe teacher preparation programs in visual arts education in Louisiana public universities and to analyze these programs for possible discrepancies when compared to contemporary national standards presented by NAEA (Wygant, 1979).

The following criteria list based on the NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979) was used to examine each of the programs and determine discrepancies:

**Check List for Art Education Curriculum Discrepancies**

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

University ____________________________

Date of Data Collection ____________

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:
1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in the major content area as an absolute minimum?

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours, which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   - Drawing
   - Painting
   - Printmaking
   - Graphic Communication
   - Sculpture
   - Photography
   - Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)

4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component, which is a more acceptable standard?

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history, and criticism?

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?
8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 51-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 51-54)

General Electives Hours______________________________

Art Education Hours_________________________________

9. Supplementary knowledge in the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education
   (e) history of art education
      Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area?

10. Humanistic and behavioral:
   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)
      Are 9 hours required in this area?

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching:
    Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?
Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?

Is student teaching required?

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?

12. Faculty Credentials:

Are the faculty members art educators?

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?

Comments:

Completed criteria lists for each university are included in Appendix I. The findings are presented and discussed in the following chapter.

Recommendations

The study produced recommendations about possible future actions based on analysis of gathered data. This study described the current status of visual arts teacher preparation education in Louisiana, identified discrepancies, and formulated possible modifications. Potential areas for future research were also identified. The recommendations are presented in Chapter V of this document.
Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology used in this study, and the procedure for collecting the data was reviewed. The delineated criteria based on the NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979) have also been outlined. Findings and recommendations will be presented in the next two chapters.
CHAPTER IV
Findings

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the implementation of the research plan described in Chapter III. It begins with a description of the current art education teacher training programs in Louisiana's public universities. It also compares these programs to recommended standards in order to discover what discrepancies exist.

Data Collection and Compilation

Subjects

Even though 13 universities were identified as offering teacher preparation programs in art education through the Louisiana State Department of Education (1985-86) (see Appendix E), Louisiana actually has only 12 programs at its public universities. In the process of arranging interviews, the researcher discovered that 2 of the universities in close geographical proximity had a joint art education program as part of a desegregation decree issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. The researcher decided to interview both of the universities to determine to what extent the universities interacted with each other in this art education degree program.
The interview process began with the task of locating the appropriate person working with art education at each of the universities. After these individuals were located, each of them was interviewed in person using the interview guide (see Appendix C).

Interviews, Records, and Documents

The interviews were conducted in the Spring of 1988 except for one interview which took place in August 1988. The last interview was delayed due to appointment scheduling problems. The data for this study are current as of Spring 1988.

The interviews were conducted in the following order on these dates: University A, April 5, 1988; University B, April 6, 1988; University C, April 6, 1988; University D, April 7, 1988; University E, April 15, 1988; University F, April 19, 1988; University G, April 20, 1988; University H, April 26, 1988; University I, April 26, 1988; University J, April 27, 1988; University K, May 5, 1988; University L, May 9, 1988; and University M, August 29, 1988.

Available documents were studied for each university. These included programs of study which were obtained from each university, statistics on numbers of graduates from records at the office of the Board of Regents in Baton Rouge, information on numbers of certifications which was obtained through the Louisiana State Department of
Education Teacher Certification office, and catalogs which were purchased from each university.

The interviewer requested the art education curriculum outline at each university, and, with only one exception, these requests were honored. The information about numbers of graduates in the programs was not readily available in all of the departments. Additional and more comprehensive information was obtained through examining state records to determine the statistics on art education graduates over the last 10 years.

The researcher also consulted state records to get accurate information on graduates and certifications. For statistics on the number of graduates from each of the universities in art education over the last 10 years, documents of the Board of Regents were consulted. The data are presented in Table 2. To find the number of art teachers who were certified, the researcher also looked at the statistical data on file at the Louisiana State Department of Education in the certification office. See Table 3 for the composite of teacher certification data from each of the universities. The last 9 years were on file; the records on teacher certification for 10 years ago were not available.

The number of individuals who were certified was not the same as the number of graduates, even if the last nine years were compared as they are in Table 4. Individuals
Table 2
Art Education Degree Completion Past Ten Years

Section One: 1979-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals  63  58  44  29  24

^Combined program with University I by court order. All art education degrees issued by University I.
Table 2  
Art Education Degree Completion Past Ten Years

Section Two: 1984-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 26, 41, 27, 13, 25, 350

*Combined program with University I by court order. All art education degrees issued by University I.*
Table 3

Certifications Past Ten Years

Section One: 1979-1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>NA²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals     | NA   | 41   | 32   | 21   | 22   |

²NA-Teacher certification figures not available for 1979.
Table 3
Certifications Past Ten Years

Section Two: 1984-1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 29 35 33 17 20 250
## Table 4

**Yearly Averages: Degrees Completed & Teachers Certified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H(^3)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals Averaged**  
2.9  2.6  2.1

\(^3\)Combined program with University I by court order. Art education degrees have been awarded by University I. Total degrees awarded are averaged without University H.
who graduate from a Louisiana university in art education are not automatically certified. They must submit the necessary forms, credentials, and fees to be considered for certification. These applicants must also meet the requirements noted in Chapter II. Some of the graduates from the 12 art education teacher training programs could have chosen not to apply for certification at the time of their graduation or not to apply at all. Also, other individuals who may have received certification in any given year could be individuals who have met the certification requirements through means other than an undergraduate degree in art education. The numbers for teacher certification in art education do not include the number of out-of-state applicants or applicants from private institutions. The certification figures as presented are solely individuals from the universities in this study. Teachers certified from University H are assumed to be students who completed course work for certification which was combined with another degree, because all art education graduates would have received their degrees from University I in accord with the joint program.

The researcher also ordered and studied the current catalog from each of the universities. The catalogs provided additional information about curriculum and entrance requirements as well as about the faculty of the
universities and the education and visual arts departments. Catalogs are listed in references according to the name of the university documents (Grambling State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Louisiana State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Louisiana State University in Shreveport Bulletin General Catalog, 1988-89; Louisiana Tech University Bulletin, 1988-89; McNeese State University Catalog, 1988-89; Nicholls State University Bulletin, 1988-89; Northeast Louisiana University Catalog, 1987-88; Northwestern State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Southeastern Louisiana University General Catalogue, 1988-89; Southern University and A & M College Catalog, 1987-89; Southern University at New Orleans Bulletin, 1986-89; University of New Orleans General Catalog, 1986-87; The University of Southwestern Louisiana Bulletin, 1985-87).

Profiles of Louisiana's Public Universities

In Spring 1988, Louisiana had 12 art education teacher preparation programs at 13 universities. University H and University I had a joint program. Each profile includes general information about the population of the community where the university is located (Rand McNally, 1988) as well as information on the population of the student body and of the faculty when available from catalogs and from the Louisiana School Directory (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1988-89). Each
of the profiles contains a summarized description of the curriculum components which was obtained from the programs of study and the university catalogs. In the profiles the researcher also summarized the data concerning the number of graduates; this information was obtained from the Board of Regents' records. The number of teachers being certified was obtained from Louisiana State Department of Education Teacher Certification records from each university (see Appendix B for detailed profiles of each program). In the NAEP standards (Wygant, 1979), anthropology is included as a part of the humanistic and behavioral component. The catalogs were reviewed to see what anthropology course options visual arts students might have for inclusion in their programs.

University A. Located in a medium-sized community, University A served approximately 10,000 students, and 14 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art with a teaching minor; the degree was offered through the education department. University A had approximately 500 faculty members; approximately 40 were education faculty members, and 7 were members of the art faculty. One art educator was a member of the art faculty.

University A was accredited by the Southern Association Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.
The B.A. in art education was accredited through NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University A was conducted in early April 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who worked full-time in a tenured position in art education. The program at University A was also discussed with the chair of the art department.

In the art department, University A had one full-time faculty member in art education. He had a Ph.D. in school administration and a minor in art.

At University A the art education students generally did their student teaching on the secondary level and were supervised by education professors, not art education faculty. Some of the art education students student taught in a minor field other than art. The primary respondent expressed concern over the lack of teaching options for Louisiana art education graduates. At University A, the elementary education majors were required to take a course in art education for elementary teachers.

University A produced relatively few art educators for Louisiana over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 11 students graduated in art education (see Table 2), and 1 student received a M.Ed. in art from a degree program that was canceled in December 1979. In the past 9 years,
the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 16 students in art education from University A (see Table 3).

University A required a total of 140 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 140 hour total, 42 hours were required in art, which included 6 hours in art education and 9 hours in art history. A total of 31 hours were required in education, including speech, plus 9 hours in psychology. The total of 140 hours also included 9 hours in electives.

With one exception, the art courses listed in the catalog for University A did not include any aesthetics or criticism. The exception was a graduate course in art theory, which was partially described as research and criticism of art works. The catalog for University A listed 12 courses in anthropology and indicated that 18 hours were required for a minor in anthropology.

University B. Located in a small community, University B served approximately 6,000 students, and 3 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.S. degree in art education that was offered through the education department. University B had approximately 350 faculty members; approximately 40 were education faculty members, and 5 were members of the art faculty. In the art department, University B had 2 faculty members teaching in art education.

University B was accredited by the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.S. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University B was conducted in early April 1988. The primary respondent was a male instructor who worked full-time in a tenured position on the art faculty in the area of art education.

At University B the art education students generally did student teaching in junior high or high school and were supervised by faculty in art education. The respondent expressed concern over the lack of art education jobs in Louisiana.

Elementary education majors were required to take six to nine hours of art. One of the courses was art for teaching.

University B produced a small number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 14 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 2 students in art education from University B (see Table 3).

University B required a total of 152 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 152 hour total, 40 hours were required in art, which included 6 hours in art
education and 6 hours in art history. A total of 42 hours were required in education including speech, plus 6 hours in psychology. The total of 152 hours included 5 hours in electives.

The art courses listed in the catalog from University B included one course in ethnic art and one in Afro-American art. None of the course descriptions included any specific mention of aesthetics or criticism. University B had eight courses in anthropology listed in the catalog.

University C. Located in a small community, University C served approximately 10,000 students, and 9 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education which was offered through the education department. University C had approximately 500 faculty members; approximately 20 were education faculty members, and 13 were members of the art faculty. One art educator was a member of the art faculty.

University C was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degrees, offered through the art department, had NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University C was conducted in April
1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who worked full-time in a tenured position in the art department. The education department supervised the student teaching experience. University C had a scholarship for art education. The elementary education majors were required to take an art education class.

University C produced a substantial group of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 41 students graduated in art education (see Table 2), and 17 students received a M.A. in art education. In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 31 students in art education from University C (see Table 3).

University C required a total of 138 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 138 hour total, 48 hours were required in art which included 6 hours in art history. A total of 44 hours were required in education; these included 3 hours in speech, 6 hours in art education, and 6 hours in psychology. The curriculum did not include any hours for electives.

The art courses listed in the catalog for University C mentioned aesthetics in the course title for photography, with special emphasis on photographic seeing. In addition, two courses in art history were described as critical appraisal of art, and critical judgment was mentioned in the description of one appreciation course.
University C had an introductory course in anthropology listed in the catalog.

**University D.** Located in a large community, University D served approximately 4,500 students, and 17 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree which was called elementary and secondary education, art. The degree was offered through the education department. University D had approximately 150 faculty members; 15 were education faculty members, and 3 to 4 were members of the art faculty.

University D was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University D was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who worked full-time as chair of the art department. There was one part-time art education faculty member.

Art education students did their student teaching in both secondary and elementary schools. They were supervised by the education department. The plans projected for art education included improving the supervision of the art education student teachers. The
elementary education majors were required to take art for elementary schools and another art course.

University D produced a fairly substantial number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 31 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 28 students in art education from University D (see Table 3).

University D required a total of 136 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 136 hour total, 36 hours were required in art, which included 6 hours in art history. A total of 40 hours were required in education including speech, 3 hours in art education, and 9 hours in psychology. The curriculum included 10 hours in electives.

None of the art courses listed in the catalog included any specific mention of aesthetics or criticism. The catalog for University D listed six anthropology courses.

University E. Located in a large community, University E served approximately 15,000 students, and 15 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education; the degree was offered through the education department. University E had approximately 600 faculty members; 45 were education faculty members, and 9 were members of the
fine arts faculty. One member of the art faculty taught art education.

University E was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University E was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who worked full-time in the art department. He was the one faculty member for art education and had a background in art education and fine arts.

The college of education supervised the art education student teachers. The elementary education majors were required to take three hours in art.

University E produced a fairly substantial number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 41 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 30 students in art education from University E (see Table 3).

University E required a total of 144 to 146 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the total, 33 hours were required in art; this included 6 hours in art education and 6 hours in art history. A total of 42 hours were
required in education, including speech and 6 hours in psychology. The curriculum included 18 hours in electives.

None of the art courses listed in the catalog from University E mentioned aesthetics or criticism. University E had 19 anthropology courses listed in the catalog.

University F. Located in a small community, University F served approximately 8,000 students, and 30 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education which was offered through the education department. University F also offered a M.Ed. degree with 12 hours in art education. University F had approximately 300 faculty members; 40 were education faculty members, and 5 were members of the art faculty.

University F was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University F was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a female professor working full-time in the art department. Two members of the art faculty and two part-time instructors were
teaching art education.

The art education student teachers were supervised through the education department. They were placed in junior high and high school classrooms. The elementary education majors were required to take three hours in art.

University F produced a fairly substantial number of art education graduates but comparatively few certified art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 45 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 26 students in art education from University F (see Table 3).

University F required a total of 137 to 141 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the total, 51 hours were required in art; these hours included 6 hours in art education and 6 hours in art history. A total of 31 hours were required in education including speech and 6 hours in psychology. The curriculum included 8 hours in electives.

There were two art history courses listed in the catalog from University F with titles that included aesthetics and criticism. The catalog for University F had four anthropology courses listed.

University G. Located in a small community, University G served approximately 7,000 students, and 4 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education; the
degree was offered through the education department. University G had approximately 250 faculty members; approximately 30 were education faculty members, and 4 were members of the art faculty.

University G was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University G was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who was chair of the education department. The art education faculty was virtually nonexistent. The art education course was described as a generic methods class taught by an educator but not necessarily an art educator. The respondent indicated that plans for the future might include eliminating the art education program due to the small number of art education graduates.

The respondent had statistics on file of the number of art education students enrolled from Spring 1975 through Spring 1988. The art education students enrolled at University G ranged from as high as 25 (1975 and 1976) to as low as 3 (1986 and 1987). Four students were enrolled in 1988. The decline in numbers had been fairly steady, with minor fluctuations.
University G produced a small number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 19 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 14 students in art education from University G (see Table 3).

University G required a total of 151 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 151 hour total, 39 hours were required in art, including 6 hours in art history. A total of 51 hours were required in education; this total included speech, 6 hours in art education, and 9 hours in psychology. The curriculum included zero hours in electives.

The catalog from University G did not include any aesthetics or criticism courses. No anthropology courses were found in the catalog for University G.

University H. Located in a large community, University H served approximately 16,000 students, but none of those were art education students. Art education students could earn a degree in art education in a cooperative program with University I. University H had approximately 507 faculty members; approximately 75 were education faculty members, and 12 were members of the art faculty.

University H was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for
teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The art degrees, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University H was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who was chair of the art department. The art department had approximately 250 undergraduate students and another 16 graduate students in fine arts. One part-time faculty member taught art education. All art education students were listed with University I.

University H produced a very small number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, no students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 2 students in art education from University H (see Table 3).

University I. Located in a large community, University I served approximately 4,000 students, and 4 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education which was offered through the education department as part of the cooperative program with University H. University I had approximately 130 faculty members; 16 were education faculty members, and 3 were members of the art faculty.

University I was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for
teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was not accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

The interviewing at University I was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a female professor who was a member of the education faculty. The art department had faculty members who had experience teaching art education classes.

The education department supervised the student teaching of art education majors. Elementary education majors were required to take art methods for the elementary school.

University I produced an average number of art education graduates, but a very small number of certified art educators. In the past 10 years, 21 students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 4 students in art education from University I (see Table 3).

University I required a total of 143 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 143 hour total, 42 hours were required in art, including 6 hours in art education and 9 hours in art history. A total of 52 hours were required in education, including speech and 10 hours in psychology. The curriculum did not include any hours in
electives.

In the art courses listed in the catalog of University I, an introduction to art course was described as relating art and artists to aesthetic experiences and aesthetic judgment. University I had one introductory anthropology course listed in the catalog.

University J. Located in a large community, University J served approximately 26,000 students, and 32 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.S. degree in art education; the degree was offered through the education department. University J had approximately 50 faculty members in the education department and approximately 30 faculty members in the school of art.

University J was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.S. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degrees, offered through the art department, had NASAD accreditation.

The interviewing at University J was conducted in April 1988. The primary respondent was a female professor who was a full-time member of the art department with a background in art education and fine arts. The art department had 3 full-time art education faculty members. There were approximately 35 undergraduate art education
students enrolled. The art education student teachers were supervised by art education faculty.

In the process of discussing art education with a second art education professor at University J, this researcher learned that University J had been invited to attend the Getty Center for Education in the Arts seminar in August 1988 in Snowbird, Utah. For various reasons, University J did not attend. No other public universities in Louisiana indicated that they were invited to participate in that conference.

The projected plans at University J included the fact that Holmes Group proposals were being examined for implementation in 1990. The elementary education majors were required to take an art education class, but that was in the process of being changed.

University J produced a substantial number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 77 students graduated in art education (see Table 2), and 7 students received M.A. degrees in art education from a degree program that was canceled in October 1986. In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 67 students in art education from University J (see Table 3).

University J required a total of 137 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 137 hour total, 51 hours were required in art, which included 9 hours in art
education and 12 hours in art history. A total of 34 hours were required in education, which included 3 art education hours and 6 hours in psychology. A total of 12 hours were required in art education. The curriculum included 6 hours in electives.

The art courses listed in the catalog from University J included one course that mentioned aesthetics and one that mentioned criticism. University J listed 46 courses in anthropology, including archaeology, folklore, cultures, linguistics, and architecture.

University K. Located in a medium-sized community, University K served approximately 7,600 students, and 26 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education; the degree was offered through the education department. At University K, of the approximately 300 faculty members, 8 were members of the art faculty.

University K was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. NASAD accreditation was pending for the art degree offered through the art department.

The interviewing at University K was conducted in May 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who was a full-time member of the art department. There were two
faculty members working with art education in the art
department. Both of the professors had backgrounds in art
education and art. There were approximately 26 art
education students enrolled.

The art education student teachers were supervised by
art education faculty. The elementary education majors
were required to take one class in art education.

University K produced a moderate number of art
educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 20
students graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the
past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education
certified 12 students in art education from University K
(see Table 3).

University K required a total of 133 hours in the art
education curriculum. Of the total, 42-45 hours were
required in art, with 6 hours in art education and 3 hours
in art history. A total of 38 hours were required in
education, including speech, 3 hours in art education, and
6 hours in psychology. There were a total of 9 hours in
art education. The curriculum included zero hours in
 electives.

The courses listed in the catalog from University K
included a humanities course that mentioned criticism of
art forms. However, there was no mention of aesthetics or
criticism in the art courses. University K had two or
three courses in anthropology and three courses listed in
humanities.

University L. Located in a small community, University L served approximately 6,500 students, and 10 of those were art education students. The art education students could earn a B.A. degree in art education which was offered through the education department. University L had approximately 220 faculty members; approximately 15 were education faculty members, and 4 were members of the art faculty.

University L was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.A. in art education was accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University L was conducted in May 1988. The primary respondent was a male professor who was the chair of the art department. University L had one full-time faculty member in the art department teaching art education classes. The art education professor had a background in art education and computer graphics.

Most of the art education student teachers were working on the high school level. They were supervised through the education department.

University L produced a small number of art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 9 students
graduated in art education (see Table 2). In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 14 students in art education from University L (see Table 3).

University L required a total of 134 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the 134 hour total, 52 hours were required in art; this total included 6 hours in art education and 9 hours in art history. A total of 29 hours were required in education, including speech and 6 hours in psychology. The curriculum did not include any hours in electives.

None of the descriptions of the art courses in the catalog from University A included any mention of aesthetics or criticism. University L had 15 courses in anthropology listed in the catalog.

University M. Located in a large community, University M served approximately 10,000 students. The art education students could earn a B.S.Ed. degree in art education; the degree was offered through the education department. University M had approximately 600 faculty members; 6 were members of the art faculty.

University M was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education. The B.S.Ed. and M.Ed. (no thesis) in art education were accredited by NCATE. The art degree, offered through the
art department, did not have NASAD accreditation.

Interviewing at University M was conducted in August 1988. The primary respondent was a female working in the education department with a background in education. The respondent indicated that University M had no art education faculty and approximately five art education students. The lab school art teacher was responsible for teaching art for the elementary school and for supervising the art education student teachers at the lab school. The elementary education majors were required to take art for the elementary school.

University M graduated an average number of art education but produced few certified art educators over the last decade. In the past 10 years, 21 students graduated in art education (see Table 2), and 2 students received the M.ED. degree in art education. In the past 9 years, the Louisiana State Department of Education certified 4 students in art education from University M (see Table 3).

University M required a total of 139 hours in the art education curriculum. Of the total, 41 hours were required in art, including 3 hours in art education and 6 hours in art history. A total of 40 hours were required in education, including speech, 3 hours of art education, and 9 hours in psychology. There were 6 total hours required in art education. The curriculum included zero
hours in electives.

The catalog from University M listed seven courses in art education plus two more for special education situations. In the art courses listed, one was called aesthetics and described as relating beauty to theory. The catalog for University M had two anthropology courses listed.

Summary of Findings

The 13 public universities in Louisiana enrolled a total of approximately 78,000 students in 1988; of that total, approximately 164 were art education students. In the past 10 years, a total of 350 art education students graduated from the 12 undergraduate programs in the state. Together, the universities in Louisiana were averaging 35 graduates in art education per year. Calculated on this total, each university would have averaged almost 3 (2.9) graduates each year. The actual individual university averages ranged from as low as less than 1 (0.9) graduate each year, University L, to as high as almost 8 (7.7) graduates per year, University J (see Table 4).

In the past 9 years, 250 art teachers had been certified from all 13 of the universities in Louisiana. That combined total put the certification average at nearly 30 (27.7) art education teachers being certified each year. (See Table 4 for yearly averages for teacher certification from each university.) The data available
for degrees completed and certification varied. Data from the past 10 years were available for degrees completed, but only data for the past 9 years were available concerning certification. Table 4 provides the averages for the past 9 years for both categories: degrees completed and certification.

The number of art education faculty members at the universities varied from as few as one part-time instructor to as many as three full-time faculty members. This varied from situation to situation, and it was not always clear whether the art education faculty worked exclusively with art education. At University G it was noted that art education faculty was virtually nonexistent.

According to the data collected about the art education programs included in this study, 11 of the 12 visual arts education teacher training programs were accredited by NCATE. However, only 2 of the visual arts programs of the 13 programs were accredited by NASAD.

The number of graduates from the 12 universities over the past 10 years declined (see Table 2). Over the past 10 years, the least number of graduates was 9 at University L, and the largest number of graduates was 77 at University J.

The average number of education hours required was approximately 32 (32.16). The hours required ranged from
as low as 25 to as high as 42 hours.

The number of art education courses required varied from as few as 3 hours to as many as 12 hours. One university required 12 hours in art education, while one required 9 hours. Nine universities required 6 hours in art education. One university required only 3 hours in art education.

The average number of hours required for studio was 32 hours. The range for studio was from as few as 21 hours to a high of 42 hours.

The average requirement for art history was 7 hours. The range of required hours in art history was as few as 3 hours up to a high of 12 hours. Three out of the 12 programs mentioned criticism or aesthetics in one course in art history.

Data Analysis

Criteria

For the purpose of this study, the aspect of the NAEA (Wygant, 1979) standards that deal specifically with the curriculum are utilized to help determine the key focus of art education teacher training program. The NAEA standards specifically address the major area of study, which is called "content for the teaching specialty (art)" (Wygant, 1979, p.3). In addition to the art content, the standards also recommend criteria for faculty, student advisement, resources, facilities and equipment,
evaluation and program review, and also graduate programs at the master's level.

The questions based on NAEA standards were delineated in Chapter III in the discussion of methodology. After examining the university programs in this study, answers which have been generated about curricula for each of the universities are provided in the following discussion. A discrepancy check list for each university art education program is in Appendix I.

Comparison to Standards

Major Content, Art Studio. All 12 of the visual arts education programs included 21 semester hours in major content area. Of the 12 programs, 8 included the more acceptable standard of 30 semester hours for the basic studio component (see Table 5).

Studio Courses. Printmaking was absent from 4 of the 12 visual arts education programs' studio requirements. Graphic communication was not always specified in the course listings. Sculpture was not listed as a required course in 4 of the 12 programs. Photography was absent from the studio requirements of 8 programs (see Appendix I).

Aesthetics, Art Criticism, and Art History. Only one program required 12 hours in art history. Three programs required 9 hours in art history. Seven of the 12 programs required only 6 hours in art history. One of the visual
arts education programs required 3 hours in art history. None of the programs exceeded 12 required hours in art history (see Table 5). Only 3 of the 12 programs have at least one course mentioning criticism or aesthetics in the art history component.

**Advanced Art Component.** Only 2 of the 12 programs, University C and University F, included enough art hours for an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas. Two more programs, University D and University E, could allow a student this opportunity if all of the general electives were used for this purpose.

None of the programs had a total of 51 to 54 hours in the art component. One program, University F, could bring the total to 53 hours if all of the general electives were used for art (see Table 6).

**Supplementary Knowledge Component.** All of the programs satisfied the category of supplementary knowledge through course work in literature and art education except for one, University D, which only had three hours in art education.

**Humanistic and Behavioral Component.** All of the programs satisfied the category of humanistic and behavioral courses through psychology hours and education hours.

**Field Experience and Student Teaching.** All of the
Table 5

Art Education Curriculum at Louisiana Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Art Total</th>
<th>Art Studio</th>
<th>Art Hist</th>
<th>Art Elec</th>
<th>Gen Educ</th>
<th>Art Educ</th>
<th>Art Psych</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>144-46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>137-41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NA - not applicable. University H has a cooperative program with University I by court order. Art education degrees have been awarded by University I.*
Table 6
Art Content and General Electives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Combined Art Studio</th>
<th>Combined Art Hist</th>
<th>Combined Art Hist</th>
<th>Combined Gen Elec</th>
<th>Combined Gen Elec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Total, if general electives are all used for art.

<sup>b</sup>Combined program with University I by court order. All art education degrees awarded by University I.
universities required student teaching. The state requirements dictated field experience in at least the sophomore year in addition to student teaching. The state requirements do not dictate an art educator as the college supervisor. Out of the 12 university art education programs, 4 respondents (Universities B, J, K, and M) indicated that the student teaching was supervised by art education faculty. The remaining 8 indicated that supervision was conducted by education faculty other than art education faculty.

**Faculty Credentials.** The art education faculty varied substantially, however, the standards (Wygant, 1979) are difficult to use for a quantifiable comparison based on the information available in this study. One program, University G, indicated that art education faculty was nonexistent for their program. The remainder of the 11 programs acknowledged having art education faculty. The information available from this study did not determine if the art education faculty members had had successful teaching experience on one or more levels prior to university teaching. Nor was information available to determine if the art education faculty had obtained proficiency in one area of visual arts. Three universities (A, F, and J) had art education faculty members with doctoral degrees. University J had two art educators with doctoral degrees.
Discussion

The discrepancies reported in the findings indicate that the 12 visual arts education programs need to be strengthened by upgrading their requirements. None of the programs met or exceeded all of the criteria established in the NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979). All of the programs had discrepancies when they were compared to the standards (see Table 7).

Major Content Area. The NAEA standards require 21 semester hours in the major content area as an absolute minimum and describe 30 semester hours as a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum. Studio courses should include: drawing; painting; printmaking; graphic communication; sculpture; photography; and crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics). The standards require 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum and state that 12-15 hours in the art history component is a more acceptable standard. The art history component should include aesthetics, art history, and criticism.

The standards require an in-depth, advanced component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas bringing the total of art hours up to 51-54 hours (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 51-54).

Each of the programs had deficiencies in the total number of required hours in the specialty area, art (see
### Table 7

**Art Content: NAEA Standards and Louisiana Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Art Studio Hours</th>
<th>Art Studio History</th>
<th>Art Appr (In-Depth)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>36-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Art studio hours in excess of 30.

NA, not applicable, joint program with University I.
Tables 7 and 8). Most of the programs had a substantial difference in requirements in art history, and all of the programs needed requirements to ensure that aesthetics and criticism are included in the course work.

The studio course requirements varied from one university to another. Shortages and/or omissions in studio requirements need attention to ensure breadth. Requirements for depth in the art component were noticeably absent from most of the programs. Correcting these serious discrepancies would help strengthen visual arts teacher preparation programs.

Supplementary Knowledge and Humanistic and Behavioral Content. The standards recommended the following for supplementary knowledge with 12 to 15 hours required in this area: (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature; (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts; (c) psychology of art; (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education; and (e) history of art education. For the humanistic and behavioral courses, these were noted: (a) sociology; (b) psychology; (c) anthropology; and (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) with 9 hours required in this area.

The areas of supplementary knowledge and humanistic and behavioral content were generally satisfied--for the total number of hours required--through English literature requirements, art education course work, psychology
Table 8

Art Content: NAEA Standards and Louisiana Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours in Art Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Studio/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art Appr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio History</td>
<td>(In-Depth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAEA Standards:
Hours
Recommended 21-30 12-15 6-9 51-54

Louisiana Universities:
Average Hours
Required\(^{a}\) 28.6 7 3.0-3.2 38.6-38.8

\(^{a}\)Louisiana universities average hours required, computed on the hours required in the 12 art education programs in this study.
classes, and education courses. However, these areas are important for the possibilities in cultural understanding and in relating the arts for prospective visual arts teachers. Interpreting and using these components for their full potential will require diligence on the part of the art education student and the student's advisor. Through creative use of social science hours, to name one avenue, progress can be made toward visual arts students taking course work in related areas of study: anthropology, sociology, and the arts.

The standards describe art education courses and student teaching, and these descriptions can be used as a foundation for course content. Art educators can evaluate the existing art education courses in the programs to determine if the content outlined in the NAEA standards is included in the required classes.

Field Experience and Student Teaching. According to the standards, art education programs should require field experience, other than student teaching, on a variety of grade levels, K-12. Student teaching should be required on both elementary and secondary levels, and the college supervisor of the student teaching should be trained in art education.

All of the art education programs except one needs to scrutinize ways to change student teaching to ensure that prospective art teachers are required to teach on both the
elementary and secondary levels. Eight of the programs need to attend to the fact that trained art educators should be supervising the student teaching experiences.

**Faculty Credentials.** The standards require that the faculty members teaching art education be art educators and that the art education faculty members have successful teaching experience at one or more levels. The art education faculty should have acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts.

University G, the program without an art educator, should address that serious discrepancy. Each program with weak art education faculty should attend to the deficiencies as judiciously as possible. Detailed case studies would provide data about the performance and teaching experience backgrounds of art educators working in the programs.

**Summary**

This study involved interviewing the individuals in charge of the visual arts teacher education programs. The information that was not available from these respondents was obtained through university catalogs and through records at state offices.

In this chapter, the findings have been reported and analyzed for discrepancies. Discrepancies are found in what is taking place in the 12 art education programs in Louisiana. These discrepancies need to be addressed, and
visual arts education teacher training programs in Louisiana need to be improved.

The findings can be used to recommend modifications in the visual arts education teacher preparation programs in Louisiana institutions. Some of the discrepancies are straightforward and readily visible. Some of the strengths and weaknesses are more difficult to assess. Recommendations will be discussed in Chapter V in light of the obvious discrepancies and in an attempt to address those issues that are not easily measured.
CHAPTER V

Recommendations

The implications and recommendations discussed in this chapter follow from the purpose, methodology, and findings of the study. The aims of this study were to describe the visual arts education teacher training programs in Louisiana universities as of Spring 1988 and to compare these programs to standards delineated by NAEA (Wygant, 1979). The discussion section of this chapter summarizes the findings and discusses the implications of the identified discrepancies for present and future practice. This chapter includes recommendations for possible actions as well as for further investigations.

Discussion

This study has involved a review of current literature and survey of visual arts education programs at public institutions of higher education in Louisiana. The study has been guided by the questions initially posed in Chapter I. The implications of identified discrepancies between current practices in visual arts education teacher preparation programs and the NAEA (Wygant, 1979) standards help formulate recommendations for modifications in the Louisiana art education programs.
Comparing existing practices in Louisiana universities to NAEA standards begins the process of establishing a model for improving visual arts teacher training programs. Although the standards established by NAEA (Wygant, 1979) are certainly not above debate, they are strong standards and widely used. Some possible weaknesses of the standards have been noted in Chapter II. Those weaknesses are essentially loopholes that result from what could be perceived as an actual strength in the standards, i.e., flexibility. By using the standards and implementing careful counseling, art education students can be guided to develop a course of study that incorporates the appropriate social sciences, cultural studies, and supporting arts which are best suited to the students' curriculum focus.

The NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979) provided the basic criteria for evaluating the Louisiana programs. They were selected for this study as the foundation criteria of a visual arts education program. These standards are flexible enough to permit expansion and generous enough to allow for the potential for excellence. For example, the NAEA standards recommend not only minimum hours, but also more acceptable hours for requirements. Similarly, the descriptions of course content provide numerous options for art education. By using the NAEA standards, there are
options for interpretation which can yield exemplary, yet diverse, programs.

Art education majors should be well-educated students who will become teachers with both a broad background in the visual arts and an in-depth specialty in art. In addition, potential art teachers should learn proper pedagogy for teaching the visual arts to others. A basic curriculum of the art education student can be divided into three components: (a) core curriculum (general education component), (b) major area (art component), and (c) professional education (art education and education component).

The study revealed strengths as well as weaknesses in the art education programs in Louisiana. The study also revealed a number of discrepancies in the art education programs when compared with the delineated standards. Details of Louisiana art education certification requirements and the accreditation of each of the Louisiana art education programs have been established in earlier chapters and in the profiles of each of the universities (see Appendix B).

General Education Component. In the core curriculum, general education component, emphasis should be on liberal arts in a student's education and on improving cultural understandings. This has been a focus of the general education reform reports. Visual arts education students
need these components in their curriculum as much as any student. The core curriculum at each of the universities needs to include the component of cultural education to prepare each visual arts student with a background in understanding the development of humanity and world cultures for a context in which to study the history and development of the visual arts.

The NAEA standards include anthropology, sociology, and related arts as recommended areas of study. Very little attention is given to any of these in the programs of study for visual arts teachers at the universities in Louisiana. More attention should be focused on how these areas of study can be incorporated into the existing art education programs of study or how the programs of study can be modified to ensure that appropriate courses can be included. Judicious use of social science hours, health and physical education hours, and electives would be an initial way to work toward solving this inadequacy. The hours that universities require in social sciences and health and physical education are not always specified. In these cases, students can be advised to include anthropology, sociology, and related arts courses by using the undesignated hours to enhance their art education teacher preparation.

Art Component. The major area, art component, is the area where students develop their competence in the
content of their specialty. The major area should give each student broad coverage in the visual arts, but also in-depth study in at least one area of art. The art component of the teacher training program should incorporate instruction in aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production (studio).

All of the art education programs were meeting the minimum standards established by NAEA for required course work in art production. In Spring 1988, however, aesthetics and art criticism were receiving little or no attention in required course work in the Louisiana programs. Courses need to be modified and added to ensure that art education students are receiving foundations in these areas. All of the universities need to increase their requirements in art history hours, except University J which required 12 hours. Each of the universities need to offer and require aesthetics and art criticism. All of the university art education programs need to upgrade their requirements in the art studio component to meet the more acceptable standards of NAEA and to ensure that the prospective art teachers have breadth and depth in their undergraduate education in art.

**Education and Art Education Component.** The professional education courses should prepare the art education student to teach art to individuals in multicultural settings in grades K-12. The number of
hours in professional education course work, other than art education, was more than adequate. The abundance of education courses needs to be evaluated to limit them to the most important classes about the philosophy and history of education which ensure that teachers obtain the essential general background to understand schools and pedagogy. The state requirements in this area need evaluation. Obviously, those requirements have to be met until they are changed through legislative and/or BESE action. A more detailed study of content of individual courses would have to be conducted to assess the value of particular courses being taught. The emphasis in professional education course work should be on art education pedagogy, art teaching and observation experiences, and working under the tutelage of model teachers.

The professors teaching art education classes and counseling art education students should be art educators with solid credentials in the field. The NAEA standards are vague as to what these credentials should be. This flexibility in the standards is a reminder that each professor has to be evaluated individually, no matter what the credentials say on paper. The art education faculty at Louisiana universities varied from having one part-time instructor to having three full-time art education professors. At one university the art education faculty
was nonexistent. At University G, the interviewee indicated that the person teaching art education was a faculty member in elementary education with a background in art. Some of the professors teaching art education had backgrounds in art education and others had primarily art training. It is recommended that detailed case studies of university faculty members teaching art education in Louisiana be conducted.

Field experiences and student teaching should be done on a variety of grade levels. All prospective visual arts teachers should have supervised teaching experiences on the elementary and secondary levels. Only one university stated that their art education students were student teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels.

The faculty members supervising art education student teachers should be trained in art education and supervision. This was not the case in most of the universities in Louisiana. Every effort should be made to gain cooperation between education and art education to ensure that the supervising teachers for art education students are art educators. One of the problems with the new focus in art education, i.e., DBAE, is the fact that university faculty are not adequately prepared to teach it. Support for continued professional training for art education professors is needed to help ensure that prospective art teachers will have training in how to
teach criticism and aesthetics, as well as art history and studio.

All but one of the art education programs had national accreditation. A majority of the programs were part of education departments that were NCATE accredited. Two of the art education programs were operating in the context of art departments with NASAD accreditation. Some of the art education programs were well supported through the art departments in the area of art production.

Most of the individuals being interviewed indicated that decision-making for the art education program is a joint process between the education department and the art department. The extent to which there was harmony between and among departments was not determined in this study. The need for close collaboration has been supported in the literature. The art education faculty, art studio faculty, art history faculty, and education faculty need to work as a team toward implementing programs of excellence in art education. This sometimes volatile issue of collaboration would be an interesting topic for a case study.

In many respects the NAEA standards are not being reached. Louisiana universities need to alter the status quo to enable art education students to be the best-prepared visual arts teachers possible. Of course, reforms must be realistic. Long-term progress can be
thwarted when recommended reforms are not feasible. Ideas and reforms can die from lack of a plan that is viable. It is perhaps judicious to implement change in art education meticulously with input into the process by the individuals most affected. The key to the implementation of any recommendations from this study will be to build on the strengths that are already in place (Bell, 1984; NAEA & NASAD, 1982). Bell (1984) recommended that improvements in education do not necessitate massive spending but rather require leadership and motivation committed to achieving excellence.

Implications

In spite of the strengths noted, there are various ways in which all of the art education teacher training programs can be improved. The existing programs can each profit from careful evaluation of their course requirements and course content by using the NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979) as a starting point. The courses in each of the art education programs now in existence can be enhanced to implement the elements that are missing. For instance, a teacher training program that has excellent studio art training with a rich variety of strong studio courses could begin introducing criticism and aesthetics into existing studio, art history, and art education courses through integration of subject content. As noted earlier, Barrett (1988) has made recommendations
about art criticism in studio classes to help ensure adequate modeling of appropriate art criticism. Hamblen (1985a, 1988) and others have suggested concrete ways to begin teaching aesthetics to prospective art teachers. Faculty will need, as noted earlier, support to obtain additional skills to teach new content. As a program grows, faculty can be expanded and new courses added.

In the process of examining the visual arts teacher training programs, it is valuable to realize that the existing programs are educating and graduating certified visual arts teachers. It would be erroneous to claim that nothing is right. However, both the quality of the art education programs and the graduates can be even better.

One problem with "reform" literature and rhetoric is that it can be frightening to teachers and administrators working at their tasks to be confronted with movements that challenge the tenets of their operational knowledge. Of course, it can also be argued that without theory reformation, little or nothing would ever be changed.

For reform that is deemed advisable, the crucial question to ask and answer then is how to implement the changes. The implementation process for change is essential for reform success. Each justifiable component for reform needs to be assessed and implemented into a plan.
Recommendations

Improvement of Current Programs

Each Louisiana art education program that is maintained should work to fulfill the NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979). All programs maintained should offer and require the necessary courses in aesthetics, art criticism, art education, art history, and art production (studio).

Field experiences and student teaching should be done on both the elementary and secondary levels. Supervision of field experiences and student teaching needs to be done by university art education faculty.

Qualified faculty should be employed to support the curriculum, the course work, and the students in each of the programs. The art education faculty needs to be able to train prospective art teachers to teach aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production as well as to supervise classroom experiences.

Each program should have an art education student population adequate enough to ensure a healthy learning environment through interaction, experiences, and discussion. Programs with small numbers of art education students need to increase their enrollment.

Universities with art education programs should have the necessary library resources and art facilities to support the art education programs. Library resources
will need to be evaluated and upgraded to provide the research support for each of the programs.

**Alternative Program Organization**

If each of the Louisiana programs could increase its student population to provide for a healthy number of students to work together, plus provide the appropriate faculty to teach the necessary course work, then perhaps the state could justify 12 programs. However, given present realities, other alternatives might serve the state and the visual arts education teachers better at this time. Faced with low art education student populations and financial limitations, it might be best to facilitate art education program centers situated at selected universities throughout the state. The visual arts students and the statewide system would be better served by combining art education resources and having a small number of stronger art education teacher training programs.

Some of the existing programs could be merged to gain the faculty to support essential course offerings. The merger of student populations could help enhance the size of the groups of students interacting in the art education process.

There might also be a system established whereby the art education students from a certain group of universities would feed into one of approximately four art
education programs for their specialized art education courses, such as aesthetics, art criticism, and art education.

If art education centers were established on three or four campuses, each of the centers could incorporate a second area of focus in addition to the undergraduate art education preparation. At one center, for example, the second focus could be museum education. At another center, the second focus could be art therapy. One of the centers might select to focus on administration within the area of art education. Another area of focus at one of the art education programs could be architecture. Another possible focus could be cultural and social issues in the visual arts. Such centers as mentioned here could be one part of a long-term plan and would probably have ramifications for further specialization in graduate programs.

Further Investigation

Some key factors to be considered in addition to financial issues for the above-cited centers are:
(a) geographical locations of the universities;
(b) student populations for art education, the number of students plus their location in the state; (c) current faculty, facilities, and resources on the university campuses, both moveable and stationary; (d) student teaching options; (e) art museum options; (f) graduate
programs; and (g) program accreditations.

Further research would need to be conducted regarding financial resources available for each program. The actual physical facilities on the campuses and the resources available for each program would need to be assessed.

The quality of the visual arts departments and availability of art museums will need further scrutiny when deciding where a visual arts education program would be best situated. Student teaching options also vary from location to location and should be investigated and improved whenever possible.

Geographic locations become crucial in considering where to place programs. Location is influenced by a number of factors such as the facilities at each university and the student population in the state. Further investigation will be required to determine how many art programs are needed to serve the university students in the state.

Current faculty members could obtain additional training and/or in-service education to be better prepared to incorporate missing curriculum components, such as aesthetics and criticism. Options for support and for training should be explored. Additional research would be necessary to determine the possibilities of art professors traveling from university to university to offer
specialized art and art education courses.

The visual arts and visual arts education faculty members will need to work in conjunction with the education faculty members to combine the best resources and develop the best undergraduate and graduate programs possible. The faculty of both the education departments and the visual arts departments will need to be educated about the changes in visual arts education and be part of the implementation process.

The art education graduate programs in the Louisiana universities need careful scrutiny in conjunction with any decisions to combine programs and institute specialty areas. The availability of financial resources have to be considered as well as the need for strength in each and every program that is maintained and developed.

Study should be focused on the elementary schools and the possibilities of working toward more visual arts specialists to teach art education. Elementary classroom teachers are currently required to teach art to their students. Additional research needs to done to find out what precertification course work in art and art education these elementary classroom teachers should be required to take.

The following are potential areas for future investigation:

1. Detailed case studies on art education faculty
2. Detailed studies of available art education resources and their use, such as, library volumes, slides, prints, and films.

3. Evaluations of the content of professional education and art education courses.

4. Investigations of art education student teaching issues and options.

5. Case studies of collaboration among departments: art, art education, art history, and education.

6. Detailed studies of graduate programs in art education.

7. Studies of the various avenues and methods for instituting change: adding faculty, adding courses, increasing numbers of students, changing curricula, and changing state requirements.

8. Evaluations of financial resources, geographical influences, museum options, and student teaching opportunities as they relate to art education programs.

9. Detailed studies of elementary schools' visual arts programs.

10. Detailed studies of art and art education preparation of elementary classroom teachers.
Transitional Options

In the transitional phase while working for the goal of optimum art education teacher training programs, it might be necessary to implement creative compromises. For example, until the necessary courses can be added, the existing courses could be enhanced to include curriculum components such as aesthetics and art criticism. The course descriptions in the catalog and each course outline should be rewritten to help ensure that there is a clear understanding of what is expected to be taught in the courses. Written course content expectations do not offer a guarantee, but they will be a first step and will help when faculty changes occur.

Until the necessary faculty can be added, the current faculty members should be supported and encouraged to obtain the background to teach necessary components of the art education curriculum which are missing. Until the faculty can be added, another option might be that special faculty members be shared among programs through traveling visual arts education teams.

Instead of faculty traveling, the students could take course work at other universities when it is offered. Students should be able to transfer credits for courses in aesthetics, art criticism, art education, art history, or art production offered at other universities. This would require well-organized summer programs and innovative
scheduling with intensive short courses. Also, library resources could be consolidated or loaned until the art education centers acquire the needed resources in art education, aesthetics, art history, art production, and art criticism.

By establishing a grand plan for statewide implementation, art education programs can begin the necessary steps to improve the quality of the programs that are offered and the quality of the graduates that become visual arts teachers. It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the policy-making and credential granting roles of institutions and legislative bodies that actually make or could make statewide changes in art education teacher preparation.

Summary

In this chapter the findings from this study have been summarized, and recommendations have been made about the visual arts education programs in Louisiana. Suggestions for further investigation have also been delineated as they evolved from this research.

Even though existing programs can all be improved through modifications, the potential for maximum success is best served by meticulously planned change. With careful study and planning, progress can be made toward more comprehensive art education teacher preparation programs. Ideally, university visual arts education
programs continually improve their programs and work for the best-educated and best-trained art teachers. Visual arts education programs need to be concerned with depth as well as scope. Educators cooperatively working for comprehensive visual arts teacher education programs throughout the state could bring about the beginning of reform.

The university educators responsible for the preservice teacher preparation ideally need to become involved in the in-service aspect of teacher education. Awarding of the undergraduate degree and certification is really only the beginning.

This study has led this researcher to the belief that changes and reforms that are proposed in the literature can gradually and steadily be undertaken with constant improvement of programs as the goal. Building and modifying slowly and carefully will help ensure strong curriculum structure. Qualified visual arts teachers are being prepared in Louisiana universities, however, there is room for improvement. What is already sound and of substance should be used as a base for building.
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Chapman's Recommendations
Art Teachers and Basic Art Education

Chapman (1982) has made several recommendations about arts teachers and arts teachers' training. She has advocated full-time teachers for all arts in the schools. Chapman has proposed that teachers of the arts be persons who are broadly knowledgeable within those arts, skilled in teaching young people, and committed to the importance of the subject of art within the curriculum as a whole, and to the principle of developing programs that will serve all students, not just the talented. (1982, p. 151)

Chapman (1982) also recommended that art teachers not only be performing artists but also have art content backgrounds. She noted that effective teachers may also come from the ranks of persons who have an extensive background in the history of the arts, in art criticism, and within the visual arts, in the several design fields, including architecture. Teachers should be encouraged to regard public education in art as their central
responsibility. Toward that end, their skills in articulating ideas, engaging students in creative and critical thought, and their acquisition of a broad understanding of art are vital occupational skills. (pp. 151-152)

Based on her theories of education in the arts, Chapman (1982) indicated that the elementary and secondary school art content needs to be "efficient, powerful, and representative of opportunities and issues in art" (p. 152). She also called attention to the need for certifying agents to attend to the credentials of arts teachers. Chapman has recommended that state departments of education should require evidence of such skills and commitments in teachers as a condition for teacher certification and for the accreditation of school art programs.

Teacher certification in art should be required for employment of any person who will teach art on a full-time or half-time basis during a school year. The employment of artists should not be given higher priority than the employment of full-time certified teachers of art. Adequate resources for the regular in-school art program must be provided, and this too, has greater priority than the use of community services which may be beneficial, but not essential. (p. 152)
In Chapman's (1982) framework for an art curriculum, she has delineated the following subgoals to explain her major goals which were noted in the review of literature, Chapter II.

**Encourage Personal Response and Expression**—Help students learn different ways to generate ideas for expression through art

- use visual qualities for artistic expression
- use media to create expressive qualities
- perceive visual qualities as sources of feeling
- interpret the meaning of visual qualities
- judge the significance of their art experience

**Promote awareness of the artistic heritage**—Help students learn how members of the artistic community generate ideas for their work

- use visual qualities for artistic expression
- use media to express their ideas
- perceive and describe art
- interpret works of art
- judge and explain works of art

**Promote Awareness of the Role of Art in Society**—Help students understand how people in a given society or culture

- express various beliefs in visual forms
- use visual qualities for artistic expression
- use media to create expressive forms
- perceive visual qualities
- interpret visual forms
- judge visual forms in the environment (pp. 33-34)
APPENDIX B
Profiles: Louisiana Universities
Visual Arts Education Programs

These profiles include data about the universities as of Spring 1988. There were 13 universities and 12 art education programs. University H and University I had a joint program. Each profile includes general information about the population of the community where the university is located (Rand McNally, 1988) as well as information on the population of the student body and of the faculty when available from catalogs and from the Louisiana School Directory (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1988-89). Each of the profiles contains a summarized description of the curriculum components which was obtained from the programs of study and the university catalogs (Grambling State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Louisiana State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Louisiana State University in Shreveport Bulletin General Catalog, 1988-89; Louisiana Tech University Bulletin, 1988-89; McNeese State University Catalog, 1988-89; Nicholls State University Bulletin, 1988-89; Northeast Louisiana University Catalog, 1987-88; Northwestern State University General Catalog, 1987-88; Southeastern
In the profiles the researcher also summarized data concerning the number of graduates; this information was obtained from the Board of Regents' records. The number of teachers being certified at each university was obtained from Louisiana State Department of Education Teacher Certification records.

For clarification, Type C certification as noted in the profiles is based upon a baccalaureate degree including completion of a teacher education program approved by the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, with credits...including general, professional, and specialized academic education. This certificate authorizes employment for a period of not more than three years for services endorsed thereon. (State of Louisiana Department of Education, 1985)

In the profiles the population of the city in which each university is located has been classified into one of three categories: small--less than 25,000, medium--25,000-100,000, or large--more than 100,000. The following notations are used in the profiles: NA is used to note
when information was not available, and double asterisks (***) are used to indicate when information was not applicable.
Profile for University A

Art Education

University A is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1931

City Size _______ medium

# of Faculty ___________ 500

# of Students _____________ 10,215

# of Educ Faculty ___________ 43

# of Educ Students __________ NA

# of Art Faculty _____________ 7

# of Art Students _____________ 72

# of Art Educ Faculty _________ 1

# of Art Educ Students ________ 14

Degree(s) Offered B.A. art and a teaching minor

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.A. art and a teaching minor-

NCATE, Approved, 1983 (next review 1990)
Art-
NASAD, Not Sought

Number of Graduates: Certification:
Art Education Art Education
(Board of Regents) (LA State Dept. of Educ.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>M.ED.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(M.ED. Art canceled 12/79)

Curriculum Summary

Total Hours required ________140________
Art Hours required ________42________
Art Educ Hours required 6 of 42 art hours
Art History Hours required 9 of 42 art hours
Professional Education Hours required 40
Psychology hours required 9 of 40 educ hrs
Elective hours ____________9__________
ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. &amp; P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. (computers)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Total Hrs 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Production/Studio:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Painting

Ceramics/Crafts/Sculpture

Ceramics 3
Crafts 3
Sculpture 3

Printmaking

Printing 3
Silk Scr 3

Other

Comments:

Origin of Art Educ Program 1962
Profile for University B
Art Education

University B is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1901
City Size _______ small
# of Faculty ______________ 350
# of Students _____________ 6,000
# of Educ Faculty ____________ 42
# of Educ Students __________ NA
# of Art Faculty ______________ 5
# of Art Students _____________ 4
# of Art Educ Faculty __________ 2
# of Art Educ Students __________ 3

Degree(s) Offered B.S. art education

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.S.Art Education-

NCATE, Approved, 1979; next review 1989
Art-

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La. State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Type C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 0</td>
<td>1987-88 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 1</td>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 1</td>
<td>1985-86 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 3</td>
<td>1984-85 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 0</td>
<td>1983-84 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 1</td>
<td>1982-83 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 3</td>
<td>1981-82 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 0</td>
<td>1980-81 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 1</td>
<td>1979-80 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 4</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary

Total Hours required ________152_______

Art Hours required ________40_______

Art Educ Hours required _____6 of 40 art hours_____

Art History Hours required _____6 of 40 art hours_____

Professional Education Hours required _____48_____

Psychology hours required _____6 of 48 educ hrs_____

Elective hours _______________ 5______________

Other ___________________________ __________________________
ART EDUCATION, K-12
Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

- **English** Total Hrs 12
- **Math** Total Hrs 9
- **H.&P.E.** Total Hrs 4
- **Science** Total Hrs 12
- **Social Stud.** Total Hrs 18

**Electives**

- **Other Orientation, Fresh Sem., Lyceum** 4

**Professional Education:**

- **Education** Total Hrs 48
  - **Intro. to teaching** 3
  - **General Educ. Seminar** 1
  - **Diagnosis & Evaluation** 3
  - **Philo. & Sociol. Founda. of Educ.** 3
  - **General Educ. Seminar** 1
  - **Sem. Adv. Teaching Methods** 6
  - **Instr. Media** 3
  - **General Educ. Seminar** 1
  - **Student Teaching** 12
  - **Reading elec.** 6
  - **Speech** 3
  - **Psychology** 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Total Hrs 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___________</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Art Production/Studio: |       |
| Design                |       |
| Design                |       |
|   ___________         | 2     |
| 3D Design             |       |
|                       |       |
| Drawing               |       |
| Drawing               |       |
|   ___________         | 2     |
| Drawing               |       |
|   ___________         | 2     |
| Drawing               |       |
|   ___________         | 2     |
| Painting              |       |
| Painting              |       |
|   ___________         | 2     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics/Crafts/Sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Elective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Sources varied about the number of hours.
Origin of Art Educ Program 1956
Profile for University C

Art Education

University C is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of
Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana
Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1895

City Size _______ small

# of Faculty ________________ 500

# of Students ___________ 10,150

# of Educ Faculty ____________ 28

# of Educ Students _______ NA

# of Art Faculty ____________ 13

# of Art Students _______ NA

# of Art Educ Faculty _______ 1

# of Art Educ Students _______ 9

Degree(s) Offered  B.A. Art Education

M.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree  Education

Accreditation:

Art Education-B.A. and M.A.

NCATE, Approved, 10/83; next review 9/91

NASAD, Approved, 10/85; next review 10/91

Number of Graduates:  
Certification:
Art Education  
(Art Education  
(Board of Regents)  
(La State Dept. of Educ.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>Type C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1986-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1985-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1984-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1983-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1981-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1979-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1978-79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary

Total Hours required ________138

Art Hours required _______48 not including art education

Art Educ Hours required _______6 of 44 education hours

Art History Hours required _______6 of 48 art hours

Professional Education Hours required _______44

Psychology hours required _______6 of 44 educ hrs

Elective hours ________________________________

Other________________________________________
## ART EDUCATION, K-12

### Curriculum Detailed

**Core Curriculum/General Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.V. Lab</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Appreciation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Production/Studio:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Color</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft Category</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic/Crafts/Sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Printing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Profile for University D

Art Education

University D is:

(2) Under the control and supervision of Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1967

City Size _______ large

# of Faculty _______________ 151

# of Students _______________ 4,500

# of Education Faculty_______ 9-15

# of Education Students_______ 400

# of Art Faculty__________ 3-4

# of Art Students _________ 53

# of Art Education Faculty_____1(part-time)

# of Art Education Students __17

Degree(s) Offered  B.A. Elementary and Secondary Educ. Art

M.Ed. (15 hours art)_____________________

Department Offering Degree  Education___________________

Accreditation:

B.A. Elementary and Secondary Education Art

NCATE, Approved, 4/83; next review 4/89___
Art-B.A. Fine Arts

**NASAD, Not Sought**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Hours required</th>
<th>136</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Hours required</td>
<td>36 not including art education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Educ Hours required</td>
<td>3 of 40 education hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Hours required</td>
<td>6 of 36 art hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional Education Hours required | 40 |
| Psychology hours required | 9 of 40 educ hrs |
| Elective hours | 10 |

Other
## ART EDUCATION, K-12

### Curriculum Detailed

#### Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech (Comm)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major:

---

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Total Hrs 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Production/Studio:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serigraphy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Due to discrepancy in science hours/computer science hours, total is ambiguous.
Profile for University E
Art Education

University E is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1898 (1901)

City Size __________ large

# of Faculty __________ 614

# of Students __________ 15,300

# of Education Faculty __________ 45-49

# of Education Students __________ 1500

# of Art Faculty __________ 9-17 (9 Fine Arts)

# of Art Students __________ NA

# of Art Education Faculty __________ 1

# of Art Education Students __________ 15

Degree(s) Offered B.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Approved, 1982; next review 1989
Art-B.F.A. Fine Arts

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Type C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 5</td>
<td>1987-88 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
<td>1986-87 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 2</td>
<td>1985-86 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 4</td>
<td>1984-85 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 6</td>
<td>1983-84 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 1</td>
<td>1982-83 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 4</td>
<td>1981-82 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 7</td>
<td>1980-81 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 9</td>
<td>1979-80 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 3</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Hours required</th>
<th>144/146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Hours required</td>
<td>33 including art education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Educ Hours required</td>
<td>6 of 33 art hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Hours required</td>
<td>6 of 33 art hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education Hours required</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology hours required</td>
<td>6 of 42 educ hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective hours</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Curriculum/General Education:

**English**
Total Hrs 12

**Math**
Total Hrs 6

**H.&P.E.**
Total Hrs 8

**Science**
Total Hrs 12

**Social Stud.**
Total Hrs 12 (Incl. Humanistic Trad.)

**Electives**
18

**Other (Computers 200 and Orientation)**
4

Professional Education:

**Education**
Total Hrs 42

- **Introduction**
  3

- **Measurement and Evaluation**
  2

- **Methods of Teaching**
  3

- **Discipline Education**
  1

- **Field Experience**
  1

- **Special Education**
  3

- **Student Teaching**
  14

- **Reading**
  6

- **Speech (Communications)**
  3

- **Psychology**
  6

Major:
### Art Total Hrs. 33 (course outline)

#### Art Education:

- **Art in Education** 3
- **Art Education Secondary Schools** 3

#### Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:

- **Intro. & Art History** 3
- **20th Century** 3

#### Art Production/Studio:

- **Design**
  - **Design** 3
  - **Design** 3

- **Drawing**
  - **Drawing** 3

- **Painting**
  - **Painting** 3
Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Catalog listed 39 art hours. The catalog included ceramics and graphic art. Due to discrepancies in course outline and the catalog, total number of hours for curriculum could be 144 or 146.
Profile for University F
Art Education

University F is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1925
City Size small

# of Faculty 299
# of Students 8,200
# of Education Faculty 40
# of Education Students NA
# of Art Faculty 5
# of Art Students 80
# of Art Education Faculty 2
# of Art Education Students 30(+) 

Degree(s) Offered B.A. Art Education

M.Ed. (12 hours art education)

Department Offering Degree (uncertain)

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Approved, 3/85; next review 9/90
Art-B.F.A. Fine Arts

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Type C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 5</td>
<td>1987-88 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 2</td>
<td>1986-87 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 3</td>
<td>1985-86 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 5</td>
<td>1984-85 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 2</td>
<td>1983-84 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 3</td>
<td>1982-83 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 3</td>
<td>1981-82 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 3</td>
<td>1980-81 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 8</td>
<td>1979-80 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 11</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary

Total Hours required ____________ 137/141

Art Hours required ____________ 51 including art education

Art Educ Hours required ____________ 6 of 51 art hours

Art History Hours required ____________ 6 of 51 art hours

Professional Education Hours required ____________ 31

Psychology hours required ____________ 6 of 31 educ hrs

Elective hours ____________ 8

Other ____________
ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12 (Incl. Humanistic Trad.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Library Science)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Measurement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Methods-High School Subj.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art</th>
<th>Total Hrs 51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History (Contemp/Aesthetics/Criticism)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Production/Studio:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 3D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

**Sculpture**

---

**Sculpture**

---

Printmaking

---

Other

**Art Electives**

---

**Painting or Sculpture**

---

**Ceramics, Photography, Printmaking, or Graphic Design**

---

3

Comments: Art History was described as contemporary art, aesthetics, and criticism.
Profile for University G

Art Education

University G is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1948

City Size ______ small

# of Faculty ____________ 274

# of Students ____________ 7,200

# of Education Faculty __ 20-42

# of Education Students __ 465

# of Art Faculty ____________ 4

# of Art Students ____________ NA

# of Art Education Faculty __ 0

# of Art Education Students __ 4

Degree(s) Offered  B.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree  Education

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Approved, 4/83; next review 1989
Art-B.A. Art

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Type C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary:

Total Hours required 151

Art Hours required 39 not including art education

Art Educ Hours required 6 of 54 education hours

Art History Hours required 6 of 39 art hours

Professional Education Hours required 54

Psychology hours required 9 of 54 educ hrs

Elective hours 0

Other The Curriculum total includes 6 hours of
humanities in addition to 2 hours social sciences.

ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Humanities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art for Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for Secondary Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major:

**Art**  
Total Hrs. **39**

**Art Education:**

(see education)

**Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:**

Art History Elective  
3

Art History Elective  
3

**Art Production/Studio:**

Design

Design  
3

Design  
3

Drawing

Drawing  
3

Painting

Painting  
3
### Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

**Art Electives (Drawing or Painting or Sculpture or Printmaking or Ceramics)** 12

### Comments

Six hours in Humanities in addition to 12 hours Social Sciences.
Profile for University H

Art Education

University H is:

??? (1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1958

City Size       large

# of Faculty _____ 507

# of Students _____ 16,300

# of Education Faculty _____ 75

# of Education Students _____ NA

# of Art Faculty _____ 12

# of Art Students _____ 250 (+)

# of Art Education Faculty _____ NA

# of Art Education Students _____ NA

Degree(s) Offered: B.A. Fine Arts-Studio, Teaching

Certificate joint program: must be completed at or in cooperation with another institution/professional school

(University H has a joint art education program with University I.)
Department Offering Degree _____________________________

Accreditation:

B.A. Fine Arts Studio Teaching Certificate

NASAD, Not Sought

M.F.A. Fine Arts, B.A. Fine Arts-Art History, M.A.
Arts Administration, B.A. Fine Arts-Studio Art

NASAD, Not Sought

Continuation of profile for University # 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>Type C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 **</td>
<td>1987-88 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 **</td>
<td>1986-87 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 **</td>
<td>1985-86 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 **</td>
<td>1984-85 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 **</td>
<td>1983-84 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 **</td>
<td>1982-83 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 **</td>
<td>1981-82 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 **</td>
<td>1980-81 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 **</td>
<td>1979-80 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 **</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile for University I
Art Education

University I is:

(3) Under the control and supervision of Southern University Board of Supervisors.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1959
City Size _________ large

# of Faculty ____________ 133
# of Students ____________ 3,800

# of Education Faculty _______ 16
# of Education Students _______ 220
# of Art Faculty ____________ 3
# of Art Students ____________ 20
# of Art Education Faculty ___ NA
# of Art Education Students ___ 4

Degree(s) Offered B.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Not Sought
Art-B.A. Art

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates: Art Education (Board of Regents)</th>
<th>Certification: Art Education (La State Dept. of Educ.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 1</td>
<td>1987-88 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 2</td>
<td>1985-86 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 2</td>
<td>1984-85 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 0</td>
<td>1983-84 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 0</td>
<td>1982-83 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 0</td>
<td>1981-82 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 2</td>
<td>1980-81 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 7</td>
<td>1979-80 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 7</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Summary:

Total Hours required 143

Art Hours required 42 including art education

Art Educ Hours required 6 of 42 art hours

Art History Hours required 9 of 42 art hours (Art, aesthetics)

Professional Education Hours required 52

Psychology hours required 10 of 52 educ hrs

Elective hours

Other Survey of Music
ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Curriculum/General Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Total Hrs 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Total Hrs 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>Total Hrs 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Total Hrs 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>Total Hrs 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Orientation &amp; Survey of Music</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Total Hrs 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Measurement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities for Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Secondary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials for Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Prob. in Multi-Cultural Settings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Total Hrs: 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Education:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction/Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Production/Studio:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Watercolor

Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printmaking

Printmaking

| Other         |   |

Comments: Introductory Art History is described as aesthetics. Humanities (education course) is listed as studies of the arts. Survey of Music is required. University is working jointly with another university in art education.
Profile for University J

Art Education

University J is:

(2) Under the control and supervision of Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1860

City Size ________ large

# of Faculty ______________ NA

# of Students ___________ 26,353

# of Education Faculty____ 56

# of Education Students ____ NA

# of Art Faculty___________ 33

# of Art Students __________ NA

# of Art Education Faculty____ 3

# of Art Education Students ____ 32

Degree(s) Offered B.S. Art Education

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.S. Art Education

NCATE, Approved 3/84, next review 9/90

NASAD, Approved 11/81. next review 11/88

Number of Graduates: Certification:
Art Education Art Education
(Board of Regents) (La State Dept. of Educ.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.S.</th>
<th>M.A.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(M.A. Art Education program canceled 10/86.)

Curriculum Summary:

Total Hours required 137

Art Hours required 51 including 9 art education hr
Art Educ Hours required 12

9 art education hours of 51 art hours

3 art education hours of 28 education hours
Art History Hours required 12 of 51 art hours
### ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

**Core Curriculum/General Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electives (or ROTC)**

|                | 6         |

**Other**

**Professional Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles &amp; Practices K-12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and Materials Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major:

Art Total Hrs 51

Art Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Education</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History Survey</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art History Survey</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Contemporary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Art Production/Studio:

Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drawing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Twelve hours are required in art education, art history, and drawing. There were zero hours in design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profile for University K

Art Education

University K is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1939

City Size medium

# of Faculty 331

# of Students 7,600

# of Education Faculty NA

# of Education Students NA

# of Art Faculty 8

# of Art Students 142

# of Art Education Faculty 2

# of Art Education Students 26

Degree(s) Offered B.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree Art/Educ, sources vary

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Approved 3/81, next review 11/88
Art-B.A.-Painting, Sculpture, Graphic Design

**Number of Graduates:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Certification:**

- **Art Education**
- **Type C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Summary:**

- **Total Hours required:** 133
- **Art Hours required:** 45 including 6 art education hrs
  - **Art Educ Hours required:** 9
    - 6 of 45 art hours and 3 of 38 education hours
  - **Art History Hours required:** 3 of 45 art hours
- **Professional Education Hours required:** 38
- **Psychology hours required:** 6 of 38 educ hrs
- **Elective hours:** 9 hours of 45 art hours
ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Orientation &amp; Computer Literacy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles Secondary Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods-Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Education</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Education</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art History</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Production/Studio:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawing</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawing</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drawing</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Painting</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts

Crafts or Clay

Printmaking

Printmaking

Other

Art Electives

Photography or Advertising Design

Comments: There were 6 hours listed for art electives in the program of study and 9 in the catalog.
Profile for University L

Art Education

University L is:

(1) Under the control and supervision of Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1885

City Size ______ small

# of Faculty __________ 220

# of Students __________ 6,500

# of Education Faculty ______ 13-17

# of Education Students ______ NA

# of Art Faculty __________ 4

# of Art Students __________ 103

# of Art Education Faculty ______ 1

# of Art Education Students ______ 10

Degree(s) Offered B.A. Art Education

Department Offering Degree Education

Accreditation:

B.A. Art Education

NCATE, Approved 10/85, next review 1992
Art-B.A. and M.A.

**NASAD, Not sought**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Board of Regents)</td>
<td>(La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Type C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 2</td>
<td>1987-88 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
<td>1986-87 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 2</td>
<td>1985-86 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85 0</td>
<td>1984-85 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 0</td>
<td>1983-84 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 1</td>
<td>1982-83 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 1</td>
<td>1981-82 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 3</td>
<td>1980-81 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 0</td>
<td>1979-80 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 0</td>
<td>1978-79 NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curriculum Summary:**

- **Total Hours required:** 134
- **Art Hours required:** 52 including 6 art education hr
- **Art Educ Hours required:** 6 of 52 art hours
- **Art History Hours required:** 9 of 52 art hours
- **Professional Education Hours required:** 35
- **Psychology hours required:** 6 of 35 educ hrs
- **Elective hours:**
- **Other:**
ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.&amp;P.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electives

Professional Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Teaching Methods and Student Teaching</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Major:**

| Art             | Total Hrs | 52 |

**Art Education:**

| Art Education | 3 |
| Art Education | 3 |
| Art Education |   |
| Art Education |   |

**Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism:**

| Art History | 3 |
| Art History | 3 |
| Art History American | 3 |

**Art Production/Studio:**

**Design**

| Design | 3 |
| Design | 3 |
| Graphic Design | 3 |

**Drawing**

| Drawing | 3 |
| Drawing | 3 |
| Painting |   |

<p>| Painting | 3 |
| Painting | 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics/Sculpture/Crafts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts or Fiber Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Exhibition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: The art hours included 3 hours for senior exhibit. Excellent facilities.
Profile for University M
Art Education

University M is:

(3) Under the control and supervision of Southern University Board of Supervisors.

(A) Accredited for teacher training by the Louisiana Department of Education.

(S) Accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Date of Origin of University 1881
City Size ______ large
# of Faculty ___________ 587
# of Students __________ 9,800
# of Education Faculty____ 84
# of Education Students _____ NA
# of Art Faculty____________ 6
# of Art Students __________ NA
# of Art Education Faculty NA
# of Art Education Students NA

Degree(s) Offered _B.S.Ed. Art Education_ ____________

_M.Ed. Art Education (no thesis)_

Department Offering Degree _Education_ ____________

Accreditation:

_B.S.Ed. Art Education_

_NCATE, Approved, 1978; next review, 1988_
M.Ed. Art Education (no thesis)

NCATE. Approved, 1983-84; next review, 1989-91

Art-B.A. Fine Arts

NASAD, Not Sought

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Graduates:</th>
<th>Certification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education (Board of Regents)</td>
<td>Art Education (La State Dept. of Educ.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.Ed.</td>
<td>M.Ed.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*M.Ed., no thesis.

Curriculum Summary:

Total Hours required 139

Art Hours required 41

Art Educ Hours required 6

3 of 41 art hours and 3 of 40 education hours

Art History Hours required 6 of 41 art hours
Professional Education Hours required 40

Psychology hours required 9 of 40 educ hrs

Elective hours 0

Other Understanding Art and Understanding Music-6hrs

Orientation-2 hrs

Critical Thinking-6 hrs

ART EDUCATION, K-12

Curriculum Detailed

Core Curriculum/General Education:

English Total Hrs 12
Math Total Hrs 6
H.&P.E. Total Hrs 4
Science Total Hrs 12
Social Stud. Total Hrs 12

Other Orientation 2
Other Understanding Music 3
Other Understanding Art 3
Electives

Professional Education:

Education Total Hrs 40

Introduction 3
Evaluation Procedures 3
Introduction to Instru. Tech. 3
Library and Research 1
Methods and Materials in Secondary Art 3
Student Teaching Seminar 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Total Hrs 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art in Elementary Sch</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History/Aesthetics/Criticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Production/Studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: There were differences in what the catalog listed and what the program of study listed.
APPENDIX C
Interview Guide

Interviewer_____________________________ Date__________

Method of interview___________ in person/phone/other

Name of institution_____________________________________

Address __________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________________

Phone____________________________________________________________________________

Person being interviewed______________________________________

Personal information: Age__________ Sex__________

Degree/s_____________________________________________________

Universities__________________________________________________

Qualifications_________________________________________________

Tenured____ Tenured-track_________ Other___________

Full-time____ Part-time________________ Other___________

University _______ or College _______:

Size: Faculty__________ Students__________

Location____________________________________________________

Date of origin_______ Age of University__________

College of Education__________________________________________

Size: Faculty ________ Students __________

School of Art ________________________________________________

Size: Faculty ________ Students __________
Art Education Department ___________________

Size: Faculty _______ Students _________

Art Education Program

Degrees offered____________________________________

Graduate degrees offered____________________________________

Origin of art education program

When program began __________________________________________

Who started program _________________________________________

Number of students enrolled: 1987-88 _______
1986-87 ______ 1985-86 ______ 1984-85 _______
1983-84 ______ 1982-83 ______ 1981-82 _______
1980-81 ______ 1979-80 ______ 1978-79 _______

Number of students completed: 1987-88 _______
1986-87 ______ 1985-86 ______ 1984-85 _______
1983-84 ______ 1982-83 ______ 1981-82 _______
1980-81 ______ 1979-80 ______ 1978-79 _______

Person/s in charge of art education program_____________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Credentials________________________________________________

Person/s teaching art education courses_______________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Credentials________________________________________________

What courses are students required to take: include the credit hours for the courses:
Education

Art Education

Aesthetics

Art Criticism

Art History

Art Production/Studio

Supervision of student teachers:

Person/s supervising student teachers - Location/s

Are any other field experiences included in your program?
Certification requirements: __________________________

____________________________________________________

NTE_________ Student teaching__________________________

4 year program_________ Graduate degree___________

Department that issues the art education degree: _____

___________________________________________________________(Educ/Art/other)

Person/s making decisions about art education programs:

__________________________________________________________

Credentials________________________________________________

What plans are in the preparatory stages that might modify
current practices in the program?________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D
PREINTERVIEW GUIDE

University ______________ or College __________:

College of Education

Size: Faculty _______ Students _______

School of Art

Size: Faculty _______ Students _______

Art Education Department

Size: Faculty _______ Students _______

Art Education Program

Origin of Art Education Program

When program began ____________________________

Who started program _____________________________

Number of students enrolled: 1987-88 _______

1986-87 _____ 1985-86 _____ 1984-85 _______

1983-84 _____ 1982-83 _____ 1981-82 _______


Number of students completed: 1987-88 _______

1986-87 _____ 1985-86 _____ 1984-85 _______

1983-84 _____ 1982-83 _____ 1981-82 _______


What courses are students required to take, include the credit hours for the courses:

Education ____________________________________
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What plans are in the preparatory stages that might modify current practices in the program?
APPENDIX E

Universities Included in Study and Addresses

Four-Year Public Louisiana Colleges and Universities
With State Approved Programs
Leading To Teacher Certification In Visual Arts:

1. Grambling State University
   P.O. Box 607
   Grambling, Louisiana 71245

2. Louisiana State University
   Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

3. Louisiana State University in Shreveport
   8515 Youree Drive
   Shreveport, Louisiana 71115

4. Louisiana Tech University
   P.O. Box 3184
   Tech Station
   Ruston, Louisiana 71272

5. McNeese State University
   4100 Ryan Street
   Lake Charles, Louisiana 70609

6. Nicholls State University
   University Station
   Thibodaux, Louisiana 70310
7. Northeast Louisiana University
    700 University Avenue
    Monroe, Louisiana 71209

8. Northwestern State University of Louisiana
    College Avenue
    Natchitoches, Louisiana 71457

9. Southeastern Louisiana University
    P.O. Box 784
    University Station
    Hammond, Louisiana 70402

10. Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College
    Southern Branch Post Office
    Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813

11. Southern University in New Orleans
    6400 Press Drive
    New Orleans, Louisiana 70126

12. University of New Orleans
    Lakefront
    New Orleans, Louisiana 70148

13. University of Southwestern Louisiana
    Box 41008, USL Station
    Lafayette, Louisiana 70504

   (Louisiana State Department of Education, 1985-86, pp. 316-319, 324)
APPENDIX F

Preinterview Letter

5609 Congress Boulevard
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808
Date

Professor ____________________
_________ Department
_________ University
________, Louisiana Zip Code

Dear Professor ____________________:

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me on ______, 1988, at _____ PM. I appreciate your taking the time to participate in my research.

As a doctoral student at LSU, I am studying teacher preparation. As part of my research, I am gathering information about art education at each of the public universities in Louisiana.

A preinterview guide is enclosed so that you will have an idea about the subjects we will be discussing.

I am looking forward to our meeting next week.

Sincerely,

Eloise M. Murchison
APPENDIX G

Program of Study: University C's Format

University ____________________________________________

ART EDUCATION - K-12

__________Total Hours-Minor Required/No Minor Required

Student ______________________________ Date ____________

English Total Hrs ______

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________

Math Total Hrs ______

________________________
________________________
________________________

H.&P.E. Total Hrs ______

________________________
________________________
________________________

Science Total Hrs ________ Science Options:

________________________
________________________
________________________
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Social Stud. Total Hrs ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

Education Total Hrs ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

___________  ______

Special Ed  ______

Speech  ______

Psychology  ______

Psychology  ______

Other  ______

Electives  ______

Art  Total Hours  ______

Note Substitutions:
* No grade below "C" acceptable in these courses

* Required for upper division effective Fall 1988

(See university bulletin/catalogue for additional requirements.)

Apply for upper division during the semester in which you expect to fulfill the requirements.

Notes:
APPENDIX H

Postinterview Letter

5609 Congress Boulevard
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70808
Date

Name
Address
City, Louisiana Zip Code

Dear Professor:

After our interview in the Spring of 1988, I prepared a profile of the art education program at University. Enclosed is a copy of the profile, which is based on the information that I obtained from the interview plus your course outlines and catalog.

Please let me know if any corrections need to be made. The information is based on the facts available as of Spring, 1988. If I have not heard from you by date, I will assume the profile needs no corrections.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Eloise M. Murchison
APPENDIX I

Discrepancy Chart for each University

13 Public Louisiana University Art Education Programs

Spring 1988
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?
   - yes
   - 27

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?
   - no

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   - Drawing
     - 3
   - Painting
     - 3
   - Printmaking
     - 6
   - Graphic Communication
   - Sculpture
     - 3
   - Photography
   - Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)
     - 6
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum? __________ yes________

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard? __________ no________

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism? __________ no________

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas? __________ no________

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54) __________ no________

General Electives Hours _______9________
Art Education Hours ____________6________

Comments: If the general electives were all used for art, the art hours could total 45.
University A Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature  yes __
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts ______________
   (c) psychology of art ______________
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education  yes __
   (e) history of art education ______________

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area?  yes __

   (a) sociology ______________
   (b) psychology  9 ______________
   (c) anthropology ______________
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)  31 ______________

Are 9 hours required in this area?  yes __

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  NA

Is student teaching required? yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? no

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? no

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? yes

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? NA

Comments: Art education faculty member, Ph.D. in school administration, minor in art education.
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  
   yes  
   28

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  
   no

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:  
   Drawing  
   Painting  
   Printmaking  
   Graphic Communication  
   Sculpture  
   Photography  
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  no

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  no

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  no
   (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)

   General Electives Hours  5
   Art Education Hours  6
   Comments: If the general electives were all used for art, the art hours could total 39.
University B Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature  yes
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education  6
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area?  yes

    (a) sociology
    (b) psychology  6
    (c) anthropology
    (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)  42

Are 9 hours required in this area?  yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching? ________________________________ yes _____

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12? ________________________________ NA ____________

Is student teaching required? ________________________________ yes _____

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? ________________________________ no _____

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? ________________________________ yes _____

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? ________________________________ yes _____

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? ________________________________ NA ____________

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? ________________________________ NA ____________

Comments: One art education faculty member had a M.S. in art education.
University C
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  
   
   yes 42

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  
   
   yes 42

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   
   Drawing 9
   Painting 9
   Printmaking 3
   Graphic Communication
   Sculpture
   Photography
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics) 6
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  no  6

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  *

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  yes

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  no  48

General Electives Hours 0
Art Education Hours 6
Comments: Four design courses were required. *One course mentions critical judgment and art in the environment.
These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature
      ____________________________ yes __
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
      ____________________________
   (c) psychology of art
      ____________________________
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education
      ____________________________ 6 __
   (e) history of art education
      ____________________________
   Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? ____________________________ yes __

    (a) sociology
        ____________________________
    (b) psychology
        ____________________________ 6 __
    (c) anthropology
        ____________________________
    (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)
        ____________________________ 32 __
    Are 9 hours required in this area? ____________________________ yes __

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching

Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  NA

Is student teaching required?  yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  no

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  no

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  NA

Comments:
University D
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum? ___ yes ___ 30

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum? ___ yes ___ 30

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:

   Drawing ______ 6
   Painting ______ 6
   Printmaking ______ 3
   Graphic Communication ______
   Sculpture ______ 3
   Photography ______
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics) ______ 3
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  
   no

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  
   no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  
   no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  
   no

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  
   no

General Electives Hours 10
Art Education Hours 3

Comments: If all general electives were used for art, the art hours could total 46. Three design courses were listed.
University D Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature ________ yes ______
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education ________ 3 ______
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? _____ no _____

   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology ________ 9 ______
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) ________ 28 ______

Are 9 hours required in this area? ______ yes ______

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching? ___ yes ___

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12? ___ NA ___

Is student teaching required? ___ yes ___

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? ___ yes ___

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? ___ no ___

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? ___ yes ___

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? ___ NA ___

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? ___ NA ___

Comments:
University E
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum? __________ yes ______

21

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum? __________ no ______

21

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:

Drawing __________ 3
Painting __________ 3
Printmaking
Graphic Communication
Sculpture __________ 3
Photography
Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  _no_

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  _no_

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  _no_

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  _no_

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  _no_

General Electives Hours  18
Art Education Hours  6

Comments: If general electives are all used for art, art hours could total 45. Two design courses were listed.
University E Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature __________ yes ______
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts __________
   (c) psychology of art __________
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education ________ 6 ______
   (e) history of art education __________

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? __________ yes ______

   (a) sociology __________
   (b) psychology ________ 6 ______
   (c) anthropology __________
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) ________ 36 ______

Are 9 hours required in this area? __________ yes ______

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  NA

Is student teaching required?  yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  no

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  no

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  no

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  no

Comments: Art education faculty member had B.A. in art education, M.F.A., and masters in special education.
University F
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  
   
   |   yes   |
   |   39    |

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?

   |   yes   |
   |   39    |

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:

   - Drawing  
   - Painting  
   - Printmaking  
   - Graphic Communication  
   - Sculpture  
   - Photography  
   - Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)

   |   9    |
   |   6    |
   |   0    |
   |         |
   |   6    |
   |         |
   |   3    |
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum? no

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard? no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism? yes

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas? yes

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54) no

General Electives Hours 8
Art Education Hours 6

Comments: If general electives were all used for art, art hours could total 45. Photography or design was listed.
University F Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? yes

    (a) sociology
    (b) psychology
    (c) anthropology
    (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)

Are 9 hours required in this area? yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  yes

Is student teaching required?  yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  no

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  no

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  NA

Comments: Art education faculty member has Ph.D.
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  yes  33

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  yes  33

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   Drawing  6
   Painting  3
   Printmaking  3
   Graphic Communication
   Sculpture  3
   Photography
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)  3
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  
   no

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard? 
   no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism? 
   no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  
   no

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  
   (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  
   no

General Electives Hours  8
Art Education Hours  6

Comments: If general electives were all used for art, art hours could total 47. Two design were required.
University G Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature __________________________________ yes __________
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts ______________
   (c) psychology of art ______________
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education __________ 6
   (e) history of art education ______________

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? ______________

   (a) sociology ______________
   (b) psychology __________ 9
   (c) anthropology ______________
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) __________ 39

Are 9 hours required in this area? __________ yes __________

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching? ______ yes ______

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12? ______ NA ______

Is student teaching required? ______ yes ______

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? ______ no ______

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? ______ no ______

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? ______ no ______

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? ______ NA ______

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? ______ NA ______

Comments: Art education faculty was described as nonexistent, and art education classes as generic methods.
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?
   
   2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   
   Drawing
   Painting
   Printmaking
   Graphic Communication
   Sculpture
   Photography
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)
   
   NA
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  
   NA

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  
   NA

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  
   NA

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  
   NA

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  
   (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  
   NA

General Electives Hours_______________
Art Education Hours_______________

Comments: By court order, University H has a cooperative program with University I.
University H Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? NA

   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)

Are 9 hours required in this area? NA

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching? ___NA____

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12? ___NA____

Is student teaching required? ___NA____

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? ___NA____

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? ___NA____

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? ___NA____

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? ___NA____

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? ___NA____

Comments: NA-Not Applicable due to the fact that art education students must take their art education course work at University I.
University I
Spring 1988
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?
   yes
   27

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?
   no

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   Drawing  3
   Painting  6
   Printmaking  3
   Graphic Communication
   Sculpture  3
   Photography
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)  6
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  __yes__

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  __no__

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  __yes__

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  __no__

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  __no__

General Electives Hours ________0________
Art Education Hours ____________6________

Comments: There were two design courses in the studio requirements.
University I Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature  yes
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education  6
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area?  yes

   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology  10
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)  42

Are 9 hours required in this area?  yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  NA

Is student teaching required?  yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  no

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  no

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  uncertain

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  NA

Comments: The "art education" faculty member has had experience teaching the art education classes.
University J  
Spring 1988  
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art  
Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)  
In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:  
1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  
   yes  
   30  
2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  
   yes  
   30  
3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:  
Drawing  
   12  
Painting  
   3  
Printmaking  
   3  
Graphic Communication  
Sculpture  
   3  
Photography  
Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)  
   3
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  **yes**

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  **yes**

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  **no**

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  **no**

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  **no**

(30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)

**General Electives Hours** 6

**Art Education Hours** 12

Comments: If all general electives were used for art, art hours could total 42. No design courses were required.
University J Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature
       yes
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education
       12
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? yes

    (a) sociology
    (b) psychology 6
    (c) anthropology
    (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)
        25

Are 9 hours required in this area? yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  

Yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  

NA

Is student teaching required?  

Yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  

No

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  

Yes

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  

Yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  

NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  

NA

Comments: Two art education faculty members had their Ph.D.s. At least one art education faculty member was regularly participating in art shows. At least one art education faculty member was regularly contributing to art education publications.
University K
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?
   yes
   33-36

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?
   yes
   33-36

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   Drawing
   9
   Painting
   3
   Printmaking
   3
   Graphic Communication

   Sculpture
   Photography
   3
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)
   3
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  no 3

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism? no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  no 33-36

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54) no 36-39

General Electives Hours 0
Art Education Hours 9

Comments: There were 6 art electives included in the total (33-36).
University K Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature __________________________________ yes
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education _______ 9
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? __________________________________________ yes

   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology _______ 6
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) _______ 29

Are 9 hours required in this area? _______ yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  

Is student teaching required?  

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  

12. Faculty Credentials 

Are the faculty members art educators?  

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  

Comments:
University L
Spring 1988

Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art
Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  yes 37

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  yes 37

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   Drawing  6
   Painting  6
   Printmaking
   Graphic Communication
   Sculpture
   Photography  3
   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)  6
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  yes  9

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  no

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours? (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  no  46

General Electives Hours 0
Art Education Hours 6

Comments: This curriculum included a course for senior exhibit and three courses in design.
University L Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature ______ yes ______
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education ______ 6 ______
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area? ______ yes ______

    (a) sociology
    (b) psychology ______ 6 ______
    (c) anthropology
    (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum) ______ 29 ______

Are 9 hours required in this area? ______

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching?  

Yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12?  

No

Is student teaching required?  

Yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels?  

No

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education?  

No

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators?  

Yes

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels?  

NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts?  

NA

Comments:
Check List for Discrepancies in Content Area of Art

Questions based on NAEA standards (Wygant, 1979)

In examining the university programs in this study, these questions are applicable to the major content area:

1. Does this art education program include 21 semester hours in major content area as an absolute minimum?  
   yes  
   37

2. Does this art education program include 30 semester hours which is a more acceptable standard for the basic studio component of the curriculum?  
   yes  
   37

3. Does this art education program include studio courses in the following:
   
   Drawing  
   4

   Painting  
   6

   Printmaking

   Graphic Communication

   Sculpture

   Photography  
   3

   Crafts (fibers, fabric design, woodwork, metalwork, jewelry, ceramics)  
   6
4. Does this art education program include 9 hours in the art history component as a minimum?  
   no
   6

5. Does this art education program include 12-15 hours in the art history component which is a more acceptable standard?  
   no

6. Does the art history component include aesthetics, art history and criticism?  
   no

7. Does this art education program include an in-depth, advanced work component for extended work in at least one or more studio and/or art appreciation areas?  
   no

8. Does this in-depth component bring the total of art hours up to 52-54 hours?  
   (30 plus 12-15 plus 9 = 52-54)  
   no
   43

General Electives Hours 9
Art Education Hours 6

Comments: If the general electives were all used for art, the art hours could total 52.
University M Discrepancy Chart Continued:

These questions are applicable to the supplementary knowledge area as well as the humanistic and behavioral component:

9. Supplementary knowledge in art of the teaching field and allied fields:
   (a) related arts, dance, drama, music, and literature  yes
   (b) technological knowledge related to visual arts
   (c) psychology of art
   (d) relevance of art to life, vocational possibilities, art education  6
   (e) history of art education

Are 12 to 15 hours required in this area?  yes

   (a) sociology
   (b) psychology  9
   (c) anthropology
   (d) education (philosophy, history, and curriculum)  31

Are 9 hours required in this area?  yes

11. Field Experience and Student Teaching
Does this art education program require field experience other than student teaching? ___________ yes

Is this field experience on a variety of grade levels, K-12? ___________ NA

Is student teaching required? ___________ yes

Is the student teaching required on both elementary and secondary levels? ___________ uncertain

Is the college supervisor of the student teaching trained in art education? ___________ uncertain

12. Faculty Credentials

Are the faculty members art educators? ___________ uncertain

Did the art education faculty have successful teaching experience at one or more levels? ___________ NA

Has the art education faculty acquired competency in one or more of the various areas of the visual arts? ___________ NA

Comments: There were uncertainties about the art education faculty and about student teaching (whether students were placed in schools other than the lab school).
Vita

Eloise McClendon Murchison was born April 4, 1948, in Minden, Louisiana. She received her undergraduate degree, a B.A. in Art Education, from Louisiana Polytechnic Institute in August 1969, and her M.Ed. from Louisiana State University in August 1979. Her professional involvement in visual arts education began 20 years ago and her teaching experience has included many levels, preschool through college.
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