



NAEA Higher Education Listserv Survey, 2006

Melody K. Milbrandt, PhD

Sheri R. Klein, PhD

NAEA

NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

ABOUT NAEA

The National Art Education Association is the world's largest professional visual arts education association and a leader in educational research, policy, and practice for art education. NAEA's mission is to advance art education through professional development, service, advancement of knowledge, and leadership.

Membership includes elementary and secondary art teachers, middle school and high school students in the National Art Honor Society programs, artists, administrators, museum educators, arts council staff, university professors, and students from the United States and several foreign countries. It also includes publishers, manufacturers and suppliers of art materials, parents, students, retired art educators, and others concerned about quality art education in our schools.

NAEA publishes *Art Education*, *Studies in Art Education*, and other professional papers on art education; holds an annual convention; conducts research; sponsors a teacher awards program; develops standards for student learning, school programs, and teacher preparation; and co-sponsors workshops, seminars, and institutes on art education.

© 2008 by the National Art Education Association
1916 Association Drive
Reston, VA 20191

Reprint information: You may download and reprint, free of charge, single copies of this document for personal use or for handouts at a school-related event or professional conference. You must acknowledge the source of the material: "Reprinted with permission from the National Art Education Association, © 2008, www.arteducators.org."

For additional information, contact the National Art Education Association: www.arteducators.org or 800-299-8321.

NAEA

NAEA HIGHER EDUCATION LISTSERV SURVEY, 2006

Melody K. Milbrandt, PhD

Associate Professor
Art Education
Georgia State University
Ernest G. Welch School of Art and Design
P.O. Box 4107
Atlanta, GA. 30302-4107
milbrandt@gsu.edu

Sheri R. Klein, PhD

Professor of Art Education
UW-Stout
421 McCalmont Hall
Menomonie, WI 54751
KleinS@uwstout.edu

NAEA HIGHER EDUCATION LISTSERV SURVEY 2006

INTRODUCTION / BACKGROUND OF SURVEY

In their review of the state of demographic research in the field of art teacher education, Galbraith and Grauer (2004) argued that “there is much to be learned from examining existing demographic studies” (p. 419) to determine where gaps exist in the research. Zimmerman (1997), Hutchens (1997), Burton (1998), Seigny (1987), and Davis (1990) all pointed to the need for more demographic research at all levels of art teacher education and practices. Galbraith and Grauer (2004) suggested that demographic inquiry investigates three predominant themes: teacher education programs, preservice and practicing teachers, and teacher educators.

In the fall of 2006, Milbrandt and Klein posted an electronic survey of 48 items, entitled “NAEA Higher Education Demographics, Interests and Needs Assessment.” The survey was developed in response to a discussion on the NAEA Higher Education Listserv that took place in the early winter of 2006. This discussion centered on the professional qualifications of university level art educators and revealed polarized thinking among the membership regarding this issue. The apparent need for more demographic data to contextualize the listserv comments and reveal professional concerns within the Higher Education Division ignited the gathering of demographic data through the online listserv survey.

As noted, there are existing research articles that report demographic information, but until recently there has not been a system for creating or maintaining a large demographic warehouse of data. The goals of this online report are to (1) document all of the demographic information generated by the Higher Education Listserv Survey, which is far more than could be reported and analyzed in a typical research article and may provide a baseline from which to build a descriptive profile of the field, and (2) provide an accessible initial databank of demographic information to the NAEA membership to motivate and encourage further demographic research.

The format of the report will be to provide a chart of responses to each survey question, including all participant comments, followed by one or more very general summary statements regarding participant responses and a list of possible related known sources of information. A more thorough analysis and interpretation of the Higher Ed Survey data may be found in “Survey of Art Teacher Educators: Qualifications, Identity, and Practice” (Milbrandt & Klein, 2008).

Guiding Research Questions

All NAEA Higher Education Listserv members (422) were invited to respond to the online survey. Five guiding research questions directed the survey questionnaire:

- 1) What are the contexts and conditions for postsecondary art education?
- 2) What credentials, educational backgrounds and experiences do university/college art educators possess?
- 3) How do art educators identify themselves as professionals?
- 4) What content do art educators believe is most important to address in teacher preparation?
- 5) What issues or topics are important to higher art educators?

The information generated from the participant responses was analyzed in the spring of 2007.

One hundred volunteer members of the NAEA Higher Education Division Listserv (23.69%) responded to the online survey. Survey data emerged in two broad areas of Art Education Teacher Preparation: the situational professional work environment of higher education, and the values and concerns of art teacher educators. Specific survey data provided information in the following categories:

- 1) Faculty location of appointment, rank, and experience;
- 2) Types of art education programs;
- 3) Faculty degrees and qualifications;
- 4) Faculty perceptions of their institutions' values;
- 5) Faculty perceptions of their professional identity;
- 6) Time spent on professional activities and responsibilities; and
- 7) Issues, concerns, and professional development needs of Higher Education faculty.

While descriptive quantitative data were collected, the comments sections of the listserv survey also provided respondents with an opportunity to extensively voice and candidly illustrate the circumstances in which they teach. This combination of quantitative and qualitative data provides a rare professional profile of the art teacher educator in higher education.

SURVEY FINDINGS**Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions****PARTICIPANT INSTITUTIONS AND DEGREES OFFERED****Survey Responses Regarding the Structure of Institutions and Programs****1. Please check all of the descriptors that identify your institution.**

Type of Institution	Percent of Participants
Research Institution	65%
Comprehensive	68%
Teaching Institution	52%
Art School	25%
Two-year	0%
Public, primarily state funded	53%
Private	12%
Religious Affiliation	6%
Others, please specify	6%

General Findings

The majority of art teacher educator survey participants viewed their institutions as comprehensive (68%) and focused on research (65%). Slightly more than half viewed their institution as a publicly funded (53%) institution with a focus on teacher preparation (52%). Approximately 12-15% saw their institution as having multiple strengths and overlapping foci.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

2. Please check the best description of your current art education position.

Position	Percent of Participants
Tenured, Assistant Professor	10%
Tenured, Associate Professor	29%
Tenured, Full Professor	31%
Non-tenured, Assistant Professor	19%
Non-tenured, Associate Professor	3%
Full time, non-tenure track	1%
Part time, non-tenure track	1%
Graduate student in a teaching position	1%
Retired higher education art educator	1%
Other, please specify	5%

General Findings

The wide majority of total participants responding to the survey were tenured professors (70%). Tenured, Full Professors responded most frequently (31%) followed closely by Tenured, Associate Professors (29%).

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

3. Please check all items that describe how your Art Education program is administratively housed within your institution and to which unit(s) art educators are appointed.

Administrative Unit	Participants
Within a School or College of Fine Arts	53%
Within a School or College of Arts and Sciences	16%
Within a School or College of Liberal Arts	6%
Within a School or College of Education	15%
Jointly appointed (please indicate below)	12%
Other (below)	17%

Other for Question 3, please specify

- 1) Fine arts and humanities
- 2) Our master's degree is a MAEd in art
- 3) Two members of our faculty hold joint appointments
- 4) College of Arts and Letters
- 5) School of Education and School of Arts and Science
- 6) College of Arts, Media & Communication and working with the Education Dept. which is in Division of Graduate Art & Communication Studies
- 7) School of Arts and Humanities
- 8) Administrative: Education; location: Fine Arts
- 9) Art and Education depts.
- 10) Within a professional college of art
- 11) College of Humanities and Fine Arts within a Division of Graduate Studies, also subject to college of education requirements
- 12) Department of Fine Arts
- 13) School of Arts and Humanities
- 14) As part of the Art Department, under School of A&H

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

Comments for Question 3

- One faculty member has a full appointment in the College of Education. The second faculty member has a joint appointment in Fine Arts and the College of Education. Art Education is located in the College of Education.
- Have taught at three different institutions of higher education and also been administrator at art & design school, as well as other post-doctoral positions outside of higher ed.
- One in A ED and Women's Studies, one in A ED and Curriculum & Instruction; both hold primary appointments in A ED.
- I would prefer the Art Education Program be in the College of Fine Arts.
- College of Communications and Fine Arts
- College of Arts, Media & Communication includes Theatre, Music, Art, Journalism, Radio/TV/Film departments.
- My university does not have an art department per se and did not have an art education program until I arrived. Even now, the possibility of earning an Art Education degree exists only at the graduate level.
- Another College
- I only completed my PhD 4 years ago, which explains my many years of service and my lowly position.
- I teach at a unique college that combines four schools: Art, Architecture, Planning, and Design.
- Department of Art & Design is in the College of Arts and Humanities. Teacher licensure is through the College of Education.
- I teach partly in the School of Education and partly in the School of Fine Arts.
- College of Arts and Humanities
- The BAE/MAE is owned and housed by the School of Art and Design. The certification for our art ed program is housed in the School of Education. We have one of 2 positions that has a 1/3 line with SOE; the rest of that line and others is with the School of Art and Design. All degree decisions are maintained by School of Art and Design, but Professional Education courses (not art education professional courses) and student teaching (which we place all student teachers and find the supervisor, but all credit for this goes to SOE) is with SOE.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- A BS degree is granted in the art department, but students adhere to admission's requirements for the teacher education program for licensure and student teaching.
- One area you did not inquire about is experience in supervision and administration so I included those years in my teaching experience.
- Undergraduate courses in art education are housed within the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. Graduate courses leading to the MAT degree are shared between the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (Content course) & the College of Education (pedagogy).

General Findings

There are numerous contexts and administrative configurations for Art Education programs in higher education. The comments describing the “other” administrative housing of art education reflect 12 out of 14 responses denoting *Art* as a part of the title of the administrative unit. The additional comments elaborated on the position of art education programs. These comments also predominately described the housing of art education in some type of Art unit but there were also several explanations of sharing faculty and certification coursework with an Education unit.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

Survey Responses Regarding Degrees Offered in Art Education

4. Please indicate all of the degrees offered in Art Education at your institution.

terminal degree in Art Education, PhD or EdD	23%
terminal degree in Education, emphasis art education	27%
Traditional master's level graduate program in Art Education	62%
Masters level graduate program primarily for providing initial certification	43%
Masters level graduate program in Studio Art for art educators	11%
Undergraduate program (BA or BFA) in art education or education	79%
Associates degree offering art education courses	0%
coursework, non-degree	14%
Other, please briefly list below the degrees offered.	29%

- terminal degree in Humanities, with art ed focus
- Master's in Education with arts integration
- BS in Art Education
- Master's degree in Education w/ emphasis in art
- Combined degree BFA/MS
- Post-bac K-12 Visual Art Licensure
- Master's and PhD degrees in Teacher Development
- Terminal degree in Interdisciplinary Education
- traditional master's degree in Education w/art ed emphasis
- BFAAE, MAT, MAAE
- MA Arts Policy and Administration, MA Online
- Certificate in Art Museum Education
- Master's in curriculum, with emphasis on art ed
- Undergrad is a Bachelors in Art Education, BAE
- BS Ed
- BS degree; MEd in EDUC only 12 hrs in art
- Master's level graduate program in community arts

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- BA with emphasis in art ed. minor under review
- Master's in C&I with emphasis in art education
- MAT and MA in Art + Design Education
- K-12 Art Ed Licensure with studio BFA, BA, or BS
- BA in Art with Teacher Certification K-12
- Certification only track for those with a Master's
- post bac certification
- post-degree licensure only in addition to BFA
- BAE

Comments for Question 4

- We have an MAT program, a Master's in Ed. w/ emphasis in art and undergraduate BA or BFA with emphasis in art ed. I do not work with MAT students or other grad students other than w/ independent studies.
- We offer BS as undergraduate Art Education degree; MEd and MS; also PhD.
- My institution offers a PhD program in Visual Arts and Education. For undergraduates there is an itinerary on Art Education. We also offer a Master's Course on Visual Culture Studies.
- The School of Arts & Sciences (undergraduate) offers programs leading to the Bachelor's degrees. The Graduate School offers programs leading to the Master's degrees. The faculty and administration for each school is separate. In other words, graduate school art education faculty members do not teach undergraduate courses and vice versa.
- Undergrad program is a BS.
- We also off a non-degree, post-bac. certification program in Art Ed for initial licensure.
- Undergraduate degree is BS in Art Education.
- BS degree offered coupled with certification. We do not have a stand-alone certification program option.
- MAT in art ed, initial cert.
- I can't recommend our EDUC - MEd program, but most of our students seem to stay in the region, so this makes the program convenient for them.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Minor in art ed currently under review for better preparing candidates to enter the MAT program. Also, an approved minor replaces the undergraduate cognate requirement for graduation.
- We will begin a doctoral program (EdD) in 2007.
- Licensure is at undergraduate level.

General Findings

There are different paths to K-12 art licensure through programs that award the BS, BAED, BFA, MAT, MAArtED, MAEd, MAT, and PhD/EdD. The most frequently reported degree program was a BA or BFA in art education or education (79%). At the master's level, 62% of the participants reported that they had a traditional master's program (for professional growth beyond initial certification). Another 43% of the participants reported that their institution offered a master's level degree with coursework preparing students for initial certification. In the additional comments for this item participants pointed out a variety of approaches for obtaining certification from non-degree programs to master's level coursework. Another finding of the comments for this item suggested that different art education faculty were assigned for different degree programs.

Survey Responses Regarding Full- and Part-Time Faculty

5. Please indicate the number of full-time and part-time art education faculty at your institution.

Number of Faculty	Number of Responses
1-3	68
4-6	14
7-9	12
10-12	4
13-15	4
16-18	0
19-21	1
Average number of full-time art education faculty	4

General Findings

The most frequently reported (68%) number of art educators in the participants' institutions was 1-3, while the average number of full-time faculty was slightly higher (4). It is not clear from the data what percentage of faculty in an art education area is part-time; however, there seems to be a substantial amount of part-time adjuncts who supervise student teachers who are retired art teachers or graduate students.

6. Are you in a semester or quarter hour system?

Credit Hour System	Percentage of Participant Responses
Semester hour system	94%
Quarter hour system	6%

General Findings

A wide majority of art teacher educators reported teaching on the semester system.

PARTICIPANTS' DEGREES AND QUALIFICATIONS**Survey Responses Regarding Higher Education Preparation Experiences****7. How many years have you taught in higher education?**

Number Years	Responses
0-5 years	20
6-10 years	22
11-15 years	13
16-20 years	18
21-25 years	10
26-30 years	13
31-35 years	9
36-40 years	5
41-45 years	2
Average	17

General Findings

The average number of years taught by survey participants was 17. The most frequently reported number of years taught in higher education was 6-10 years. Forty-two percent of all of the participants taught 10 years or less in higher education, with 20% teaching 5 years or less.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

8. How many years did you teach in K-12 prior to Higher Ed?

Years	Responses
0-3	33
4-8	36
9-12	18
13-16	11
17-20	3
21-25	6
26-30	2
Average of all years taught	8 yrs.

General Findings

The average number of years of K-12 teaching prior to higher education was 8. The most frequently reported number of years taught in K-12 was 4 to 6 years. Sixty-six percent of all of the participants taught less than 8 years in K-12 before moving into higher education; 33% of all participants taught 3 years or less in P-12 contexts.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

9. Please indicate all of the academic credentials that YOU currently possess.

Degree	Percentage of Responses with Each Degree
MFA	15%
MS	16%
MA	40%
Med	22%
EdS	2%
EdD	24%
PhD	67%
Other, please specify	24%

Other, please indicate the subject area of your terminal degrees if NOT art education.

- Art history
- Education (and another in Art Education)
- Aesthetic education/curriculum and instruction
- MFA Painting/Fibers
- MFA: Fine Arts (Drawing)
- MA: Art Education
- PhD in Art with specialization in Art Education
- Human Development and Education
- Policy & educational management
- Art History
- MEd Education w/ Emphasis Art
- MFA in Design/Ceramics

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Curriculum, dissertation focused on museum education and youth Education
- Curriculum and Instruction, Emphasis Art Education, Minors in Anthropology and Painting
- MFA in art
- Curriculum and Instruction
- Art and Arts Education
- Fine Arts
- MA in Art Therapy (in addition to the EdD in Art Education)
- Curriculum and teaching
- Studio Art
- Curriculum & Instruction, and Administration
- Psychology: Human Development
- MFA in Ceramics
- Curriculum and instruction—secondary education
- Philosophy and Education
- MFA Painting
- EdD Arts Education but post secondary emphasis only—do not have any certification or PS teaching—but do have Museum education and college/university level teaching.
- Art history
- Curriculum and Teaching
- Art History
- MFA – Sculpture
- Instructional Technology and Distance Education with arts emphasis

General Findings

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

A wide majority of total participants (67%) possess a doctorate or PhD. Rather than a terminal degree in art education, 34% of the participants indicated a related degree, such as Curriculum and Instruction. 28.5% of the participants described their terminal degree in Fine Arts, and 11% reported a terminal degree in Art History, including one participant with a degree in Museum Education. Approximately 15% reported that their degree in Art Education was at the master's level rather than a terminal degree.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

10. Please indicate the degree(s) that were required at the time of your hire or that were stated in the art education position listing.

Degree Required at Time of Hire	Percent of Participants
ABD	21%
MS	2%
MA	7%
EdS	0%
EdD	55%
MFA	10%
PhD	81%

General Findings

A high percentage (81%) of respondents noted the doctoral degrees were listed as the preferred degree for hiring, tenure and promotion. In actuality, although the doctoral degree in art education may be preferred, many institutions accept a variety of credentials for hiring, tenure, and promotion that may not include the doctorate in art education (see question 12). The reasons for these differences among institutions may be in part due to the focus and kinds of art education programs, and the values of hiring committees, promotion committees, and institutions that allow for the hiring, tenure and promotion of art education faculty who do not possess terminal degrees in the field.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

11. Indicate all of the sets of skills or qualifications that you believe were helpful in securing your present position.

Helpful Skills or Qualifications	Number of responses indicating this skill set was helpful to employment	Percentage of total number of participants selecting this skill set most frequently
Successful P-12 teaching experience	81	82%
Successful higher education experience	74	75%
Knowledge of research methodologies	58	59%
Organization and management skills	59	60%
Artistic proficiency	57	58%
Research interest	68	69%
Other, please specify below	28	28%

- Studio (teaching) skills
- Ability to work in urban setting
- Experience in museum and arts education nonprofits
- Community/state/national work in art education
- Not sure what they were looking for.
- Experience as museum director and museum educator
- Record of funded research/ external grant funding
- Knowledge, experience with urban public education
- Knowledge of social and anthropological issues
- Community Partnerships
- Environmental Psychology
- Being ABD was a highly desirable qualification
- Experience with diverse communities/community arts

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Publications
- Knowledge of current changes in Art Education
- Good fit with department—and personnel
- Technology applications in art education
- Certification in Administrator & Supervision
- Museum and gallery experience in New York City
- I have an administrative position
- Administrative experience
- Getty Doctoral Fellowship, FIAE fellowships, NAEA
- I had built the program substantially as an adjunct
- Note that all of these change in 5 years
- Administrative experience and publications
- Worked with State Ed on many initiatives, Pres of State Association
- I had held a TA position at UGA
- Museum education experience

General Findings

A variety of professional service, research and publication experience and K-12 art teaching experience were viewed as important qualifications for being hired as a university art educator, but P-12 experience (82%) and experience teaching in higher education (75%) were viewed as highly important with their research interests ranking third (69%). In the related comment section for this item approximately 14% of the participants indicated that they believed that their experience in community arts organizations was an asset to their hiring, while another 14% thought that their administrative experience was an asset to their hiring. Almost 11% of the participants believed that their experience working in museums was important and 7% pointed out their publications as important to their hiring. While it appears that art educators perceive a variety of activities as important to their hiring, successful teaching in P-12 and in higher education were perceived as the most valuable experiences to their hiring.

Survey Responses Regarding Position Descriptions and Requirements**12. Was a terminal degree in art education required in your position prior to tenure?**

Yes	76%
No	24%

If no, what degree was (is) required or accepted for promotion and tenure in your current position?

- PhD in Art History
- MFA
- MFA
- A great deal of professional activity
- I'm on fixed term, but offered opportunity to go on tenure track which I declined
- Alabama accepts the MFA as a terminal degree
- A terminal degree, any field
- Terminal degree in art education, education or related field
- I was hired as an ABD and if I did not have the dissertation completed within a five year period--I WOULD BE FIRED!
- No tenure is offered at the university
- MA or MEd
- PhD in any field
- A terminal degree relating to Art Education...not necessarily in art education
- We do not have tenure.
- MFA
- I was required to have a terminal degree. My PhD is in Curriculum & Instruction and Administration (not art education)

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- EdD or PhD
- Any terminal degree: MFA, EdD or PhD
- PhD in education
- MFA
- I have been reassigned to a position that requires a terminal degree, which I have. I was probably under employed when I was hired, but I wanted to be in a laboratory school and now I am in an experimental lab school.
- No, because we do not have tenure.
- Also, for half our positions, we require a terminal degree—but not all—some require extensive experience in the schools.
- PhD in Art History
- To attain my position, I had to have at least an MFA plus teaching certification in art ed (NASAD approved) plus proven track record as a public school teacher and I was also leader in the statewide professional association. To move up in rank and get tenure, I had to demonstrate excellence in teaching, publish in the field, and do community service.

General Findings

A high percentage of participants (76%) noted that the terminal degree in art education (PhD) was required by the time of tenure. However, in the comment section, 18 responses or 69% of all comment responses noted that other terminal degrees related to Art Education, Education, and/or Art would all be acceptable credentials. A couple of survey participants indicated that their institutions do not have tenure.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

13. If your institution was advertising today for a comparable position to the one you currently hold do you think that the job description would require the same degree or would it be different?

Responses	Number of Responses	Percentage
The Same	94/101	93%
Different	7/ 101	7 %

General Findings

A very high percentage (93%) of participants noted that the qualifications for a new art educator position at their institution would be consistent with the terms of their own employment.

14. If different, please speculate what you believe would now be required.

PhD	10	77%
EdD	6	46%
EdS	0	0%
MFA	2	15%
MA	0	0%
MS	0	0%
Other, please specify	5	38%

General Findings

Over three-quarters of all respondents (77%) noted that the required degrees for a new art educator position at their institution would state the PhD and/or EdD.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

FACULTY WORKLOAD

Survey Responses Regarding Courses Taught

- 15. How many courses (or equivalent workload) must you typically teach each academic YEAR to be considered full-time teaching faculty?**

Number of Courses	Percentage of Participants
1	0%
2	3%
3	2%
4	21%
5	20%
6	33%
7	2%
8	12%
9	0%
10	0%
11	0%
NA	0%
Other, please specify	7%

Comments for Question 15

- Each 3-hour semester course meets 5 hours per week and I teach 3 courses per semester.
- Doctoral Faculty teach 3 to 4 credit courses a year.
- One art education faculty member serves as chair of the department with a 50% teaching assignment. This faculty member teaches 1-2 art education courses each year.
- As I Chair, I teach 2 courses per year.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- If you teach 100 or more students it is common to have a 2/2 teaching load with fewer students in one class you would have a 3/2 load. If you take more than that—it is called an overload—you get extra pay.
- I am also the Curriculum Expert for the Arts Integration Institute which gives me additional income and several additional courses per year.
- Because of New York State requirements that at least 50% of the program's teacher education courses be taught by a full time faculty person, an art education faculty line was granted for Fall 2007. We have begun the search process and hope to fill the position by early next Spring. That will result in a decrease in adjunct positions and bring the total art education faculty to two.
- Next year the college will move to a 3/3 (6) credit workload for F/T faculty.
- Why do you ask number of years in K-12 education and not in community education?
- Keep in mind, that when I said five courses for a year, that is a 60% teaching load, 25% research, and some service thrown in.
- 6 studio = 8 lecture. Art ed scheduled as studio.
- I teach 6 per year with some being studio (meets twice as long) and due to my joint appointment between art dept. However, my C & I colleague teaches 8 per year.
- There are many combinations that add up to a full load. It is common for art ed faculty to have some lecture blended with some studio and student teacher supervision across the course of a year.
- Usually each art education faculty member teaches 3-4 classes each semester. (Some art education courses (such as methods classes, practicum, etc.) are double-periods. When we teach these courses, our workload consists of only 3 courses; when we have all lecture courses (Intro to Art, Art Education for Elementary Teachers, etc.), we usually have 4 courses/semester.
- Studio faculty members on a 3/3
- I also work with students returning for a master's for licensure K-12 art. This degree is offered in the EDUC department. I see the students for the majority of their “bridging courses.”
- We have several student teacher supervisors who have just one student teacher. They are generally retired art teachers with master’s degrees.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Academic faculty have a 4/4 load (12 contact hours per semester). Art studio faculty have 3/3 load (18 contact hours per semester). Art educators load is ill-defined, as one may teach 3 studios during fall semester but may only teach 1 studio during spring semester while supervising 8 or 9 student teachers and conducting a weekly 3-hour student teaching seminar.
- It was supposed to be a 3/2 teaching load when I came here but has turned out to be 3/3 and possibly 4/4.
- In the Department of Art + Design Education full-time faculty teach 6 courses per year, but as a department head I receive a 2 course relief for being department head.
- Most in my dept. teach a 3/2 load, while I teach a 3/3 plus advise, supervise, and coordinate the program.
- Although the normal course load is 4 classes per semester, our institution has a variety of opportunities for professors to get released from one course.
- My 6 courses are studio, lecture profs teach 8 each academic year.

General Findings

About one-third of the participants (33%) reported that they teach 6 courses a year; however, work/teaching load varies across institutions and programs and depends on the nature of one's assignment (administrator, supervisor of student teachers, split studio/art education). The next most frequently reported number of courses *annually* taught was 4 (21%) and 5 courses (20%). There was not a question regarding online teaching or the impact of online teaching on workload, though that is a rising issue in faculty workload.

It is clear that faculty workload schedules vary due to the institution, departmental affiliation, state requirements, kind of program, and student needs. See "Faculty Work and Workloads" for comparisons to AAUP reports. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/facwork/>

SUPPORT FROM INSTITUTIONS**Survey Responses Regarding Salaries and Professional Compensation**

16. Estimate the beginning annual salary of a tenure track entry level terminal degree assistant professor in art education in your institution.

Annual Entry Salary	Percentage of Participants
20,000	0%
25,000	1%
30,000	0%
35,000	12%
40,000	23%
45,000	36%
50,000	18%
Other, please specify below	10%

- \$55,000
- I don't know
- 55K
- 48,000 (not sure as it changes)
- 57,000
- 55,000
- No idea. Mine is compress.
- 54,000
- 60,000
- 52,000

General Findings

The most frequently reported (36%) salary for entry level art education positions was \$45,000 and the second most frequently reported amount was \$50,000 (18%), so over half of the participants (54%) reported a salary between \$45,000 and \$50,000. It is not clear as to how salaries differ among male and female university art educators.

For more information see: NASAD Heads Report and The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) "Faculty Salary and Faculty Distribution Fact Sheet."

<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubres/research/2003-04factsheet.htm>

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

17. Estimate the combined amount of your annual professional development and travel budget for each faculty member in art education in your institution.

Amount of Professional Development and Travel Budget	Percent of Responses Indicating this Budget Amount
\$2500	2%
\$2400	0%
\$2300	0%
\$2200	2%
\$2100	0%
\$2000	7%
\$1900	0%
\$1800	2%
\$1700	0%
\$1600	0%
\$1500	10%
\$1400	0%
\$1300	3%
\$1200	9%
\$1100	1%
\$1000	14%
\$900	5%
\$800	1%
\$700	4%
\$600	6%
\$500	9%
\$400	3%
\$300	1%
\$200	3%
Less than \$200	0%
None	3%
Other, please specify	15%

Comments for Question 17

- The Chairperson does get some \$ for conferences.
- About \$4000
- There is not a fixed budget.
- \$500 per year for tenure track, more for non-tenure
- Unsure
- Each faculty member receives approximately \$1,000
- Grants only up to \$900 total
- Other travel \$ is available through grants
- Varies year to year
- \$350 to be exact...Very, very sad
- Varies from semester to semester
- The amount varies according to grants secured.
- I do not know.
- There is no full-time faculty in art education.
- So far this year—none—this has never happened.
- For 12 it is at least \$7800—not public info

General Findings

There were a wide range of responses regarding funding for professional development. Over one third of the participants (37%) reported professional development funding in a range from \$1000-1500 while a fourth (25%) reported funding in the range of \$500-\$900. Another 15% of the participants provided comments primarily explaining that the amount of their professional development funding was either not known or varied for a number of reasons.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- 18. Is this amount of money awarded equally across all tenure track faculty or is it awarded competitively?**

Way in Which Funding is Awarded	Percentage of Responses Indicating Method of Funding Distribution.
Equally funded	42%
Competitively funded	34%
Other situations (please explain)	23%
Total	100%

Other situations for Question 18

- It depends upon requests.
- Given as needed and as available.
- Unequally
- Competitive/ based on level of participation at conferences
- This for untenured—less for tenured
- Allocated to fund travel for conference presentations
- See below in Comments
- Newer faculty will get more
- I am new and do not know this yet.
- Provided to assistant professors only
- At the whim of the Director, Dean, and/or Provost
- For mileage & conference attendance
- This is not the case in my university
- Unsure
- 3 levels of grants

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Unclear how decisions are made
- Depends on funds available and conference
- Based upon need and frequency of awards
- Both. More \$ for participation
- Those who present the most or need the support
- Equity + Academic Enhancement grant supplements
- We apply at the beginning of the year.

Comments for Question 18

- Travel is highly funded when faculty is presenting.
- Additional professional development money may be secured through internal grant process.
- Chair is very helpful and encourages attendance and presentations at conferences, but \$1000. Is about the limit for any one-faculty member.
- Funding for travel depends on conference presentations accepted; research funds awarded competitively.
- The amount for #25 is equally funded, not competitive; however, faculty members may pursue additional funding from other bodies on campus such as Instructional Development Center, College Research committee, etc.
- You do not include the availability of grants to support research and teaching?
- My department and institution provide EXCELLENT support for PD and travel, especially when presenting. There are multiple sources for funding, some Equally funded some competitive.
- Wish we had more.
- Some years, I have received more than \$2,000 in travel money. This year there is nothing.
- The structure of the University of Barcelona, and in general European Universities, has a different financial structure.
- No guaranty of grant funds even if presenting

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Faculty can apply for additional travel dollars through competitive grants: just-in-time grant (max award \$750) and a travel grant with awards averaging \$1500.
- With only \$350 per year... my personal credit card takes a beating when attending NAEA conferences... but it is worth it.
- If we are accepted as presenter at a National conference we are eligible for an additional \$600. Teaching a one credit freshman orientation course can provide an additional \$500. Sponsoring an Honors student in their final project results in \$200 more.
- Accreditation participants are getting travel awards now. When over, will go to broader considerations
- I wish you had added questions about salary. I would love to see what colleagues in other states are making with equal number of years teaching.
- Senior research faculty pay their own way some years.
- Full-time faculty receives reimbursements for state and national conventions to the extent possible (generally complete reimbursement). Those faculty who have extraordinary opportunities (such as an invited presentation at a major venue) get extra consideration, or may apply to the dean for extra funds. Every effort is made to support each faculty's research and service efforts.
- You can request a little more for specific projects...varies individually.
- Usually the National conference is funded. International requires additional grant writing or is unfunded and yet the department says it values international presentations.
- Additional professional development money is awarded competitively.
- We are hoping funding will be awarded in January. We have always received some funding in the past. There have been no travel funds awarded this year across campus.

General Findings

The participants reported that the process for attaining funding for professional development was that the practice of funding of all faculty members (42%) was a little more frequent than the competitive funding process (34%). Other findings suggest that avenues and practices for funding professional development vary widely across institutions. Funding for travel appeared to be a widespread need to support continued professional development.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

19. Please rank the level of professional support you receive from your institution.

Rankings Low to High:	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
Technology support	6%	6%	19%	23%	23%	24%	0%
In-house competitive funding for research	12%	15%	19%	27%	16%	8%	2%
On campus professional development	9%	15%	18%	24%	25%	10%	0%
Off campus professional development Opportunities	12%	17%	28%	10%	16%	13%	3%
Graduate assistants	31%	13%	15%	10%	9%	7%	13%
Secretarial or clerical help	25%	26%	11%	11%	14%	12%	1%
Other support:	20%	8%	13%	20%	18%	7%	15%

Comments for Question 19

- More travel money needed.
- We get the \$1,000 to use for this. Most use it for travel to conferences.
- There is no budget for this issue.
- There are numerous off campus opportunities, but it all depends on funding.
- Financial aid is available for attending conferences or taking courses for credit.
- There is support for attending activities that the University deems important for institutional goals.
- The university supports my attendance to state and national art education conventions, such as NAEA, SECEC, and other pertinent professional development opportunities.
- For getting the new programs and for accreditation we can go to conferences.
- Except attending NAEA and TAEA events.
- Faculty can apply for "reassignment" for one semester—essentially a research sabbatical, especially if there is a book or major exhibition involved. These are few and competitive across the entire School of the Arts

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Our dean terminated our part-time office worker and now our secretary has to pick up the slack ... meanwhile, university continues to spend in other areas seemingly without limits. She is under a lot of stress.
- Fortunate to have wonderful secretary. Assistance needed for the size of our department.
- Nothing
- We have no secretarial support for faculty.
- None exists
- This is my dream. We have a secretary for 30 faculty members.
- Only have one person for dept, and need more.
- The good secretaries are taken by the Chair and Dean. Program directors have to do much of their clerical work. Faculty have do much clerical work, too, i.e. Typing recommendations, communicating with colleagues on and off campus, etc.
- Hard times at state universities.
- We have one excellent, overworked and underpaid OP for a department with 16 full-time and 8 part-time faculty, 450 majors, and 35 minors. More and more tasks have been pushed down to the department level and fall on the OP and Chair. OP has evolved into more and more accounting.
- We have an administrative assistance for the art department, but no individual secretaries or other clerical help for our specific use.
- Excellent secretary is leaving with nobody training to take her place—big mistake.
- We have one, but she is responsible only to the head.
- We have a full-time administrative director which is a collateral faculty position. In addition, we have two work-study students who serve as receptionists and help with clerical duties.
- Internal professional development grants are helpful.
- Great librarians!
- Good will
- Department also has full-time visual resources librarian/curator and lab tech for areas such as wood shop, studio labs.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- I am split between Studio and Art Ed. In 3D studio, Ceramics, it is very hard for me to get support in the upkeep and repair of equipment that is outside my level of expertise
- Not much
- We have no secretarial support for faculty.
- Student workers
- Student workers are available.
- Undergrad student workers--very smart and hardworking.
- Financial support; purchase of new tools and technology.
- General administrative
- (There is no other support...)
- Things like course development
- Our programs have had decent support given the shrinking amount of state appropriations. NASAD accreditation has been helpful in this regard. Our enrollment and number of majors also helps us. We are the second largest department within the College of Arts and Sciences in terms of majors.
- I have a student-assistant who works five hours per week. This has been extremely helpful since mine is an art education major and an outstanding assistant. She can get more done in 5 hours than most other assistants get done in 10 hours.
- Tripled in students, budget less than any one of our 3 art clubs (individually) and 30 students per faculty ratio, and advised to be more creative in boosting FTE.
- Slide curator and good library of slides.
- There is consultation, collegiality, and time available for research.
- I am trying to answer these questions from the perspective of the faculty. I myself am an administrator but my field is art education.
- We have a few student teacher supervisors. They each have one student teacher assigned to them.
- Office of Grants and Sponsored Research alerts faculty to funding opportunities in areas of research interests

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Our department is very poor in supporting one another. They talk a lot, but it is hit or miss.
- Good tech support
- Advising

General Findings

Professional development funding and secretarial/administrative support varies widely across institutions. About 31% of the participants ranked graduate assistants (31%) and secretarial or clerical help (25%) as the lowest form of professional support provided by their institutions.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

STUDENT TEACHING SUPERVISION

Survey Responses Regarding Student Teaching Contexts

20. Who supervises art education student teachers in your institution? Please check all that apply.

Clinical faculty (non-tenure track) in art education	27%
Clinical faculty (non-tenure track) from general education	6%
Full-time art education faculty	65%
Full-time general education faculty	8%
Part-time art education faculty	38%
Doctoral level graduate students	11%
Master's level graduate students	7%
NA	2%
Others (please explain)	12%

Comments for Question 20

- Usually a full-time art education faculty member supervises student teachers. Currently our full time faculty member is on disability.
- I usually supervise my student teachers but I am on sabbatical this year and the College of Ed. has a PT Gifted/Talented teacher supervise. Supervision is important for me to keep in touch with teachers, my students and what's going on in schools.
- I am the only Art Ed faculty and am split (50/50) between Art Ed and Studio. I supervise all art ed interns in our small, but very strong, program.
- There are no art education student teachers at my institution.
- We supervise early field experiences but not student teaching. Student teachers are supervised by non-art education staff from the teacher education office.
- Art education faculty has always supervised their student teachers here for the last 50 years until this year. School of Education dropped the shared line for this so that now they hire, upon our approval, part time people to do an ungodly amount of supervision (2 sites per student, 4 visits each site, times 24 students in a 16-week semester. This they want to do with 1 retired teacher! We are negotiating compromise here.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- WE are fortunate to have three retired master teachers who, along with our two tenure track art ed faculty, enable us to make sure that we have experienced art teachers to serve as supervisors for all of our student teachers.
- NASAD got this changed during our last site visit. Was done by retired art educator through EDUC
- Besides our regular faculty, we have a few P/T student teacher supervisors. They are generally retired art teachers with masters degrees. They each supervise one student teacher.
- When I have too many students to supervise, the COE hires someone to assist.

General Findings

Based on the participants' responses, there is often a combination of faculty members in varied faculty positions who supervise student teachers. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (65%) reported that their student teachers were supervised by full-time art educators. Others reported that part-time (38%) or clinical faculty (27%) with art education background supervised student teachers. In the additional comments, the respondents noted that retired teachers were often hired to supervise student teachers along with tenure track faculty. One participant responded that "supervision was important (for her)... to keep in touch with teachers, my students and what's going on in schools." While this information indicates that full-time faculty are most often responsible for supervising student teachers across higher education, nationally, there seems to be a trend toward employing greater numbers of part-time faculty. For more information regarding the growing numbers of part-time faculty in Higher Education see "Background facts on Contingent Faculty," The American Association of University Professors. <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/contingent/contingentfacts.htm>

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

Survey Responses Regarding Time Devoted to Professional Activities

21. Art Educators are required to perform competently in many areas. Please indicate the percentage of your professional time that you devote to each of the following activities. These percentages should add up to APPROXIMATELY 100%. If you devote time to a professional activity not listed please indicate the nature and a percentage of time spent in that activity in the comment area.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Teaching and preparation for teaching:	4 4%	24 24%	28 29%	19 19%	14 14%	6 6%	2 2%	0 0%	0 0%	1 1%
Studio art practice:	43 81%	6 11%	3 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 2%
Conducting and writing art education research:	33 37%	26 29%	20 22%	6 7%	3 3%	0 0%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Advising, including work as a thesis or dissertation	48 56%	27 31%	9 10%	2 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Chair or committee person:	48 62%	17 22%	3 4%	4 5%	3 4%	2 3%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Institutional service activities: (departmental committees, reports, paperwork).	66 69%	20 21%	8 8%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Professional service activities: (organizational work and leadership etc.)	62 81%	12 16%	3 4%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Community service activities (providing arts leadership within the community)	50 81%	8 13%	4 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Comments for Question 21

- 120% = approx 60-hour work week.
- Hard to record. Discard 1 on option 2.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Technically, our job is divided evenly across teaching, research, and service, but tenure decisions prioritize research and teaching.
- The committees breakdown into units less than 1 whole percentage
- I am also President of my state art education association and have organized conference for the last 3 years, & served on Delegates at NAEA for the past 2 years. Unfortunately at our school, our research/ creative activity comes last; support for it is not great. They are really pushing "public engagement" so I do lots of that.
- I think I have developed attention deficit syndrome as a result of the above.
- Sorry, I could not "uncheck" a block, so I ended up with 110%. There is an expectation of research or creative activity for the chair, but I haven't found how to work that in yet. Also, advising is not listed and institutional service activities take up more than 10%.
- 120% I work long days X's 6 days
- If you want things to add up to 100%, this survey is not the appropriate instrument.
- The teaching and work load here is very heavy. I do all of my studio art practice in the summers (no teaching).
- Required to do 40% Teaching, 40% Research, 20% Service, but do much more in our free time and at night. We do 160%.
- My % is more than 100% because your scale only includes 10% increments. The 4 service areas (advising, committee, institutional service, and professional service) should total 20%, not 40%.
- My caveat on the research point is that it doesn't all have to be art education focused. I am currently working on teacher education research and advocacy.
- There should be a category for 0% - I would categorize my responses for studio art practice and community service as 0%, but I cannot uncheck the 1 that I indicated.
- There are three areas to promotion and tenure: Teaching, Professional Development, and Service. (1) Teaching includes: teaching and preparation for teaching, advising including work as a thesis or dissertation. (2) Professional Development includes: studio art practice, conducting and writing art education research/or both and professional service activities. (3) Service includes: chair or committee person, institutional service activities and community service activities. You need to produce in these three areas.
- I split my time between art education and art therapy. I am chair of the graduate art therapy program and am very active in the national organization. I also teach and advise about 24 master's theses annually.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- Academic advising and program coordination actually comprise a greater percentage of time than indicated above.
- I know this adds up to more than 100, but I try to be efficient with administration and didn't have the choice to mark lower numbers on last 5 items.
- To give a total amount of hours is difficult, as I find that my personal time is overtaken by professional time - I work many hours a week.
- This chart didn't work very well for me. Also, weights vary during different years when I'm chair of the division and not (right now, I'm not chair).
- We are required to devote 1/4 of time to teaching, 1/4 to scholarship, 1/4 to advising, 1/4 to community work. My teaching, administrative and committee work cuts heavily into studio art practice.
- Community/professional would be total 10% this year.
- I would put the item "chair/committee person" at zero as I have factored that in to "institutional service" but the survey program would not allow me to deselect it.
- I have only recently assumed the department Chair position. It is proving to be overwhelmingly demanding of my time. I really needed options of less than 10% to describe some of these listed above. Advising and Institutional Service are also big items under the umbrella of Chair position.
- Too many committees and accreditations for tiny department faculty. Way overworked with administration stuff as we grew from one degree to 4.
- This is not really accurate, as I spend more than 100% and generally work a 50-70 hour week.
- I currently have a heavy service load both inside and outside the university. Research gets squeezed in wherever possible. The bulk of my time is taken with teaching and preparation for teaching
- Official breakdown in faculty manual is 60% teaching, 40% research and scholarship
- I am really required to do it all! Every area.
- A lot is expected!! It adds up to more than a 100%
- I am a Chair so most of my time is spent on administration. My recent scholarship has been art historical research in the context of art education.
- Can we change this to 200%? I seem to work 60 hours a week.

Teaching Qualification, Contexts, and Conditions

- The program would not allow me to remove a 10% in order to total 100%. I would have removed the 10% from studio art practice.
- Yes I give more than 100%. mostly to accreditation effort.
- This is the closest I could get within your parameters.
- The form did not allow less than 10 percent which I would put for community service activities. My art and research are often intertwined. Chair or committee could be subsumed under a couple other categories.

General Findings

Art teacher educators assume multiple roles and responsibilities; they are often stretched, working well beyond a 40-hour work week. Several participant comments noted that performance in higher education positions are evaluated by the three criteria of teaching, research, and service, but in tenure decisions, research and teaching actually become higher priorities. Out of all the categories, participants noted that they spent the least amount of time on their own studio art and in community service/leadership activities.

Professional Values

PERCEIVED PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Survey Responses Regarding Personal Valuing of Professional Activities

22. Please rank the following adjectives that most describe your professional identity or those activities in which you make your most important contributions to the field. If you wish to include other activities please list and rank those in the comment area.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Lowest	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Highest
Educator, Art Educator	1 1%	1 1%	8 8%	0 0%	2 2%	2 2%	12 12%	12 12%	9 9%	50 52%
Educator, Artist	12 17%	12 17%	9 13%	3 4%	6 9%	5 7%	5 7%	7 10%	3 4%	8 11%
Researcher/Art Education written scholarship	4 4%	5 6%	11 12%	8 9%	12 13%	6 7%	10 11%	11 12%	7 8%	16 18%
Exhibiting Visual Artist	29 45%	8 12%	7 11%	4 6%	4 6%	2 3%	2 3%	6 9%	1 2%	2 3%
Visual Artist/Researcher	22 38%	8 14%	4 7%	4 7%	7 12%	3 5%	3 5%	4 7%	0 0%	3 5%
Activist	17 25%	11 16%	7 10%	4 6%	4 6%	2 3%	6 9%	8 12%	1 1%	7 10%
Advisor/mentor	5 5%	3 3%	5 5%	4 4%	15 16%	9 9%	13 14%	12 13%	7 7%	22 23%
Thesis or Dissertation Chair	16 22%	7 10%	8 11%	3 4%	10 14%	6 8%	8 11%	5 7%	3 4%	7 10%
Professional service and leadership	3 3%	6 7%	6 7%	4 5%	13 15%	7 8%	10 12%	15 17%	7 8%	15 17%
Administrator	23 28%	12 15%	3 4%	4 5%	7 9%	3 4%	7 9%	7 9%	3 4%	12 15%

Comments for Question 22

- As a generalist, I have a broad knowledge of the field from Kindergarten to professional artist. I believe that while this gives me some unique and pertinent insights, it makes it difficult to be recognized as a specialist.
- This scale confused me—I'd rank these equally—artist, educator, activist. All the other work names flow from those (researcher, writer, advisor, mentor, so on).
- There is no Master's or Doctorate in my department.
- I am primarily an art therapy researcher rather than in art education.
- I'm assuming this is self-perception?
- I'd love to be more active as an artist, but not enough time.
- This question was problematic to answer, given the instructions. There is much overlap between these roles, making one uncertain as to what value to place on the individual response options listed versus considering how the overlaps aggregate. For instance, I am an educator/artist who is a visual artist/researcher and exhibits his work. It is very difficult to assign numerical values to these. There are really too many choices and too many of them are hybrids. Isolating these characteristics more and allowing the respondent to show the facets of their profile by the combination they select would have led to more useful and valid data in my opinion. I appreciate what you are trying to do however.
- These are not adjectives!
- I do too many different things, and have had to attend too many meetings to be as effective as I want to be as an artist educator, artist, and researcher. I am hoping this changes as soon as we hire an official art educator for this new art education program we offer next year.
- This is my current assessment but at other times in my career I would have listed others.
- Educator, Art Historian- 10

General Findings

Over half the art teacher educators (52%) ranked the role of Art Educator as the most important, 23% identified their role of advisor and mentor as the most valuable, and 18% ranked research or written art scholarship as the most important aspect of professional identity. The role of exhibiting visual artist was the lowest ranked aspect of identity (3%).

PERCEIVED VALUES OF INSTITUTIONS

Survey Responses Regarding Institutional Values of Professional Activities

23. Please rank the following adjectives or activities that are most highly valued within your institution for promotion, tenure and retention. If there are other issues not listed please include those items and ranks in the comments section.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Least Valued	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Highest Valued	N/A
Teaching, art educator	1 1%	4 4%	9 9%	4 4%	10 10%	8 8%	12 12%	15 15%	10 10%	24 25%	0 0%
Researcher/ Written scholarship	1 1%	4 4%	3 3%	4 4%	8 8%	3 3%	3 3%	10 10%	5 5%	56 57%	1 1%
Exhibiting Visual Artist	16 20%	12 15%	9 11%	7 9%	7 9%	5 6%	1 1%	5 6%	1 1%	16 20%	2 2%
Visual Artist/ Researcher	13 19%	13 19%	4 6%	8 11%	5 7%	4 6%	4 6%	2 3%	2 3%	10 14%	5 7%
Activist	32 48%	11 16%	7 10%	3 4%	4 6%	0 0%	4 6%	0 0%	0 0%	2 3%	4 6%
Advisor/mentor	9 10%	17 19%	16 18%	13 15%	9 10%	4 5%	3 3%	4 5%	3 3%	10 11%	0 0%
Thesis or dissertation chair	10 12%	15 19%	11 14%	6 8%	8 10%	5 6%	6 8%	3 4%	2 2%	5 6%	9 11%
Editor	11 15%	11 15%	7 10%	5 7%	6 8%	3 4%	8 11%	6 8%	0 0%	9 12%	6 8%
Administrator or administrative duties	10 12%	10 12%	13 16%	7 9%	16 20%	4 5%	2 2%	6 7%	2 2%	8 10%	3 4%
Professional service	9 10%	18 19%	17 18%	9 10%	9 10%	8 9%	6 6%	8 9%	1 1%	8 9%	1 1%

Comments for Question 23

- I get no support (i.e., course reduction) for my role as President of State Art Ed. Association. I was told this will never happen. Also: the art department hired me BECAUSE I am a studio person as well as an art ed. person. Our new chair keeps bringing up the fact that a Doctorate is the terminal degree in art education. However, based on recent job descriptions I have seen, it seems to be a philosophical choice on behalf of the institution. I have pointed this out to him in the past...but I am on sabbatical and am awaiting my fate.
- This is a school of art where the focus is on studio achievement.
- The reality is, lip service is given to other accomplishments, but it's still publish or perish.
- Being split between Art Ed and Studio, I get to choose what type and which area I want to do my research in. I choose to focus most of those energies into my creative work. SOME sort of research and production is essential for promotion.
- Although teaching and service are most valued, promotion to full professor is awarded only with a major publication (book) and an international reputation in your field.
- If you are an art dept faculty, the exhibiting art would rank higher. Also, depending on what level administrator you are that ranking might vary. I am speaking from my perspective only as a tenured art educator in a School of Education.
- Service/administration counts for promotion to full professor, less for promotion to associate.
- Collegiality
- Even though we claim to be a teaching institution, publishing is valued above all else. Someone can have a reputation for being the poorest excuse for an educator ever, but still get tenured and promoted as long as they publish. On the other hand, someone can have a reputation for being the most effective and inspirational professor to step foot on campus and NOT get tenured or promoted if they don't publish. Just observations I've made after 12 years at the university level where I have been successful in the promotion/tenure/evaluation process, making and exhibiting art seemed to be devalued, but I think it was because I was evaluated in the curriculum and instruction department, rather than in the art department.
- We do not have a graduate program in our department. Thesis advisement is, however, a valued service for P & T in departments that do have grad programs at our institution.
- We have 5 accreditation bodies that we have to report to constantly not counting the endless evaluation/observation reports and other department/university committees. I would love to just teach and make art and do research one of these years.

- Exhibition is also accepted as creative research equal to research. Regarding service it is divided into department and university. Department would include advising and mentoring.
- Teaching, creative work, and service (within the institution and outside) are our three areas of evaluation. Thus, creative work can take a variety of forms.
- Teaching, scholarship, and service are the three areas required for promotion and tenure here. In art education, scholarly research is emphasized, although studio research is acknowledged and valued.
- Criteria depend on one's specific position. Scholarship/creative activity is of overwhelming importance.

General Findings

Art education scholarship takes varied forms and institutions value scholarship differently in the teaching, research, and service triad. The perceived highest value of institutions was written scholarship with being an activist or an exhibiting artist ranked the lowest. However, one participant commented that in many institutions, exhibitions or creative activity may be valued as highly as publications depending on the institutional needs and the specific position. In the broader context of responses, Art Educators in Higher Education personal and professional values are often in conflict with the perceived institutional expectations and values.

TENURE AND PROMOTION**Survey Responses Regarding Clarity of Promotion and Tenure Policies**

24. Is the promotion and tenure *policy* at your institution clearly articulated with stated criteria for all expectations?

Response to the Question of Policy Clarity Regarding P&T	Percentage of Responses
Yes	74%
No	26%
Total	100%

If the policy for promotion and tenure is not clearly articulated, please explain.

- There is quite a bit of flexibility for different ways to meet the guidelines. Currently we are revising these and the criteria will probably be tightened.
- Criteria could be better defined.
- Vagueness permits administrative interpretations.
- The faculty uses a sliding scale and shows a clear bias for MFA degrees. Art historians and art educators are in the bottom half of the salary scale even though we produce more student hours.
- There is not a criterion checklist, e.g., "x" number of juried national shows or "x" number of articles per year or per two years. There is an expectation of quality teaching, professional activity, and service. Chair guides new faculty and evaluates each year. Tenure-track faculty participate in mid-tenure review in their third year. Their file is evaluated by departmental tenure and promotion committee, the chair and the dean of the college. The applicant receives specific feedback from each reviewing body and has meeting with chair and dean at end of process.
- No one is ever sure how much one is expected to do in each area of research, teaching, and service.
- Little clear criteria

- I submitted my application for tenure and promotion this fall under a newly adopted set of guidelines. It is much clearer now than what I started under.
- It could be improved. A scale as you used in question 34 would have been more appropriate for this question.
- They list categories (teaching, service, etc) but don't list specific criteria within categories. This is good, to me—leaves it open to include exhibition, publication, editing, more.
- There are some general criteria, but it is certainly vague and unclear as to what counts for how much. The values indicated above are merely my estimates.
- There are no specific numbers for publications, exhibitions, etc. However, the policy about promotion and tenure is fair and in spite of the above, fairly clear.
- There are lists of possibilities.
- It is in the process of being rewritten. Tenure is not an option. Promotion is an extremely complex process taking two years, collecting evidence, preparing 15-20 binders of duplicate materials for Board members, etc.
- The 'rules' have changed three times since I was hired...albeit legalistic and secretive.
- There are three areas cited for tenure: teaching, research, and service. The criteria are vague and there are no guidelines in the School of Education to provide detail and clarity to general university guidelines. As a result, there are many faculty who get tenure doing very little, and there are faculty who get denied tenure with reasons that are not supported with the stated criteria, such as "collegiality."
- N/A
- It tends to be vague for the arts. It is not vague for other disciplines.
- But they are putting forth serious effort to correct this... getting close in my opinion. Have developed a matrix that covers all 3 areas: teaching, service and scholarship.
- We are developing the clarity at present.
- It has clearly stated general expectations.
- Yes, but not followed.
- This is done department by department. We establish our criteria in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

- The promotion and tenure process is elaborate and conscientious, going through several layers of scrutiny.
- Stated general criteria exist for art studio faculty but have never been clearly defined for art education faculty. Clarification and revision of Art studio criteria is currently under review by task force. Articulation of art education criteria is on future agenda.
- It changes on a regular basis. This is an institution wanting to improve its status and like so many status seekers. It is confused and values positive publicity and “names” as opposed to long term planning and progress. They are short sighted and willing to sacrifice quality for performance if they can get publicity.
- Criteria are extremely vague and may not be consistent from level to level. Recognized national prominence in one's field is required for tenure. Outside evaluations are given tremendous weight.
- Within the last year
- Somewhat in the ranking of types of publications, but much left to interpretation, and some criteria not written but expected

General Findings

Almost three-fourths (74%) of the survey participants indicated that their tenure policy was clearly articulated. While the comments of most participants identified the main categories of Research, Teaching and Service as the structure of the promotion and tenure system there were numerous comments about the lack of clarity regarding the criteria for making informed assessments. For more information about tenure from The American Association of University Professors see <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/tenure/>

25. Is the *process* for promotion and tenure clearly articulated at your institution? If the process is not clearly articulated, please explain in the comments below.

Response to the Question of Clarity in the P&T Process	Percentage of Responses to Each Indicator
Yes	88%
No	12%
Total	100%

Comments for Question 25

- The process is articulated but the elements related to what constitutes achievement are not defined or understood. For example, differences between published research in art history (with references to primary and secondary evidences), design theory (written without references—primarily reaction papers or art reviews), art education research with human populations (IRB approvals, reviews of literature, summary of findings). The faculty that makes the tenure and promotions decisions does not understand these differences or the implications and tasks of these various methods of generating knowledge.
- Mostly clear...there is some gray area.
- See above
- It is articulated at national level.
- In very general terms...albeit legalistic and secretive.
- N/A
- University policy is vague... defers to individual departments/colleges
- Some discrepancy about what terminal degree required.
- Since I am fairly new in higher education, I am still not sure about some of the guidelines for tenure and promotion. It is all written. However, I think sometimes they assume that you already understand all the rules.
- Same as above
- Yes, but not followed.

- Faculty manual articulates campus wide promotion and tenure guidelines.
- Not at hiring, which is when it should be articulated. Otherwise it is evolving.
- The process is clear in outline, but the details are not spelled out.

General Findings

There seemed to be very high agreement (88%) among participants that the process for promotion and tenure in their institution was well defined. The survey participant comments spoke to the need for more transparency and clarity in the promotion and tenure process currently in place.

26. Please indicate whether or not your institution has collective bargaining.

Response to Question of Collective Bargaining	Percentages of Responses to Each Indicator
Yes	27%
No	55%
Don't know	18%
Total	100%

General Findings

Over half of the participants (55%) indicated that their institutions did not have collective bargaining, while another 18% did not know if that process was in place in their institution. Professional discussions about the use of collective bargaining in higher education might assist the Division members in understanding the benefits of collective negotiating. For more information about collective bargaining, see The American Association of University Professors (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/CB/>).

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Survey Responses Regarding Professional Development

27. Please rank the experiences that have provided the most important vehicles for your professional development in higher education. If there are other issues not listed please include those items and ranks in the comments section.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Lowest	2	3	4	5	6	Highest	N/A
My graduate academic experience	1 1%	6 6%	3 3%	11 11%	12 12%	16 16%	48 49%	1 1%
Mentoring by another art educator in my area at my institution	26 30%	8 9%	5 6%	7 8%	10 11%	8 9%	11 12%	13 15%
My previous teaching experience in public/private P-12 schools	4 4%	13 14%	12 12%	7 7%	16 17%	13 14%	27 28%	4 4%
Mentoring by another art educator at another institution	10 12%	20 23%	6 7%	9 10%	9 10%	7 8%	15 17%	10 12%
Participation in professional growth activities on campus	25 29%	19 22%	12 14%	9 10%	5 6%	6 7%	5 6%	5 6%
Participation in professional activities at NAEA	8 8%	6 6%	8 8%	14 14%	12 12%	20 21%	26 27%	3 3%
Participation in professional activities in organizations besides NAEA?	10 11%	14 15%	10 11%	10 11%	18 19%	13 14%	17 18%	2 2%

Comments for Question 27

- AERA has been very influential.
- I though I only taught for three years as a full time K-12 teacher, I have continued to teach K-12 art classes on a yearly. These teaching experiences have allowed me to focus on particular populations and have given me many new insights into art education.
- You assume that teaching K-12 is the only possible experience. I was a museum educator and director.

- I attend our state conference every year, but have not been to nationals since '91. I am very involved and have presented at many other PD venues: FATE, SECAC, NCECA, Alabama Clay Conference, etc.
- We need a network of help for writing that is not a putdown like *Studies in Art Education*.
- I participate in AERA, AESA.
- I am being mentored by a non art educator at my institution and it is very helpful.
- Mentoring would have been so helpful. It was not part of my experience at my institution.
- I don't understand this question. I am very active in service work for the American Art Therapy Association, but it is more of a contribution to the organization rather than professional development.
- My experiences as project director for numerous grants involving art educators has provided me with enormous opportunities for p.d [professional development] and growth.
- NAEA is an invaluable source of contact with colleagues. It is most useful when a series of sessions are organized, as Kit Grauer did on educating teacher candidates a few years ago.
- Researching and reading and community work also
- Professional art practice
- Collaborating with research colleagues from other disciplines and other universities. As well as reading/research from other disciplines. Action research out in the field, working on-site with teachers and students as well as collaborative peer researchers from other disciplines.
- As a comprehensive University that is aspiring to the next level and under new leadership there is a recognition that our institution has not provided enough of the support faculty need to advance their scholarship to the level that is the goal of incoming President and Provost.

- I trained myself in unorthodox ways. I had a double major in studio and art history when the BFA was the required way to go and now DBAE finally recognizes the importance of art history, criticism and aesthetics. I got an EdD in arts education for post secondary when, to this day, nobody officially recognizes this area of study and the CAA and NASAD say to disregard this terminal degree in favor of the MFA which I have and is severely lacking, as they all are, in preparation to teach higher education. NAEA assumes K-12 is the only area of teacher education preparation needed—INSANE!!! There are so many bad teachers at the higher education level because they just do not know how to teach!!! Ironically, the schools of ed are always the lowest on the political totem pole at the research universities, too, even though the rest of the faculty is not as well prepared to teach! Amazing! Wake up, NAEA, and everybody else. We desperately need teacher training and research training in all levels of education and terminal degrees in art teaching at the university level. Yes, I said it! and yes, it is true. Nobody on my art faculty even knew what a Likert scale was!!! Wake up, NAEA!!!!
- Also, major professor.
- As I mature activities at NAEA are becoming less relevant to me. Though I do need work on technology and how to incorporate in class.
- NAEA has helped me immensely in innumerable ways. It has provided me with opportunities to grow in the area of professional service. It has broadened my horizons tremendously through conventions, publications, and contacts that I could never have gotten anywhere else.
- My most important experiences in art education were working with my colleagues in our DBAE Institute and the other activities I pursued through the Getty Education Institute for the Arts.
- NYSATA; and working with State Ed
- Collaborating with practicing elementary and secondary art teachers
- NCATE training

General Findings

Participants thought that the experiences that have provided the most important vehicles for their professional development in higher education was first, then their graduate school experience (48%), their P-12 teaching experience (28%) and NAEA activities (27%). Based on the additional comments, art teacher educators seem to value interacting and collaborating with other teachers within NAEA and in other organizations, but the quality of professional growth opportunities after graduate school and reasons for valuing it were not determined in this study.

TEACHER PREPARATION

Survey Responses Regarding the Content of Art Teacher Preparation

28. What issues do you feel are most important to address in your teacher preparation courses or program? If there are other issues not listed please include those items and ranks in the comments section.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Lowest Priority	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Highest Priority
Issues of pedagogy, how to teach	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	3 3%	7 7%	8 8%	10 10%	11 11%	9 9%	48 48%
Planning art instruction, writing lesson plans, addressing standards	2 2%	2 2%	3 3%	3 3%	4 4%	11 11%	6 6%	16 16%	15 15%	37 37%
Visual Culture	6 7%	9 10%	12 13%	11 12%	11 12%	7 8%	12 13%	6 7%	3 3%	15 16%
Studio Techniques	9 9%	11 11%	3 3%	10 10%	10 10%	10 10%	14 15%	14 15%	3 3%	12 12%
Design Concepts	15 17%	9 10%	15 17%	8 9%	10 11%	11 12%	5 6%	11 12%	0 0%	6 7%
Design Education	21 24%	15 17%	9 10%	7 8%	10 12%	5 6%	8 9%	6 7%	1 1%	4 5%
Multi-Cultural Content and Pedagogy	0 0%	5 5%	6 6%	6 6%	10 10%	13 13%	9 9%	16 16%	3 3%	30 31%
Issues of Social Justice	11 11%	2 2%	9 9%	9 9%	6 6%	10 10%	12 12%	13 14%	4 4%	20 21%
Behavior and Classroom Management	3 3%	5 5%	12 12%	8 8%	13 13%	6 6%	9 9%	11 11%	8 8%	22 23%
Approaches to Advocacy	4 4%	11 11%	16 17%	6 6%	15 16%	5 5%	11 11%	13 14%	3 3%	12 12%
Developmental Stages of Students	1 1%	12 12%	8 8%	10 10%	13 13%	11 11%	11 11%	10 10%	6 6%	15 15%

SURVEY FINDINGS

Professional Values

Assessment	2 2%	5 5%	4 4%	4 4%	10 10%	9 9%	15 15%	15 15%	10 10%	23 24%
Teaching students with special needs	4 4%	6 6%	7 7%	12 12%	11 11%	16 17%	10 10%	11 11%	7 7%	12 12%
Teaching students who are artistically gifted and talented	9 10%	5 5%	10 11%	11 12%	17 18%	8 9%	8 9%	11 12%	XX	XX

Comments for Question 28

- Also, art education theory and curriculum design theory
- I need to improve my special needs and G/T content. They do take courses addressing these issues in the College of Ed. but of course they don't talk about teaching art. Also, activism needs to improve.
- The focus of my teaching is a comprehensive understanding of historical teaching practices contrasted with current trends in art education and their application.
- The work of my institution on TE is focused in Secondary School teaching.
- We don't emphasize studio because students have taken their bachelor's degrees in studio art.
- While some of the above may be highlighted in certain courses, I cringe to think that any of them are less than a high-priority.
- Our students learn to use contemporary art practices as the basis for carefully planned projects and lessons. We think the current standards are reductive and not too useful in planning quality curriculum.
- Somebody needs to write a book about Secondary Art Education that treats all these things!
- Being in an art school, our students have in-depth studio/history requirements, therefore we spend little time on this content but more on pedagogy— how to teach this to younger students, as well as content in aesthetic/criticism which they do not get much of at all in studio.

- Our fundamental design concepts need to be redefined and reclassified so that they can accommodate the traditional mediums and the new technologies and the new research areas that are now included. This is huge. And if I did not attend so many meetings, my book would be written.
- Studio activities cover those not included in other studio curriculum; fiber arts, paper mache etc. If there is a discussion of design components it is integrated into other topics.
- Interdisciplinary connections
- NA
- In my Introduction to Art Education, I also cover the history of art education, National and state standards of learning, NCATE criteria, creativity and aesthetics.
- State Dept. of Ed Visual Arts Curriculum Standards and ADEPT evaluation system drive the higher education art ed curriculum
- Other: Art History, Art Criticism and Aesthetics. I think the current emphasis on Visual Culture is overblown.
- There is a lot more CONTENT to teach than what you have listed. Also, we emphasize artistic meta-cognition; i.e., those thinking/working strategies that artists use to generate and improve work.
- All are important, but studio and design are addressed in studio courses, so we just focus on techniques for teaching
- G/T students are particularly not addressed or considered.
- Some discrepancy about what terminal degree required.

General Findings

The two issues that art teacher educators ranked as most important to address in their teacher preparation courses were pedagogy (48%) and planning art instruction, writing lesson plans and addressing standards (37%). The issue that was ranked the lowest by participants was design education (5%) and design concepts (7%). With many state and national standards still strongly aligned with teaching elements and principals of design this may represent a major shift of teaching priorities within the field. Multicultural education and pedagogy also remains a relatively high priority (31%). Additional written comments were varied, but several participants mentioned that studio content was not typically addressed because it was taught elsewhere in the art education program. Another small group of respondents pointed out that the discipline content and curriculum theory of art education should be the most important emphasis of art education courses.

29. Which textbooks do you currently use to teach undergraduate art education courses?

- *Teaching Meaning in Artmaking* and other Davis books
- *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching Art in High School*
- Case Studies book
- *Art and Life*
- And a number of *Studies* and *Art Ed* articles

- *Art for Life*
- M. Stewart- *Aesthetics*
- Readings

- Most Davis Art Ed. in Action series
- *Art in the Elementary School* (Linderman) for El. Ed. Majors
- *Children & Their Art* and *Art for Life*
- also use *Art Education* journal

- *Creating Meaning Through Art* Simpson et al
- *Rethinking Curriculum in Art* Stewart and Walker
- *Assessment in Art Education* Beattie

- *From Our Voices*
- *Criticizing Art, Interpreting Art*
- *Basic Printmaking Techniques*
- *Themes and Foundations of Art*
- *Thinking Through Aesthetics*

- *Bridging the Curriculum through Art*
- *Children and Their Art*
- *DBAE Handbook*

- Art Education Lab Manual for Integrating Art into the Curriculum
- *Creating Meaning Through Art*

- *ART TALK* for intro level
- *Calliope's Sisters*
- *Semiotics and Visual Culture*
- *Teaching Visual Culture*
- *Art for life: Authentic instruction in art.*

- None.

- *Children and Their Art*, by Hurwitz and Day
- *Becoming and Art Teacher*, by Bates

- *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching Art in High School*, by Taylor, Carpenter, Ballengee-Morris and Sessions
- *Art for Life*
- *Emphasis Art* and
- *Becoming an Art Teacher* by one of our recently retired faculty
- Reader
- *Understanding by Design*
- Hurwitz and Day
- Wachowiack and Clements
- *Creating Meaning...*, Simpson et al – 1998
- *Envisioning Writing*, Olson – 1992
- *Understanding Childhood*, Woodhead & Montgomery – 2003
- and a few other small publications. A course reader is assembled from a variety of articles in addition to required texts.
- Storey, J. (2001) *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*.
- Efland, A. et al. (1996) *Postmodern Art Education*.
- Eisner, E. (2002) *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*.
- Hernández, F. (2000) *Education and Visual Culture* (in Spanish).
- *Creating Meaning in Art*, Simpson
- *Art for Life*, Anderson and Milbrandt
- *Teaching Art at the Secondary Level* by John Michael
- *Arttalk* by Ragans for Art in the Elementary classes
- *Becoming an Art Teacher*
- *Engaging the Adolescent Mind*
- variety of periodical articles
- *Teaching Art In Context: Case Studies for Preservice Art Education* (NAEA)
- Eisner, Elliot. *The Arts and the Creation of Mind*
- Hurwitz and Day
- Barrett's *Art Criticism*
- *Art on the Edge and Over* by Linda Weintraub.
- *A Book of Surrealist Games* compiled by Alastair Brotchie.
- *Practices of Looking: An Introduction to Visual Culture* by Sturken & Lisa Cartwright
- *Interpreting Art: Reflecting, Wondering, and Responding* by Terry Barrett
- *Art Since 1940, Strategies of Being* by Jonathan Fineberg

- **Assessment in Art Education* by Donna Kay Beattie
- *Contemporary Art and Multicultural Education* edited by Cahill & Kocur.
- *Drawing: A Contemporary Approach* by Claudia Betti & Teel Sale.
- *The Art of Color* by Johannes Itten

- *Aesthetics and Education*, Parsona and Blocker
- *Children and their Art*, Hurwitz and Day
- *Basic Issues in Aesthetics*, Eaton
- *Art for Life*, Anderson

- Herberholz, *Artworks for Elementary Teachers*
- *Art Education in Practice* series, published by Davis

- NA

- *Children and Their Art* Hurwitz and Day
- *Art Education in Practice Series* – Davis
- *Arts and the Creation of Mind* – Eisner

- I use many different readings- too many to list here, and these change each year as I find better/newer sources. Some texts I am using now for undergraduate are: Hurwitz/Day Elementary, Milbrandt/Anderson, *Art for Life*, Barrett, Contemporary Art; Criticizing Art; Talking about art w/students, Kindler, *Elementary Art*, Geahigan/Wolf-*Art criticism and education*, Borgmann/Parr/Berghoff: *Arts together*, Stewart: *Aesthetics*; Walker: *Art Making*, Gallas: *Imagination/Literacy*; and *Languages of Learning*; Vygotsky: *Mind and Society*; Lankford *Viewpoints-Aesthetics*; *Pathways*, Hurwitz, Madeja, Katter; *Authentic Assessment*, McTighe;

- *Becoming an Art Teacher* by Jane K. Bates
- *Creating Meaning Through Art*, Ed. Judith Simpson

- Hurwitz, A., & Day, M. (2007). *Children and their art: Methods for the elementary school* (8th ed.)
- Anderson, T. & Milbrandt, M. (2004). *Art for Life*. McGraw-Hill: New York.

- *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Teaching Art in High School*; Barrett's *Interpretation Art*.
- I switch pretty often because I don't find many very worthy

- Journal: *Art Education*
- *Emphasis Art*
- *Children and Their Art*
- *Becoming an Art Teacher*

- *Children and Their Art*

- *Art for Life*
- *Envisioning Writing*
- *Drawing from Art*
- *Observational Drawing with Children*
- *Creating Meaning through Art*
- *A Child's Pictorial World (not Golomb)*
- *Design Synectics*
- *Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain*

- Schirrmacher's *Art and Creative Development for Young Children*
- Walker's *Teaching Meaning in Artmaking*
- Wachowiak and Clement's *Emphasis Art*
- Wood's *Yardsticks: Children in the Classroom Ages 4-14*

- Hurwitz, A. & Day, M. (2007). *Children and their Art* (8th ed.) Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Simpson, J.W., et al. (1998). *Creating meaning through art: Teacher as choice maker*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

- *Emphasis Art, Observation Drawing, Children a Clay and Sculpture, Creative and Mental Growth, Teaching Drawing from Art , The Art of Teaching Art, Handbook of research and policy in art education.*
- *Postmodern Art Education: An Approach to Curriculum, Teaching Stories, and many articles*

- Szekely - *Encouraging Creativity in art lessons*
- Barrett - *Talking about student art*
- Walker - *Teaching meaning in art making*

- Day, *Children and Their Art*
- Rush, *Teaching Children Art*
- Wong, *First Days of School*

- n/a

- *Children and Their Art*
- *Teaching Meaning In Artmaking*
- *Assessment in Art Education*
- *The Art Teachers Book of Lists*
- *Chapman's Adventures in Art series*
- Davis Pub's Middle Level series
- *Teaching Drawing From Art*
- Efland's *A History of Art Education*
- *Roots of Art Education Practice*
- *Teaching with Multiple Intelligences*

- *Art for Life*, Milbrandt and Anderson
- Frames of Reference

- *Teaching Art to Children*
- *Secondary Art Education: An Anthology of Issues*
- *Teaching Art In Context: Case Studies For Preservice Art Education* (I use many more, but these are required texts)

- Walker, S.R. (2001). *Teaching Meaning in Artmaking*. Davis Publications, Inc.
- Beattie, D.K. (1997). *Assessment in Art Education*. Davis Publications, Inc.
- Fay, J. & Funk, D. (1995). *Teaching with Love and Logic*. The Love and Logic Press
- Hurwitz, A. & Day, M. (2001). *Children and Their Art* (Eighth ed).
- Berry, N., et al. (1998). *Experience Art: A Handbook for Teaching and Learning with Works of Art*. Aspen, CO: Crystal Productions.
- Schirrmacker, Robert. (2006). *Art and Creative Development for Young Children*. (5th ed). New York: Thomson Delmar Learning.

- Sometimes, Davis Publications Art Education in Practice series
- mostly readings placed on electronic reserve, different each semester, and from a range of texts.

General Findings

The numerous historical and contemporary texts used by art educators speak to the need for plurality and recognition of the context and needs of students varying across programs. There were 86 responses regarding textbooks and at least 98 different textbooks listed. The most frequently reported textbooks used were *Children and Their Art* (listed 25 times), *Art for Life* (17 reports), *Emphasis Art* (listed 10 times). Approximately 17.6 % of the respondents indicated that they did not use exclusively use textbooks but rather compiled a packet of course readings from a variety of journals, periodicals and texts that include NAEA publications. There were 9 participants who responded they did not teach undergraduate courses or that the question did not apply to their teaching situation.

Organizational Action

CONCERNS AND ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE

Survey Responses Identifying Future Professional Issues

30. What do you consider the most pressing issue(s) in art education higher education to address in the next ten years? Please rank the following items with 10 being the highest and 1 the lowest ranking. If there are other issues not listed please include those items and ranks in the comments section.

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Lowest	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Highest
External political forces, i.e. No Child Left Behind impact on K-12	1 1%	1 1%	5 5%	5 5%	12 12%	8 8%	8 8%	15 15%	9 9%	33 34%
More accountability requirements from accrediting agencies, NCATE, NASAD, and others	12 13%	6 6%	5 5%	5 5%	12 13%	10 11%	8 9%	16 17%	9 10%	11 12%
Program budget concerns in higher ed	4 4%	6 6%	13 14%	7 7%	10 11%	12 13%	11 12%	11 12%	10 11%	10 11%
Salaries in higher ed	7 7%	6 6%	6 6%	13 14%	8 8%	7 7%	14 15%	18 19%	4 4%	12 13%
Preparing greater numbers of quality art educators for K-12 classroom, implications for class size and workload	4 4%	4 4%	4 4%	5 5%	11 12%	6 6%	9 10%	23 25%	9 10%	18 19%
Preparing greater numbers of quality art educators for higher education positions, workload	7 7%	4 4%	8 9%	5 5%	9 10%	15 16%	10 11%	20 21%	5 5%	11 12%

Organizational Action

Working collaboratively across other organizations, departments and institutions	1 1%	5 5%	8 8%	5 5%	17 18%	5 5%	12 12%	14 15%	9 9%	20 21%
Utilizing technology	3 3%	3 3%	5 5%	7 7%	18 19%	10 11%	12 13%	13 14%	8 8%	16 17%
The content and focus of the art education curriculum	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	4 4%	6 6%	4 4%	13 13%	18 18%	16 16%	37 38%
Connecting NAEA to more global issues in art education	6 6%	7 7%	4 4%	6 6%	16 17%	3 3%	10 11%	22 23%	9 9%	12 13%

Comments for Question 30

- I believe it is essential to prepare quality art educators but not necessarily greater numbers, as positions in our area are very limited.
- Multicultural Issues in art education
- NAEA should also be connected to issues in general (though global) ed. More crossover with groups like AERA. “Art education” is just too small a world.
- We are still in the 19th century—We need to use technology and creativity which we do not teach the process of. We need radical change in art ed. for the 21st century. We do not address contemporary art in the classroom.
- Ours is a comparatively small program within the university.
- Additional issues that should be considered include the broadening of the conventional art education definition (for students, administrators, and colleagues) to include community-based art education, museum education, and arts-based research. We should not be defined as the handmaiden for studio art preparation and practice. Our objectives are much broader.

- The current movement to regress to the Lowenfeld era (art education for mental health) should really be addressed by NAEA as a throw-back to an era that was responding to the horrors of Nazi Germany and the influence of Freudian theory. This is not the agenda for today. Instead, the wisdom of the DBAE era, with equal emphasis on aesthetics, art history, studio production, and art criticism, should drive our curricula as a fully-fledged discipline with substantial material to be taught and learned. Simultaneously, testing/assessment (NO RUBRICS!!) must be used to determine whether students actually learned the material (no social pass). Art educators who implement a demanding curriculum and assess learning will earn the respect of their colleagues and students and the profession will make progress. Regressing to the era of "creativity" and "art for mental health", using wishy-washy so-called "assessments" (i.e., rubrics), and the visual arts standards has taken the field in the opposite direction.
- Women's issues
- Research methods for our field and expanding how we deliver research are an issue somewhere near the top.
- There is far too much emphasis on social justice and social/political issues. These may be areas of concern, but they are NOT central to teaching art or preparing art teachers. In moving the emphasis away from art for art's sake toward art for society's sake, we are gradually killing our reason for being, as a culture.
- Less "accountability" less bureaucracy. We are hired by our institutions after elaborate search processes that identify us as leaders in our field—let us do our job without interference!
- I'll be emphasizing social justice and the relationships between art, visual culture, culture, and social and environmental issues. When you ask the first 2 questions, it's not clear from what perspective we might address these issues: e.g., emphasize NCLB as a path to follow or to challenge?
- Art educators are always the minority and always the other side of the brain people. We need to prepare more and better to be a stronger and more organized force so that we do not always get the short sticks in these institutions. We need to be prepared to create a revolution akin to Reggio Emilia here from K-28.
- Creating a clearer, more comprehensive, and relevant research agenda for art education via NAEA
- I think of all your questions this is the hardest to answer. Actually, I think that an increased focus on art as politics is going to prove problematic for art education. Yes, artists are concerned with social issues and so are teachers, but if we get promoting our own social and political issues confused with helping our students involve themselves in critical thinking we do our profession and our students a disservice.

General Findings

The research respondents indicated that the most pressing concerns for the future of the field was the content and focus of the art education curriculum (38%) and concern of the impact of external political policies (34%). Other mid-ranked concerns include the need to work collaboratively across departments and disciplines, the implications of preparing greater numbers of P-12 art teachers prepared to meet the challenges of the global community, and salaries in higher education. There was not a strong consensus in the comments section regarding the most pressing needs for art education. Preparing art educators who can deliver a rigorous curriculum, and address multi-cultural concerns with contemporary creative approaches were inherent in several comments. A couple of comments expressed the need for a more comprehensive research agenda for art education and some reservations about the inclusion of issues of social justice as a focus of the art curriculum.

ACTION FOR NAEA

Responses to Open-Ended Survey Question Regarding Membership Needs

31. What action(s) would you like NAEA and/or the Higher Education Division to take in addressing your concern(s)?

- We need to be more visible in the art world.
- Create more PR for the value of art in the schools
- Information dissemination—e.g., publication of the results of this survey.
- Making any adjustments in NAEA conference format/content and publications, accordingly.
- I appreciate the discussion forum the Higher Ed Listserv has provided and would like to see NAEA provide a cross-division discussion forum for issues that cross divisions
- Become associated with NCATE so we will have the same standards base as other educational areas.
- Advocate more strenuously in Congress
- I am of course interested in the MFA/ PhD debate and would like to know whether NAEA supports us MFAs as well. Also, maybe NAEA could contact our deans/chairs and recognize those of us serving as presidents of State Associations and who take part at National convention so we get more support at our school.
- (1) Create broad definitions of the tasks and responsibilities of art educators in higher education. For example art educators, like other educators in higher education, in part are charged with being actively responsive to the needs of the K-12 communities near their institutions. This responsibility is not understood by many higher education persons in the arts, sciences and humanities.

(2) Development of an evaluation rubric for art educators in higher education to recognize the range of activities that art educators engage in.

(3) The NAEA has an inward focus that hampers us from effective communication with other education professional organizations. We have a tendency to reward publication within the organization over publications that reach broader audiences. The effect has been to write for the chorus. We need to disseminate the value of visual art education to a much broader audience. These popular or out-of-discipline publications should not be regarded as inappropriate vehicles for art education research and theory.

(4) NAEA has a tendency to focus support for one philosophy or movement of thought and exclude other points of view. As a result the discipline does not represent the range of knowledge it generates.

- A stronger advocacy function would be helpful.
- Published statements on the importance of addressing issues of social justice in the classroom.

Published reports of salaries of higher education faculty throughout the country for comparison

- I would like to have a council that addresses NCATE accreditation needs, perhaps encouraging NAEA to develop a SPA for those universities undergoing NCATE accreditation.
- Promote the changing cultural diversity in art in USA and the Globe.
- Lobbying for more support of the Arts in Education. We need to keep qualified art specialists in education rather than Gen. Ed. or Artists who have no teaching background.
- More action into how we can get art instructors who are not current in the field (teaching highly directional projects rather than self-expression; visual awareness; historical perspectives and aesthetics; cultural, environmental and social issues; etc.)! In my area, the elem. level teachers are highly directional, project modeling in their pedagogy and high school level encourage plagiarism and focus only technical skills and still claim they are meeting all of the art standards! They are very threatened by my new art ed. students who want to teach self-expression, cultural pluralist views, content, etc. to the point where they don't want these students in classrooms or student teaching.
- If we are to be taken seriously, we must make the case for authentic assessment and that everything that is of worth cannot always be purely quantified. More research into correlations between student involvement in Fine/Visual Arts and performance, i.e., Critical Links Study.
- Set up network of like-minded people to publish ideas/research

Organizational Action

- Be more visible in print and news media. Organize and publicize seminars and conferences on these topics. Invite and include more school administrator and policy makers in the dialogue and conferences.
- Link with other organizations like AERA and AESA; encourage art educators to be involved in broader education issues, and to develop bigger identity labels ("EDUCATOR" not "art educator").
- Focus on the realistic teaching expectations of new faculty members. Set up a network of mentorship to help new faculty make the transition to teaching higher education. Recognize the number of new faculty who will be teaching Art for the Elementary Educator and devote time and resources to this class. Publish a journal about higher education issues that are art education specific. Maintain a list online of relevant art education (general education, technology, etc.) publication venues with links to the websites. I'll think of more...
- Better utilization of technology by NAEA as an organization.
- Advocate for the Arts in public media
- Become more visible in the political arena
- Provide directory of current research and research summaries, Identify forms of financial support to conduct research, encourage focus on empirical studies and demographic examinations of our profession like this one.
- I would like to see NAEA Higher Ed Division take a closer look at where we are going and our pressing needs and vision and share these things with the group at large
- Addressing policy issues
- Initiate face-to-face forums for the discussion of leadership training that offers teachers-in-training and those currently practicing tools to articulate the worth of preK-12 visual arts studio education
- Online share of new information and theories, discussions on current and multi-cultural, visual cultural and visual literacy issues in art education
- Publicity, publicity, publicity. National conferences for non-art educational professionals such as the one that I attended at the Univ. of Montana in 1996 where all teachers and administrators were invited to learn about art in the general curriculum.

- -Create more international collaboration on teaching and research
- -Have a more global view of Art Education approaches.
- -Develop a less WASP approach to Art Education
- More discussion and exchange
- Create a DBAE Award (like the Lowenfeld award). Create a Victor D'Amico Award. Support and promote quantitative research projects, education, and requirements for training in quantitative research for art teachers at the master's level. Get rid of the "rubrics" approach to assessment and promote written, examination, objective, content-driven assessments in art education.
- Develop online, collaborative research communities that surround issues at multiple sites.
- Put the brakes on social activism.
- Getting professional involvement, leadership and mentoring to count toward promotion more
- I have no recommendations.
- Reporting the outcome of this survey with an action plan and committees formed to address both the areas of concerns and needs of higher ed members
- We need to be more proactive in making use of the national conference. Need "curated" panels of longer length as NAEA does. Need to advocate for extra sessions on problems of gay youth, special education, and racial diversity. The current "only 2" presentations rule prevents knowledgeable art educators from providing the kind of support that teachers need.
- To support better curriculum...Higher Ed ought to do a study of the quality of the curriculum suggested in NAEA conference hands-on sessions. We are undermining our field by allowing vendors to teach poor quality workshops. NAEA needs to be proactive in raising money to assist teachers in learning about the emerging field of media (video/sound, etc.) in community arts practices with children and teens.
- I think salaries are of concern. I also think that institutional acceptance of art education is also a concern. It is getting better, but it is still not enough.
- Publish books that are more practical, methods and instruction for the classroom, for example, not so abstract and theoretical. I read to find ideas that will work in my classroom or my student teachers' classrooms.

Organizational Action

- Link the Caucuses more meaningfully into the structure (and website) of the organization, which has been addressed many times over the past years with poor results.
- I am getting tired filling out this survey and am in a hurry. I don't have a sense of how much more I'm gonna have to write... so I am hurrying.
- Establish NAEA as a SPA for accreditation of teacher preparation programs in art content
- Implications of Assessment and Funding for the Arts Education programs within all schools
- Panel discussions for facilitating interaction and collaboration among members. NAEA needs to learn from AERA and other professional organizations to gather different perspectives on the same subject and have a greater number of audiences for the subject.
- I would like for you to accept more proposals at the NAEA Annual Conference, and to offer more late evening hands-on workshops so more people can get into them.
- Effective advocacy should be our main focus. We should be out ahead of the issues to defend the importance of the arts in public school education and the importance of the arts to what Daniel Pink refers to as the Design Age. We are there already. Education in design and the arts prepares people for success and higher quality of life in this era. We need to make sure we are preparing teachers who can teach the arts in a substantive manner and we need to show the public that this has value. PSA's should be showing daily that work to convince the public of the value of the arts not just culturally but also economically. We have a golden opportunity and NAEA needs to lead.
- Too big a question to answer.
- Strengthening higher education teacher preparation and more attention to the vital role of visual literacy in education.
- I'm not wedded to the idea of Arts education. I feel that it is a sell-out for more funding. I want pure art education.
- Advocacy. I feel that not only is funding slipping but the place of art in the schools had dropped back to by-gone days. I think high ed folks are too divergent in curriculum development.

- Where have all the leaders in art education gone? Where has all the good research gone? Where have all the meaningful articles in art ed. and research in art ed gone. Much of the research seems superficial. Been there done that. No new ideas in the field. With the emphasis on arts education I feel like we are shooting ourselves in the foot.
- Maintain a "big tent" feel, where neither hard-core studio practitioners nor visual culture, political agenda-pushers dominate.
- More emphasis on Early Childhood Art Education
- More direct research on these issues.
- Create more opportunities for dialogue
- Develop an ongoing process of gathering relevant information about art education throughout the nation. Regular surveys on various subjects would be a good strategy. Synthesis or data mining from federal and state sources would also be good.
- I would like to see an organized effort at defining standards for tenure and promotion.
- They are doing it, I think...wonderful organization
- A survey like this is a good start. I don't think that most teachers respect the rhetoric coming from higher education. We need more significant and comprehensive research.
- Continue to support professional networking
- More substantive discussion about these issues at convention and in publication
- Compile and distribute research results for advocacy
- Address the issues of social justice...
- I would like NAEA to do a serious assessment of the content of preservice art ed programs and practice in art ed in the schools. With all the work by the Getty and others to make art ed a more substantive part of education, how much has changed? It would also be nice to see NAEA move beyond the trend of the moment, which is, at present, visual culture, to focus on more substantive, long-term issues, such as gender equity and cultural diversity.
- Promoting more dialogue among members, more professional development opportunities, advocacy, political lobbying.

Organizational Action

- Work on better communication—and respect—between PhD's and non-PhD's. I believe in PhD programs and value them, but there is much to value from other sources as well. The recent higher ed debate on this topic showed me that we are not able to agree to the value of having folks in our field with varied backgrounds. Issue #2 -when the field gets too insular and solipsistic (the current confusion and polar stances regarding visual culture is a good example) it weakens. We need a flexible ideology, if you will, continual infusion of fresh ideas and a continual grounding related to what is going on in the art world and the field of education. Folks who come into higher ed art ed programs who are not from a PhD program bring this world back into art ed.
- Rethink Delegates Assembly....
- Position paper/policy statement
- Act as an advocacy organization with the federal and state government agencies and funders.
- Include issues groups publications on NAEA website, flyers, and sold at NAEA. Avoid scheduling issue group annual meetings at the same time at NAEA. Focus on the recruitment and retention of African Americans as art educators, and more male teachers in preK-7. Provide computer projection equipment & support at NAEA conferences. Model integration of technology in art education.

General Findings

Many of the comments for improving NAEA center on the issue of communication: across the Division, the organization, and to external audiences. Expanding the use of electronic communications (use of listservs, blogs, etc.) across the Higher Education Division and entire organization may motivate educators to connect and create ongoing professional learning communities. The most frequent topic in the comments section suggested that NAEA increase its advocacy and lobbying efforts: to be more visible and influential in addressing political decision makers at the federal and state level. The second area of most common interest for Higher Education members was for NAEA to develop ways to initiate and fund substantial research in the field. Additional suggestions included support for networking of members for collaborative research projects. Participants' comments revealed the concern and necessity for university art educators to be engaged in the profession, to publish, to be collaborators, advocates, co-creators of policy, and to have spaces within the profession (online, at conference) to be engaged pedagogues.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is hoped that the publication and accessibility of this report online will establish a baseline of demographic information and resources about art teacher preparation that may be continually updated and expanded. In this study we have attempted to document conditions and concerns that will increase our understanding of who we are as professional art educators, the complex realities of our professional environments, and our collective beliefs, practices and visions for the future of the field. We see these understandings as essential for building a more cohesive and effective NAEA community of diverse art educators across grade levels and institutions. We invite and encourage additional research in every facet of this study.

RESOURCES

- Background facts on contingent faculty. The American Association of University Professors. Retrieved on August 21, 2008 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/contingent/contingentfacts.htm>
- Burton, D. (1998). Survey of current research in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 39(2), 183-186.
- Davis, J. D. (1990). Teacher education in the visual arts. In R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 746-757). New York: MacMillan.
- Faculty Salary and Faculty Distribution Fact Sheet. The American Association of University Professors. Retrieved on August 6, 2008 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/research/2003-04factsheet.htm>
- Galbraith, L.P. (1997). What are art teachers taught? An analysis of curriculum components for art teacher preparation programs. In M. Day (Ed.), *Preparing teachers of art* (pp.45-72). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Galbraith, L.P. (2001). Teachers of teachers: Faculty working lives and art teacher education in the United States. *Studies in Art Education*, 42(2), 163-181.
- Galbraith, L. & Grauer, K. (2004). State of the field: Demographics and teacher education. In E. Eisner & M. Day (Eds.). *Handbook of research and policy in art education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum and National Art Education Association.
- Hutchens, J. (1997). Accomplishing change in the university: Strategies for improving art teacher preparation. In M. D. Day (Ed.), *Preparing teachers of art* (pp.139-154). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Issues in higher education. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Retrieved August 6, 2007 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issuesed/>
- Milbrandt, M. & Klein, S. R. (2008). Survey of art teacher educators: Qualifications, identity, and practice. *Studies in Art Education*, 49(4), 343-358.
- NASAD Heads Report, The Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) Project (2006). Retrieved July, 2006. <http://heads.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp>
- Sevigny, M.J. (1987). Discipline based art education and teacher education. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(2), 95-128.

Tenure. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Retrieved August 6, 2008 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/tenure/>

Zimmerman, E. (1997). Whence we come from? Wither we go? Demographic analysis of art teacher education programs in the United States. In M. Day (Ed.), *Preparing teachers of art* (pp. 27-44). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.