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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines the development and revision of art teacher education and certification standards in the State of Ohio between 1802 and 1974. The year 1802 is designated as the point of departure because it was in that year that the first ordinance allowing the incorporation of seminaries, religious and educational societies, and providing for the leasing of school lands was passed by the Territorial Legislature (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). The period that was examined ends with 1974 because that was the year that the State Board of Education of Ohio formally adopted Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers as a basis for teacher preparation programs in Ohio.

By focusing on some of the factors and events that have influenced art teacher certification standards in the past, it should be possible to increase knowledge
towards the identification and understanding of factors which affect and influence decision-making taking place today. The description and examination of some of these issues which have historically affected art teacher education and certification practices in Ohio also identify criteria used in the selection and organization of content considered germane. By looking at what standards were established in the past, how they were arrived at, and why specific criteria were established, we may then be in a better position to judge whether the preparation of art educators today is determined by demands which will be made upon them in the classroom, by arbitrarily set requirements and historical tradition, or some combination thereof.

By examining events of the past it was possible to glean information resulting in an identification of some antecedents to current phenomena, thus showing how changes over time have occurred, revealing a pattern of some sort. An historical review portrays events in context, allowing us to identify factors and make generalizations about events which have led to change. In order to discuss the evolution of art teacher education and certification practices in Ohio, an historical perspective is necessary, as Barkan (1962) notes, because "awareness of when and why
many current and prevailing ideas came into being sharpens our sensitivity" to what is happening today (p.421). An example of this can be seen when examining the art curricula which occur in many contemporary art classrooms; the favored curriculum oftentimes consists of drawing and painting, crafts, and some work in sculpture. It is important to note that Logan (1955), in describing the 1875 curriculum of the Massachusetts Normal Art School, characterizes the curriculum as consisting of "drawing and painting similar to that of the art school, some industrial and crafts designing, some actual construction of craft objects, and some work in sculpture" (p.72). Is the content of the art curriculum of the 1980's what it is because of well thought-out reasons, or is it merely a modification of that 1875 curriculum? Understanding antecedents should make a difference in one's awareness of current conditions.

Events in history do not occur within a vacuum; a critical examination of art teacher education and certification practice in Ohio between 1802 and 1974 has involved the probing of political, economic, cultural, social, educational, and historical events on a local, national, and international scale; all of which have, to some degree, affected the evolution of art teacher
education and certification standards in the State of Ohio. In order to understand factors which have had an impact upon the evolution of art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio, one cannot look only at that subject, for there is certainly a relationship between art education and the general development of education within the state. By the same token, events and changes which occurred nationally as well as in Europe also had an impact on what occurred here.

Notions concerning the value of art education vary from individual to individual as well as, perhaps more critically, from group to group. Among many of those who influence decisions having to do with art teacher education and certification standards and the allocation of resources affecting art teacher preparation programs, thoughts of or concern for art education is not among the things that they value most. This is apparent in the recent "back to basics" movement which has permeated curricular revision in past years. These basics include the three R's: reading, writing, and rithmetic. While there are many who feel these "basics" to be necessary for success in college, there are others, such as the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) who feel that these skills benefit all students.
Finn (1983), commenting on the Commission's recommendations states that "if we regard secondary education as preparation for full-fledged participation in American society, then we must expect every future citizen to acquire the cognitive skills, knowledge, values, and competencies that are needed for successful participation in our complex modern culture, polity, and economy" (p.28). As with any controversial issue, there is disagreement as to exactly what these basics are and how they should be approached. Tye & Tye (1983) feel that the problem of educational improvement cannot be solved by merely focusing on quantity of subject matter, but that the aspect of quality must also be considered (p.30). Spady (1983) goes even further by criticizing those who equate adding requirements with raising standards (p.32).

The implication is that subjects that are not "basic" are, as Turner (1984) notes, "frills." Proponents of the back to basics movement feel that these frills, "defined differently by different people according to their biases, if defined at all, should be sacrificed so that greater time, money, and effort can be applied to the basics" (p.50). Goodland (1978) sees this return to "basics" as an attempt to return to a time when things were more simple and less complicated; "having cluttered up the
schools with virtually unlimited demands and seemingly having lost the manageable school we once knew, we seem to want to cut and prune so we will see at least the trunk again" (p.8). He goes on to say that, while this objective might be honorable, "it also can be misleading and misguided if in the process we believe that we can indeed make life and education simple. To run away from complexity in life or to run away from complexity in education is to try to run away from civilization" (p.8).

Miller (1983) points out that in most secondary schools that offer art classes, the status of the art class is as an elective, and "receives low priority as academically able students are counseled to concentrate their attention on the serious subjects" (p.36). So, while art education may be seen by some as "basic," many of those who make the actual decisions concerning what is basic do not consider it so. Even when those in positions of power support the arts as basic, the process of implementing change in the attitude of the public is slow and tedious. By way of example is a statement made by Ernest Boyer, U.S. Commissioner of Education: "It's time to declare that art is an essential part of the common core of education" (1979, p.18). He offers reasons, as many others have done, as to why art is basic; what it's
value is. While it is not necessary to list these reasons, what is significant is the fact that his statement has not resulted in major changes concerning policy towards or the status of art in the school curriculum. On the surface, this type of support from the U.S. Commissioner of Education would seem to be very helpful in creating an atmosphere where changes might occur. However, a consideration that must be kept in mind is that Boyer was addressing the members of the Ohio Art Education Association, a group that is already in agreement with the comments he is making. In this instance, the critical factor is not so much what is said, but rather to whom it is said.

Eisner (1983), comments that "the idea that schools should go back to the basics, when the basics mean the Three R's, is really a symptom of wanting too little rather than too much from schools" (p.49). He approaches the issue by discussing qualities of the kind of schools that we need. Again, the arts are represented in his recommendations. As can be seen, there are those who value the arts in the school curriculum, and there are those who do not. What we value is based on a variety of factors; our culture, environment, family, experience, and history, to mention a few. Those members of society who
understand the value of art education do what they can to educate and expose the rest of society to the world of art appreciation, visual sensitivity, and aesthetic literacy.

One of the most common roles associated with the responsibility of enlightening young people in the realm of art is that of the art teacher. Since it is the art teacher who functions as the "art representative" to not only his or her students, but oftentimes to the school and community, it is of paramount importance to examine and evaluate the type of preparation that the art educator goes through prior to going out into the field. Before examining and judging the content of the preparation of the art teacher, it is critical to begin by investigating how and why particular decisions concerning art teacher education and certification standards are determined. In order to better understand why particular decisions are made today, one must again recognize that values play a major role. People support what they value. Ryan (1979) comments that undergraduate teacher preparation programs, in general, are rarely based on theory. He goes on to suggest that the content of curricula which purport to prepare teachers is very much like a camel: the product of a committee. That "these creatures of committees are dumpy and lumpy, made by so many people with different
views of the human condition and of what are learning, teaching, and the characteristics of skillful teachers. In effect, a teacher-education program is a compromise of these many views and, sometimes, of many powerful factors" (p.l). While it is recognized that one's values are molded and influenced by a multiplicity of factors, this study will focus primarily on the affects of history; events and occurrences of the past.

This dissertation will critically examine how the development of the common school system of Ohio, the legislature and teacher certification, state normal schools, historical trends in art education, and art education at The Ohio State University have influenced and affected the development of art teacher education and certification standards in the State of Ohio. These five areas developed as natural categories of inquiry through the examination of literature, as discussed in Chapter II. They will be integrated to form a picture of how and why particular state standards for art teacher education and certification have been determined and revised.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The research methodology of this dissertation, which examines the development and revision of art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio between 1802 and 1974, is historical. Literature dealing with historical research defines history in several ways: as events that have occurred in the past; one of the ways we think; the story of past facts; the notable fact itself; the substance of what has happened; collective memory; a discipline that has developed a system for gathering information and evaluating it; and more (Barzun & Graff, 1985; Shafer, 1980; Clark, 1969; and Dovring, 1960). In any case, events in history are a force that, while oftentimes ignored, must be contended with and acknowledged as an influence upon contemporary decision-making that affects art teacher education and certification standards.
A common assumption is that we can learn from the past in order to avoid making the same mistakes. To some degree this is true except that rarely, if ever, are conditions and events in history reoccurring to the specific extent that "history repeats itself;" as Shaver (1980) indicates, "history deals with so many independent variables that it lacks the quality of predictability" (p.24). He goes on to say that while generalizations can be stated involving fairly simple relationships of cause and effect or statements made of statistical regularity, these are generalizations in terms of probability, not unvarying 'laws'. A greater contribution that a study of history can make is noted by Tosh (1984), where historical knowledge is not seen as a crystal ball having the potential to predict the future, but rather creating an awareness of "what is enduring and what is ephemeral in our present circumstances" (p.14). An examination of history does not reveal the causes of past events but rather the conditions leading to their emergence (Barzun & Graff, 1985). The values we hold to be true, certainly a factor which influences the decisions we make and the actions we take, are also, as Tosh (1984) notes, "conditioned by the heritage of our past" (p.16).
Contemporary literature which discusses historical research presents two principle approaches: the source-oriented model and the problem-oriented model (Shafer, 1980; and Tosh, 1984). The source-oriented approach involves an examination of material that represents the area of interest, the content of the resources determining "the nature of the enquiry" (Tosh, p.49). The problem-oriented strategy requires that a specific question be formulated, then answered by examining the appropriate resources. Both approaches have problems in application: the source-oriented model can leave one with a large volume of unrelated data; the problem-oriented model requires that appropriately defined resources are identified and available. Research for this dissertation was guided by aspects of both the source-oriented and problem-oriented models. The problem-oriented model was used in order to formulate the research question: What are some of the factors and events that have affected art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio between 1802 and 1974? The source-oriented model was used to guide inquiry in the areas of interest; i.e., the common school system of Ohio, the legislature and teacher certification in Ohio, art teacher education and The Ohio State University, etc. Barzun and Graff (1985),
Tosh (1984), and Shafer (1980) all stress the importance, to one degree or another, of critically examining sources that are utilized in historical research, and of obtaining as much evidence as possible (from different sources) that focus on the topic being examined.

The guidelines (Shafer, 1980; Tosh, 1984; Barzun and Graff, 1985) for examining sources may be summarized as follows:

(1) What information is stated or implied in the source?

(2) Who authored the source?

(3) How close in space and time was the author to what he is writing about?

(4) How does the information in the source compare with other sources of the same period?

These guidelines were applied to both primary sources (contemporary with the event being written about), and secondary sources (writings based on primary sources). While primary sources were preferred because of their proximity to the event being described, they were interpreted with the perspective that an author was focusing on those elements important to him at that time, not necessarily on those things important to the later researcher.
This study utilized research that contributed to a more comprehensive understanding of events which marked changes in the various areas being discussed. Two types of research were examined: (a) historical, and (b) evaluative. Historical research was utilized which offered description and explanation of events affecting the topic. Primary materials were used whenever possible; secondary sources, when necessary. Evaluative materials were examined if they contributed to a better understanding of changes occurring within the context of this study.

An investigation of historical literature concerning the school system, legislature, and teacher certification in Ohio uncovered two excellent primary texts; A History of Education in the State of Ohio, (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876); and Historical Sketches of Public Schools in Cities, Villages and Townships of the State of Ohio, (Ohio Public Schools, 1876). Also very helpful were sources and references found in materials that were published under the auspices of the Ohio Archeological and Historical Society. While there were some references to history in education texts, little was offered beyond generalized summaries.
Material dealing with art teacher education and The Ohio State University was quite detailed in Ross Norris' *The Cultured Mind the Skillful Hand*, (1978). Also helpful were primary sources such as the First Annual Report of the Board of Trustees, (Board of Trustees of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1872); the Third Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, (1874); and History of the Ohio State University, (Cope & Mendenhall, 1920); among other materials found in The Ohio State University Archives.

Questions having to do with art teacher education and certification were answered by referring to materials published by the Ohio Department of Education; among them: Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers, (1983); and Discussion Guide for Teacher Education and Certification Standards Revision, (1984).

In researching the history of art education in the United States, an examination of art education literature reflected a paucity of material dealing with the history of the field, applicable to this research. That is not to imply that there has not been significant publishing in the area of art education, but rather that it's contribution to an understanding of the history of art
education was not germane to this study. Two major references that are referred to quite often in the literature are Frederick Logan's *Growth of Art in American Schools*, (1955); and more recently, Foster Wygant's *Art in American Schools in the Nineteenth Century*, (1983). Sources providing information about the history and development of art education in Ohio were few and far between. References are made in some general texts. Very helpful was Ross Norris' *The Cultured Mind the Skillful Hand*, (1978), which is an unpublished manuscript that examines not only the history of art education at The Ohio State University, but other places as well. While Norris also compiled a bibliography which focuses on the history of art education (1979), only a few sources contributed information concerning art teacher education and certification standards. A cursory examination of art education literature supported Norris' (1979) claim that "approximately the same story" is found in the secondary sources that describe the evolution of art education in America (p.v). The implication is that writers of art education history have seemed to rely more on previously written art education histories (secondary sources), than seeking out additional primary sources. If one examines the art education historical reviews that are found in
contemporary texts, much of the content can be traced back to. Harry Green's dissertation of 1948, which in turn, can be traced back to Isaac Clark's writings of the late 1800's. A major theme of these writings, as well as of more recent articles by individuals such as Barkan (1962), Lanier (1963), Eisner (1965), Hamblen (1984), etc., is that the "role of art in schools has been determined by a variety of forces each of which has had its own aims, none of which have been intrinsic to art" (Norris, 1979, p.v). While Norris was referring to art and not art education, the manner in which he made his statement is striking in its clarity. In light of this current research, it seems appropriate to ask if the same can be said about decisions which have affected art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio? Have they been determined by a variety of forces, each of which has had its own aims, none of which have been intrinsic to art education? By investigating this question, it should be possible to better judge whether the preparation of art teachers is determined by demands which will be made upon them in the classroom, by arbitrarily set requirements and historical tradition, or some combination thereof. This, in essence, is the question examined in this dissertation. The answer was won by investigating, historically, changes
that have occurred in various areas.

The five areas of inquiry: (1) the development of the common school system of Ohio, (2) the legislature and teacher certification, (3) state normal schools, (4) historical trends in art education, and (5) art education at The Ohio State University, were determined by use of the source-oriented approach to historical research which involves an examination of material that represents the areas of interest, the content of the resources determining the nature of the inquiry.

Chapters for this study are organized in the following manner:

I. Introduction

This chapter presents the problem statement as well as the limitations and significance of the study.

II. Methodology

Chapter II describes the research methodology utilized in this study as well as a review of the literature. The methodology is historical, and relies on two principle approaches: the source-oriented model which was used in order to formulate the research question, and the problem-oriented model which was used to guide inquiry in the areas of interest. Two types of primary and secondary sources were examined: (a) historical, and (b) evaluative.
III. The Common School System in Ohio

This chapter discusses the settlement of Ohio, and how the experience helped form attitudes towards education that were to affect decisions concerning Ohio's educational system for generations as manifested in legislation affecting the common schools of Ohio. The configuration of the ungraded free public schools is presented as well as the introduction of art into school curricula.

IV. The Legislature and Teacher Certification in Ohio

Chapter IV discusses the role of examiners of common schools and teacher certification, the State School Department, the State Board of Public Instruction, the State Board of Examiners, the State Department of Education, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification, and guidelines for teacher preparation programs in Ohio. The development of these administrative units are discussed in terms of the conditions leading to their inception.

V. Art Teacher Education in Ohio

Chapter V traces the development of state normal schools in response to a rising need for teacher preparation; trends in art education as they have impacted upon the development of art teacher education and
certification standards; and the evolution of art education at The Ohio State University as an example of a specific situation where identifiable factors can be traced resulting in the formation of an art teacher preparation program.

VI. Art Teacher Certification Standards in Ohio

This chapter discusses the notion and implications of teacher certification, the process of and rationale for revision of teacher certification standards, and factors that have influenced standards.

VII. Summary

Overview and review as well as recommendations for further study.

Included in this study are six tables whose purpose is to provide a graphic overview of major events which have occurred within each of the five areas of inquiry. These tables include The Common School System in Ohio Between 1787 - 1921, (2) The Legislature and Teacher Certification in Ohio Between 1821 - 1904, (3) State Normal Schools Between 1829 - 1926, (4) Trends in Art Education Between 1869 - 1968, (5) Art Education and The Ohio State University Between 1869 - 1968, and (6) Overview of Factors and Events Which Have Affected Art Teacher Education and Certification Standards in Ohio.
CHAPTER III

THE COMMON SCHOOL SYSTEM IN OHIO

Settlement of Ohio

In order to discuss the history of art teacher education and certification in Ohio, one first has to look at the evolution of the Common School System in the state. The beginnings of the Common School System of Ohio can be traced back to the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory which was passed by Congress in 1787. In that ordinance, the third article states that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged" (Ohio State Teachers' Association, 1876, p.80).

The formal settlement of Ohio began in April of 1788 when, under the sponsorship of the Ohio Company, descendants of the Puritans who had settled in New England in 1620, began building a community in what was to become
Marietta; soon after, they had a school. By 1800, the Ohio Company was responsible for seven more settlements. While the Moravian missionaries probably had Indian schools operating in the area prior to the settling of Marietta, the first school for the children of settlers was probably that of Belpre, taught by Bathsheba Rouse during the summer of 1790. In general, schools were opened soon after settlements were established. The presence or absence of a school in any given settlement was most likely attributable to the background of the members of that settlement.

The process of settling the wilderness of Ohio was a fulltime job. Survival came first, and as a result, school interests were oftentimes neglected. Physical strength was seen as immediately useful and practical while intellectual endeavors were perceived by many as being less utilitarian. During the early 1800's there was no formally established authority whose function it was to determine the quality or capability of a teacher. Parents in a community would simply designate an individual who possessed the skills of reading and writing to be a teacher (Howey & Gardner, 1983).

An examination of the State of Ohio in the 19th century reveals a number of districts.
Miller (1918) notes that "each of these districts, in its customs and ideals reflected the current thought and practice of that part of the country from which its settlers came, and in no field was this more evident than in that of education" (p. 9). Settlements in southwestern Ohio were generally made up of people who came from Virginia, Kentucky and the Carolinas (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). In many of these communities, teachers were oftentimes chosen more because of their "unfittness to perform manual labor than by reason of their intellectual worth"; the ability to teach was rarely, in these cases, a reason for employing an individual as a teacher, while not being able to do "anything else" was. In these communities the status of teaching was not such as to "induce young people of spirit and worth to enter upon teaching as a vocation" (p.86). Generally speaking, parents at this time were satisfied with a teacher if their children learned some basic writing skills, could read the Bible or an almanac, and were able to use numbers to figure out the value of a load of farm produce. Many felt that too much education was not healthy; it would make boys lazy and tricky; and girls, if they could read and write well, might fall prey to "some knave who might entrap them by means of epistolary correspondence which
could never be detected by an illiterate mother" (p.87).

Northwestern Ohio was settled, for the most part, by individuals from New England, where the most advanced common schools of the Union were to be found at that time. The attitudes held by these settlers, many of them having received an education in the schools of New England, were very different from those of people who settled in Southwestern Ohio. In Northwestern Ohio, the position of the teacher was secure and considered respectable. Education was basic, consisting simply of reading, writing, spelling, and fundamental number manipulation.

Through the late 1700's and into the 1800's, among many citizens of the newly founded State of Ohio, there was a definite prejudice against the notion of a centralized administration; this feeling is manifested in much of the legislation having to do with education (Miller, 1918). The reason for this is that when settling the state as a frontier, settlers essentially had to rely on themselves and were not accustomed to outside "interference." As the state was being settled, there was no mechanism for central control or state-wide communication; by the time this was possible, people were accustomed to making their own decisions, especially concerning education, locally.
Legislation and the Common Schools of Ohio

Education in the state of Ohio was voluntary. Even though Governor Worthington, in an address to the General Assembly in 1817, recommended the establishment of a thorough system of elementary schools in Ohio, there was no legislation to support this notion for some time (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). The first general school act for Ohio was passed in 1821 (Miller, 1918); it stated that action on the part of people towards educating their children was permissible, but was not obligatory (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). The school act of 1821 was significant because it represented the state of Ohio's recognition of a system of common schools (Miller, 1918). This law was expanded in scope with the Law of 1825, which mandated a county tax for the support of common schools; however, there was still no mechanism implemented to unite the local and district schools into what might be considered a unified state system. This initial legislation which was to result in the formation of a common school system was the result of the work of a few "wise, liberal-minded" men in Cincinnati, seconded by friends of education in Cleveland and other northern towns (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). New England was
the model for the public school system these individuals envisioned (Miller, 1918). While there were some far-sighted individuals working for the establishment of common schools, the public-at-large was slow to take advantage of them. As late as 1825, there were still no public schools in Cincinnati, even though there was strong legislative support emanating from there.

Most of the legislation which occurred between 1803 and 1850 affected and acknowledged the district schools of Ohio. This is most likely due to the fact that prior to 1850 the majority of the population lived in rural communities (Bossing, 1930). During the latter half of the 18th century there was a great increase in urban growth and the focus of legislation began to shift from rural to city concerns. By 1920, Ohio was ranked 4th in state population; 4th in agricultural production; and 4th in manufacturing. An examination of the legislation during this period will show none having to do with the establishment of secondary or higher education as a component of the state system of education (Miller, 1918).
Major legislation during this period that affected the notion of public schools for Ohio included the following:

1821 - First school law; recognition of state need and responsibility

1825 - Second school law; provides taxation for schools

1838 - An organized state system; school fund is guaranteed

1847 - Akron Act; system for city schools is established

The district was the unit of educational administration until 1900, when the township became the dominant administrative unit; in 1914 the county was given the responsibility, paralleling a fast-growing city population (Bossing, 1930).

Prior to 1850, the state did little to encourage or initiate the establishment of institutions of secondary or higher education, and therefore did not have to deal with issues such as control or support. Education beyond the common school level was perceived of as a privilege for those who could afford to pay for it. What the legislature was willing to do, was legalize, by incorporation, the "educational aspirations of any group of people, while taking a minimum amount of responsibility" (Miller, 1918, p.107). Secondary schools -- at this time called academies, institutes, seminaries,
or high schools — were usually supported by a stock company, and depended on community support (Bossing, 1930). Between 1803 and 1850, 171 schools above the common school level received articles of incorporation from the Ohio legislature; during that same period, 45 institutions of higher learning were also incorporated (Miller, 1918).

Ungraded Free Public Schools in Ohio

The early schools, from necessity, were ungraded. The value of graded schools did not receive recognition until the passage of the Akron Law, and the Laws of 1849 and 1853 (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). In 1840, two members of the school board, Senator Albert Picket and James Perkins, presented a proposed basis for defining courses of study in a graded system of instruction; a curriculum focusing on grades 1-5. The Picket/Perkins curriculum is significant because it was the first course of instruction of which there is any record in the public schools of Ohio. No art or art oriented dimensions were included in this curriculum. In 1855, however, drawing and vocal music were included in the school curricula of the graded schools in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and
Columbus (p.120). In 1847, Central High School was established in Cincinnati. The curriculum included the higher English branches, ancient and modern languages, vocal music, and drawing, which primarily was approached through copying and penmanship (p.109).

The period of time between 1845 and 1855 was a period of organization, where the free public school was finally being recognized as a political institution necessary for the "enlightenment of the people and the welfare of the state" (p.115). Toward the end of 1855, the notion of the free graded system was permanently established. Additional funding for teachers was allocated, and the school year was increased to 36 weeks. In 1845, a landmark event occurred; the first session of a teacher's institute in Ohio was held in Sandusky. Beginning in 1855, teachers meetings were held on a regular basis. This provided an opportunity for teachers to receive instruction in teaching methodology and discipline, and for meetings relating to all subjects having to do with school work. This was the vehicle for teachers to receive training in their professional work. At these meetings, teachers had the opportunity to gain experience in special study areas such as drawing and music. The content of the workshops which focused on drawing depended primarily upon who was
teaching the workshop. Generally, the activities related to penmanship, how to use available materials, copying, and in some cases, the drawing lessons of Peter Schmid were introduced as an example of resources which teachers could tap into.

Public education in Ohio during the 19th century may be characterized as lacking any clearly defined statewide policy; while general guidelines for educational organization were legislated, it was left to each community to regulate its own educational activities. Had there been a desire to institute some form of centralized control, there was no vehicle for supervision. The legislature, during this period, demonstrated a passive attitude toward secondary and higher education by/legalizing institutions but not instituting them. There was also yet to be any state agency responsible for the training of teachers for Ohio schools.

Art in the School Curriculum

Drawing was included in the curriculum of younger students because it was felt that it would aid pupils in learning to read, count, and write. Elizabeth Peabody, in her Record of a School (1835), noted that "the practice of
the eye in looking at forms, and that of the hand in
imitating them, should be simultaneous" (p.270). While
Ms. Peabody did not elaborate much further, the
implications of her jottings are that she felt that
through drawing, more likely copying, students would
develop the type of eye-hand coordination that would
contribute to a better mastery of reading, counting, and
writing.

The State Commissioner of County Schools, in his
Twentieth Annual Report of the State Commissioner of
Common Schools to the General Assembly of the State of
Ohio for the School Year Ending August 31, 1873, discussed
the notion that the State's responsibility to provide
education was "founded on the necessity of education as a
means for securing national prosperity" (p.49). Included
in the menu of subjects which were perceived as being
central to education were "those branches whose object is
the training of the eye, the ear, the voice, and the hand
- Freehand and Mechanical Drawing, etc." (p.55). In the
graded curriculum of 1876, grade one included drawing,
which consisted of "freehand outline from cards,
blackboard, memory, and dictation" (Ohio State Teachers'
Association, p.130). Drawing was also a component of the
curricula of grades two through eight. In the high school
curriculum of 1876, drawing was an element of the first, second, and third years. It was not a component of the fourth year. The art component of the curriculum was taught by the classroom teacher, there was not to be a "certified art teacher" for some time.

Drawing had been taught in the Cincinnati schools since 1868 and its work had excited some attention when exhibited at the 1876 Philadelphia Exposition. Cleveland had begun even earlier to teach drawing and, by 1872, Frank Arborn of Massachusetts had been employed to continue it. Although some attempts were made to teach drawing in Columbus between 1870 and 1872, it was not adopted as a regular subject until 1873 when Professor Walter Goodnough from the State Normal School of Massachusetts, became Superintendent of Drawing in Columbus (Norris, 1978, p.47).

Goodnough brought with him Walter Smith's approach to art education as well as an attitude which stressed the importance of art and its relevance to society. William Mason, head of the Art Department of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College in Columbus, wrote in 1882 about the value of drawing, and how Massachusetts, a leader in education had seen fit to include it in the curriculum of its public school system.

During the late 1800's and into the 1900's, art was perceived as drawing and drawing as art; this was reflected in the content of the art class. Arthur Wesley Dow's picture study exercises, very popular at the time,
provided the formula that was often followed in the classroom (Lanier, 1974). Dow, who had spent a great deal of time studying Japanese art, presented teachers with a format and vocabulary that was appropriate for discussing visual images. His compositional-analysis approach focused on the areas of line, value and a concern for color. During the 1930's and into the 1940's, this method was dispensed with. Art activities in the classroom, however, remained essentially studio-oriented.

In 1957, the State Board of Education of Ohio, in establishing minimum standards for the curricula of elementary schools, included the fine arts as a component. The time-allotment that was to be devoted to art was the equivalent of one-sixth of the school year, which was also to be divided among music and directed recreation (School Survey Service, 1962). While this may have, at least in theory, helped to "insure" the place of art in the school curriculum, it did little to even the odds when competing for time, attention, teachers, facilities, and funding. As Fuller (1966) points out, in the "continuing aspects of this competition, the fine arts are distinctly a handicapped competitor, only today beginning to move slowly amid confusion and conflict. When education in the arts can succeed in this competition, it may find that
many of its other problems have also been solved" (p.85).

The art curriculum in most cases continued to be studio-based until the mid-1960's when the notion of aesthetic education, which Boyer (1980) notes as having "derived its influence and concepts mainly from the fields of philosophy and psychology" (p.154), was introduced as a means for bridging the gap between producing and responding to art, paralleling research in the field of psychology that was investigating aspects of "preference."

With this orientation came a change in focus from the learner to the subject. The roots of aesthetic education can be traced back to the picture study movement of the 1920's. To a great degree, this shift in the 1960's occurred because "art educators were concerned that art education was being lost in an integration or merger with other subjects" (p.173). An individual who contributed to this perception of the student becoming involved as artist, critic, historian, and aesthete, was J. McFee, whose Preparation For Art (1961) strongly supported, among other elements, the notion that culture has a direct influence on art learning (p.174). While art teachers would take some coursework in art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, as well as studio in their preparation programs, the curriculum they have seemed to follow when
actually teaching has, to a great extent, only very slowly been moving from one that is studio-based.

While there have been efforts made in research and art teacher preparation programs to move from the traditional studio-based curriculum, the change in actual art teacher practice has been slow. As Logan (1975) notes, "the curriculum for art in the elementary and in the secondary schools has been and remains a problem for all teachers of art" (p.12). Support must be generated from school administrators, parents, and art teachers themselves. School administrators must be willing to provide, among other things, time, resources, and facilities; parents have to offer support as well as demand quality art education programming for their children; and art teachers have to commit themselves to utilizing available resources and keeping on track in order to achieve the goals that have been out of reach due to the inadequacies stated above. There are art teachers who are implementing an art curriculum based on the roles of the artist, art critic, art historian, and aesthetician. As the public and the decision-makers become more aware of the value of art representing and offering much more than simple papier mache' and salt maps, this number continues to grow.
Table 1: The Common School System in Ohio Between 1787 - 1921

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750-</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>-- Ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>-- Formal settlement of Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>-- First school for the children of settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>-- Governor Worthington recommends the establishment of elementary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>-- First school act recognizes the State's responsibility to and need for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>-- School law provides taxation for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>-- Organized state school system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>-- Picket/Perkins curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>-- First teachers' institute is held in Sandusky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>-- Drawing is included in the elementary curriculum in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>-- City school system is established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-</td>
<td>-- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>-- Counties become responsible for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-- Bing Law requires that children ages 6 through 18 attend school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College of Education of The Ohio State University begins to sponsor annual Educational Conferences.
CHAPTER IV

THE LEGISLATURE AND TEACHER CERTIFICATION IN OHIO

Examiners of County Schools and Teacher Certification

Between 1802 and 1825, the legislature passed acts giving authorization for the incorporation of seminaries, religious and educational societies, and providing for the leasing of school lands (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). In 1821, the legislature passed a bill which created district school committees which, while authorized to employ "competent" teachers, did not mention the notion of certification (Miller, 1918). The Law of 1825 stated that each county's court of common pleas was to designate 3 members of the community as examiners of common schools; their responsibilities included the interviewing of those who wished to be employed as teachers. Before a teacher could work in a district school, they had to receive a certificate of qualification from an examiner. This law is seen as the first attempt to protect the children of
the state from the results of incompetent teaching (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876; Miller, 1918).

In 1827, the county courts had the option of appointing as many examiners as was felt necessary. In 1829, however, that number was not to be less than five nor more than the number of townships in a particular county. After 1831, the number of examiners was not to be more than twice the number of townships, and teachers received certification only in those disciplines which examiners found them to be competent (Miller, 1918); in 1834 the figure was limited to five, and teacher certification examinations were to be given publicly once a month in the county seat; reading, writing, and arithmetic were areas in which all teachers had to qualify. In 1836, a law was passed such that each township would elect three teacher examiners, and the township became the formal area-unit for certification; in 1838 this number was reduced to three, with three year appointments. By 1873, there had been several other changes in how many teacher examiners were to be appointed or elected. Up until this time, examiners were either elected by the members of the townships where they would serve, or were appointed by the local courts. There were no formally stated guidelines on who could serve until
1873, when it was decided by the legislature that "no teacher of a normal school, or school for the education of persons as teachers, can be an examiner" (p.60). While much legislation passed during this period concerning teacher examiners, little else was done for the advancement of school interests.

The notion of certification was not mentioned until 1825, when, in order to receive payment from the public treasury, a teacher had to have a certificate from an examiner. The certificate stated that the holder was considered to be "qualified" to teach school. Miller (1918) notes that while the law helped eliminate many incompetent teachers, it did not distinguish between the "liberally-educated" teacher and the one possessing "no more book knowledge than was required to entitle him to a certificate of the lowest grade" (p.101). Between 1825-1849, teachers had to pass an examination in spelling, reading, writing, and arithmetic. In 1849, the branches of geography and English grammar were added to the proficiency examination that teachers had to take in order to receive a teaching certificate. Certificates identifying specific areas of proficiency were not used until 1831. Minimally, teachers had to be "qualified" to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic (p.61). By 1853,
teachers were required to be able to teach not only reading, writing, and arithmetic, but also orthography, geography, and English grammar. It was not until later that there was a recognized need for teachers to have some knowledge of theory and practice of teaching; this became law in 1864.

The State School Department

In 1837, a bill was put before the state legislature which proposed the creation of the office of State Superintendent of Common Schools. Resistance to the notion of centralizing control of state education nearly caused the bill to fail, but it passed the House by a vote of 35 to 34. The passage of this bill also resulted in the creation of the State School department; Samuel Lewis was appointed the first State Superintendent. The major responsibility of his position was to gather statistical data on the condition of the schools of the State of Ohio. During the three years Lewis held the position, he visited more than 300 schools. He traveled 1200 miles on horseback, visiting schools during the day and speaking at town meetings at night, encouraging parents to send their children to school. Due to poor health, Lewis retired in
1839. Under Lewis' term, a school fund was established, county-taxes were increased, local taxes for building school houses were authorized, and reports from teachers and school authorities were required (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876). At this time, outside of New England, no better schools would be found in the Union than in Ohio (p.98).

In 1845, a landmark event occurred; the first session of a teacher's institute in Ohio was held in Sandusky (Ohio State Teachers Association, 1876,p.99). In 1847 the state passed an act which allowed teachers in eleven Ohio counties to incorporate teachers' institutes. These institutes provided an opportunity for teachers to receive instruction in teaching methodology and discipline, and for meetings relating to all subjects having to do with school work. This was the vehicle for teachers to receive training in their professional work. At these meetings, for instance, teachers had the opportunity to gain experience in "special studies" such as drawing (p.122). By 1855, teachers' meetings were being held on a regular basis.
The State Board of Public Instruction

It was not until 1850 that the Ohio General Assembly passed a law which resulted in the appointment of a State Board of Public Instruction. Under the terms of this law, the General Assembly would elect five individuals, one elected each year, who would serve five year terms. The member who was in his fifth year of office would serve as State Superintendent of Common Schools. The other four members of the State Board of Public Instruction would act as District Superintendents.

The State Board of Examiners

The notion of one central authority being responsible for the dispensing of teacher certificates did not occur until 1864 when the State Commissioner appointed a State Board of Examiners. This board consisted of 3 examiners who were to serve 2 year terms. They were responsible for determining who was to receive "state certificates of high qualifications;" this meant that teachers would no longer be required to seek approval from individual county or local boards. These certificates were valid throughout the state during the life of the teacher.
The school laws of Ohio were finally codified in 1873. At this point examiners were also authorized to grant teaching certificates which were to be considered valid throughout the state to exceptionally well-qualified teachers. Teacher certification was still not centralized because city and village examiners were still empowered to give certificates good in their districts, and county examiners were still giving certificates which were good only in the county in which they were granted (Bossing, 1930).

Between 1873 and 1891 laws governing county examiners went through numerous changes: terms of office were changed, the length of time teaching certificates were valid changed, and the configuration of the board of examiners was reorganized. In 1891 requirements were finally set which examiners had to meet in order to hold their positions; these included at least "two years teaching experience and to have taught within the period of five years preceding appointment" (Bossing, 1930, p.305).

Teacher certification examinations were to be controlled more centrally beginning in 1914, and were offered only eight times a year. Life certificates were still issued at this time, but eligibility was dependent
upon four years of previous teaching experience or coursework at a teacher-training institution (Bossing, 1930). In 1921, in an attempt to achieve a higher professional degree of teacher certification, the number of statewide teacher certification examinations was reduced to four; requirements for elementary, high school, and life certificates were also made more rigorous; it was necessary for applicants to have at least one year of preparation at a teacher-training institution as well as four years previous teaching experience in order to qualify for certification. The number of subjects in which a perspective teacher had to be qualified was also being increased: in 1882, American history was added; in 1888, elementary physiology; in 1896, civil government; in 1900, an understanding of narcotics and alcohol was required; and finally, literature and agriculture were included as subjects that would be found covered on the certification examination.

The late 1800's represented a confusing period in the area of teacher certification. One, two, and three year certificates were given by examiners, as well as five and eight year certificates for those teachers who qualified by meeting requirements having to do with past teaching experience. Requirements and powers of cities and
villages concerning teaching certification varied, based on population. It was not until 1904 that the village district examining board was done away with, leaving the issuing of certificates to the cities and counties.

Between 1904 and 1925, an attempt was made to simplify a system which, by this time, consisted of one-hundred and seventy-five certifying agencies which were granting over fifty different kinds of teaching certificates. County boards were to be authorized to issue only three kinds of certificates: Teachers' Elementary School Certificates, Teachers' High School Certificates, and Teachers' Special Certificates. There were still other, less permanent, certificates being received, such as provisional certificates which were valid for one, two, or three years; emergency certificates; and the limited elementary and high school certificate which was applicable for specified grades (Bossing, 1930).

In 1914, the Legislature passed a law that required student teaching as well as a written examination in order for individuals to receive certification. This act was applicable to those who wished to teach on the high school level (Norris, 1978).

The Bing Law of 1921, besides making school attendance mandatory for Ohio children, also required that elementary
teachers attend college in order to receive their certification (Roseboom & Weisenburger, 1973).

The State Department of Education

In 1935, Ohio enacted a law which centralized teacher certification at the state level. This same law gave the State Department of Education the authority to establish standards for the preparation and certification of school personnel in Ohio schools (Ohio Department of Education, 1984).

By the mid-1960's, there were more than 45 publicly assisted institutions of higher education in Ohio offering programs in teacher education (Ohio Board of Regents, 1966). Teacher preparation curricula at this time, as today, generally consisted of three components: (a) general education, (b) specific subject matter, and (c) professional education courses. While in most cases the general education aspect of the curriculum, and to some extent, the specific subject matter coursework has been determined by the specific institution, standards for the professional education courses are set by the State Department of Education. Because of the variety and number of institutions involved, these standards have been
stated in general terms, and it is the responsibility of the individual teacher preparation program to interpret and implement them.

The Division of Teacher Education and Certification

In 1958, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was created and given the responsibility for (1) ensuring the implementation of standards and courses of study for the preparation of teachers; (2) providing for the inspection of institutions desiring to prepare teachers; (3) approving institutions that maintain good training procedures; and (4) ensuring that graduates of approved programs are issued appropriate certificates (Ohio Department of Education, 1984).

Guidelines for Teacher Preparation Programs in Ohio

In late 1974, the State Board of Education of Ohio formally adopted Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers, as a basis for teacher preparation programs in Ohio.
These guidelines required that all teachers were to be prepared in certain areas including:

a. the teaching of reading
b. human relations
c. managing behavioral problems
d. clinical use of diagnostic tools
e. urban and suburban or rural school settings

Additionally, teacher preparation programs were to implement the following:

a. practical school experience beginning in the first or second year of the teacher preparation program
b. close working relationships with schools
c. broadly representative committees advising on curriculum design and evaluation
d. follow-up of graduates to obtain data for attaining further progress in teacher education
e. faculty with successful elementary or secondary teaching experience
f. funding and staffing at a level comparable with other professions (p.i)

The guidelines, which were to become effective in 1980, were to be followed by all colleges and universities intending to offer teacher preparation programs in Ohio. The same guidelines were to be used as evaluation criteria when institutions were being considered for state
financial assistance. (See Appendix A).
Table 2: The Legislature and Teacher Certification in Ohio Between 1821 - 1904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>District school committees are authorized to employ teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>District teachers are required to possess a certificate of qualification in order to teach. Teacher examination includes spelling, reading, writing, and arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Teacher certificates specifying areas of proficiency are initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Townships become the unit authorized to grant teacher certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Office of State Superintendent of Common Schools is created by the Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Geography and English grammar are added to teacher examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>State Board of Public Instruction is appointed by the Ohio Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>State Board of Examiners is appointed by the State Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>School laws of Ohio are codified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Examiners must meet specific requirements in order to be appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Village district examining board is phased out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1817, Governor Worthington raised the issue of institutions which would train teachers for the State of Ohio's schools. It was probably the first official recommendation of its kind in the country - even before Connecticut and Massachusetts. Besides Governor Worthington, the individuals most sensitive to the need for teacher-training were the teachers themselves. By 1829, teachers were forming associations as a vehicle for discussing educational problems (Bossing, 1930). In 1848 the Ohio legislature passed an act allowing for the incorporation of teachers' institutes in Ohio, and county commissioners were given authorization to designate funds for the support of these institutes. By 1851, at least forty-one teachers' institutes had been formed in the
counties of Ohio. In 1861, the legislature passed a supplementary act which allowed adjacent county teachers' institutes to combine with one-another in order to form larger institutes. It was not until 1873 that specific guidelines for the creation and organization of teachers' institutes were determined; in order for a county to provide funds, at least thirty teachers from that county had to petition for the creation of the institute (Ohio State Teachers' Association, 1876).

While the number of teachers' institutes continued to grow and provide assistance and guidance for state teachers, there was a growing number of educators who felt that more was needed than could be provided in the week to three-week-long sessions that the teachers' institutes offered. As early as 1832, the Marietta Collegiate Institute and Western Teachers' Seminary was incorporated as a training school which emphasized the education of teachers. Recognizing the need for teacher training institutions, Ohio looked to other states, such as Michigan, Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut, which already had done something about establishing teacher preparation programs. Connecticut's approach was eventually chosen as the prototype that Ohio would follow.
During the 1830's and 1840's, the Normal School, based on the European model, was introduced in the United States to provide teacher training. Howsam (1976) points out that at first, normal school students had less than a high school education; later, high school became a common requirement. In the late 19th century and into the 20th, normal schools lengthened their periods of preparation to two years. Impelled by the growing need for secondary teachers and by the desire of society to expand higher education opportunities close to home, a number of state normal schools grew in terms of resources and faculty until they were in a position to receive accreditation, and evolved into teachers' colleges and state universities. This process was essentially established by the end of W.W. II.

Connecticut's 1849 normal school law stated that the objective of the normal school would be the training of teachers in educational methodology, rather than in the specific subjects to be taught; i.e., individuals already knowledgeable in subjects to be taught would be trained in teaching methods (Ohio State Teacher' Association, 1876). While the State of Ohio was to delay for some time in establishing a statewide or state-supported system of teacher training institutions, a number of private schools
did develop; between 1850 and 1875, at least seven normal schools were started (OSTA, 1876). There was little, if any, control or supervision of these normal schools. Bossing (1930) notes that as difficult as it is to know exactly how many schools were professing to prepare teachers, it is equally as difficult to evaluate the quality of training that aspiring teachers were receiving; just because an institution was calling itself a "normal school" was no guarantee that it was truly or adequately training teachers. This condition continued until 1900 when the State finally established a standardized curriculum, based on a proposal made by the State Board of Education in 1894 for normal schools. The basic curriculum was to consist of coursework in pedagogy, history of education, and the science of education.

Local legislation concerning normal schools was general and vague; as a result, so-called "normal" schools were oftentimes responsible for providing services other than the preparation of teachers, such as secondary education for the community. A lack of central control and compulsory supervision resulted in a continuing situation where, to say that "a normal school was a normal school," was not necessarily the case.
Finally, in the late 1800's, organizations such as the Ohio State Teachers' Association and the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, among others, began passing resolutions that demanded the creation of a state-established system of normal schools that would insure not only a standardized level of quality in teacher preparation programs, but also provide an environment where educational leadership could be nurtured. When a motion proposing the establishment of state-supported normal schools came up before the House, it was defeated twice; it was not until 1902 that the bill authorizing the creation of two state normal schools was to pass; the law also provided for the establishment of a committee, whose responsibility it was to consider the development of additional normal schools. One of the state-supported normal schools was to be housed at Ohio University in Athens, the other at Miami University in Oxford. Their purpose was to offer "theoretical and practical training for all students desiring to prepare themselves for the work of teaching" (Bossing, 1930, p.325). In the following years, additional normal schools would be instituted. By 1925, there were at least 51 county normal schools that offered one-year programs, 34 city normal schools offering two to four years of teacher preparation
coursework and elementary teacher certification, and 40 colleges providing curricula leading to high school teaching certification. While some schools that were labeled "normal schools" were not actually teacher-training institutions, others that began with another focus in mind eventually integrated a strong orientation to teacher preparation programming. The Ohio State University, in Columbus, is an example of this type of institution.

Trends in Art Education

In the early 1800's there was much discussion about education for the masses. The American Philosophical Society received a plan for national education from Samuel Smith, which included a board of literature and science that was to oversee his curricula. The individuals on this board were to represent (1) languages, (2) mathematics, (3) geography and history, (4) natural philosophy, (5) moral philosophy, (6) English, (7) agriculture, (8) industry, (9) government, (10) medicine, (11) theology, (12) elements of taste -- including principles of music, architecture, gardening, and drawing, (13) military tactics, and (14) a person eminently skilled
in science, who would be President of the Board (Hansen, 1926).

Even prior to this time, as early as the late 1700's, drawing was seen as a desirable skill by industry. Michael (1978) notes that American manufacturers felt that drawing "could increase skill and improve physical judgement of distance and proportion. Such skill made one qualified and successful in the industrialized world" (p.12).

When Horace Mann, secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, published the Common Schools Journal in the 1840's and included the drawing lessons of Peter Schmidt, it was because he believed that drawing aided the development of penmanship as well as contributing to better eye/hand coordination (Eisner, 1963). During this period, the 1840's and 1850's, art and drawing were seen as synonymous.

After the Civil War era, industrial power, especially in New England, was growing. Lanier (1963) notes that "art was slowly introduced into the curriculum in an effort to (a) develop good taste among the pupils as potential consumers of manufactured goods, and (b) to reveal those pupils having innate art ability for later training as industrial designers" (p.10). In 1870,
American industrialists, hoping to become more competitive with their European counterparts, persuaded Massachusetts lawmakers to require that art be taught as part of the curriculum. The art that was to be taught had a vocational orientation to it.

In 1871 Walter Smith was brought to Boston, and under his auspices the South Kensington system was implemented, supporting the notion of industrial drawing through systematic instruction (Hamblen, 1985). Satisfaction and completeness were not concerns in the orientation of schooling at this time. Logan (1955) notes that schools existed to impart knowledge. Knowledge and attitudes had to be acquired and learned because of the role they would play in one's adult life; as to the experience of the child in his education, it was only an "incidental" to the final goal of adulthood.

In the mid to late 1800's, art academies began to flourish; the Pennsylvania Academy, Cooper Union, Art Students League, as well as others in Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Cincinnati (Logan, 1955). In 1873, Walter Smith began the Massachusetts Normal Art School: In the school's catalog or 1875-1876, its avowed purposes are stated:
This school is intended as a training school for the purpose of qualifying teachers and masters of industrial drawing.

In the future it may be necessary to provide for high skill in technical drawing and art-culture, but the immediate pressing demand is for teachers who know the elementary subjects thoroughly.

The work of Class A (first year) is devoted to Elementary Drawing; of Class B to Form, Color, and Industrial Design; of Class C to Constructive Arts; and of Class D to Sculpture and Design in the round. These groups of subjects can be studied in any order after Class A has been passed through, subject only to an examination as to the fitness of the student (Massachusetts Normal Art School, 1875–1876).

Teacher preparation coursework was not added until 1889–1890.

When Walter Smith became principal of the Massachusetts Normal Art School, he made his point clear, that any person capable of learning any branch of study can learn to draw, so as to be able to represent general forms with as much ease and certainty as he can speak or write. To do this, however, he must first learn the alphabet of the study, and know by name and at sight any feature of form from the dot to the most subtle compound curve, and from the simplest geometric form to the last problem in perspective.

In presenting this course of instruction to others, he is not therefore offering simply his own work, but also an adaptation for American schools of such features of the English and continental systems as his own experience teaches him are best suited to the necessity of American Art Education (1873, introduction).

Logan (1955) notes that the curriculum of the Massachusetts Normal Art School consisted of "drawing and painting similar to that of the art school, some
industrial and crafts designing, some actual construction of craft objects, and some work in sculpture," and that this model yet today permeates the art curriculum (p.72).

During the late 1800's, there was also a movement among America's wealthy to collect European art; much of it housed within mansions, some of it donated to Museums and Galleries. This trend filtered down to the school curricula of the period, as Michael (1978) notes, "the movement embodied the idea that the contemplation and observation of beauty in works of art can bring about a general rise in public taste" (p.15). Coinciding with the introduction of art appreciation was Arthur Dow's text, Composition (1899); his synthetic method of art production was to be followed by art teachers for some time.

Academies were to be the sole source of art instruction until the early 1900's, when, as Efland (1983) describes the situation, they would find competition in the newly developing schools of decorative arts, trade schools, and normal schools. These new centers of art training were a result of America's realization that art education would fill a void that was rapidly developing.

In the United States, the curriculum of the Massachusetts Normal Art School was the standard at this time; in Europe, meanwhile, during the 1920's, Walter
Gropius - a member of the German Bauhaus - and others, supported the notion that art curricula should also include media such as architecture, ceramics, metal work, photography and cinema, and more (Logan, 1955). They realized that a new approach had to be developed, rather than relying on the classical approach to art teaching. Their plan "was to devise a first-year experience which would acquaint the young student with the common and unique qualities of all the usual materials: wood, metal, paper, glass, stone, plastic, textiles, etc." (p.173).

This dimension of the Bauhaus was brought back to America by Josef Albers in 1933 (to Black Mountain College in North Carolina), and by Moholy-Nagy (to the Institute of Design in Chicago). A common goal of those who brought a Bauhaus orientation to their teaching was "the liberation from dead convention in favor of individual experiences and revelations" (Moholy-Nagy, 1951, p.271), as well as the desire to provide a "broader range of experiences in materials to accomplish the purposes of individual development" (Logan, 1955, p.176).

Beginning in the 1920's, one of art education's greatest supporters was the Progressive Education Association, whose concern was with the whole child and eliciting his expressive energies (Logan, 1965); art was
found to be a perfect vehicle. The roots of this movement are found with G. Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement. Hall and others were interested in the development of the child; examining needs, abilities, and interests. A critical factor was the realization that children could not be looked at as miniature adults; this change in perception was to first affect general education, then art education.

During the late 1800's and into the 1900's, the name of John Dewey was closely associated with this progressive education movement. Among other things, he supported the notion that the function of the art experience for the child was one of self-expression; that training in art should be oriented towards the expression of ideas rather than just for manual training; the focus ought to be on process, rather than product. The teacher's concern should be the facilitating of an atmosphere where creative growth could take place; this was paramount, and curricular decisions should be based on the needs of the child. As a motivating force in the area of instructional improvement, it had great impact. Dewey's *Art As Experience* (1934), which stressed the idea of art as process became very popular. According to Logan (1965), "its philosophical position dominated the constructive and
critical thought of teachers" (p.53).

As creativity became a major concern in the art classroom, problems began to occur.

Classes taught by those who seriously followed the non-directed child art approach tended to end in chaos. Except for supplying materials and maintaining order, art teachers had a very small or no role to play. They were either afraid of inhibiting or were ignorant of a means of bringing about a higher level of creativity, aesthetic-perceptual sensitivity, and aesthetic problem solving. Many administrators and parents began to think of art classes as "play time" (Michael, 1978, p.17).

While the introduction of drawing and art into the school curriculum began as a serious endeavor with vocational overtones, it was at this point that the notion of "art as play time" began to develop. It is a stigma which has remained until today.

The Depression occurred during the 1930's, and with it, reduced school budgets. With unemployment, people had time on their hands, and many spent this time attending art shows, performances, and concerts. With the increase in the resulting art activity, local and national welfare programs helped to support some of the costs. As it was becoming more difficult to earn a living by art production alone, more and more individuals enrolled in art teacher preparation programs.
The 1940's represented a time of interest in psychology. Popular at the time was an Instrumentalist conception of art; i.e., art was seen as a vehicle for instituting change in behavior; for affecting growth and development. Viktor Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947) proposed five developmental stages which children and adolescents seem to go through. His text presented various art activities and methods for working with each developmental level. "Rather than describing the needs of the individual as being met through having a wide range of meaningful experiences, he dwelt on the needs of achieving personal, psychological integration" (Logan, 1965, p.59). The notion of the art experience as therapy also became quite popular. By the 1950's, another "purpose" of the art experience was added to the laundry list; that of creativity. Lanier (1963) notes that by the 1950's, our conceptions of value towards art were fairly established. These included:

1. Art as intellectual development
2. Promotion of creativity through art
3. Art as therapy
4. Art product/process as basis for psychological diagnosis
5. Growth of cultural knowledge and appreciation through art
6. Refinement of visual perception
7. Training in artistic skills of manipulation and organization

Dewey's child-centered approach to education was to give-way in the 1960's to a subject centered orientation, due in part to the fact "that art educators were concerned that art education was being lost in an integration or merger with other subjects" (Boyer, 1980, p.173). It's affect on art education was one in which the art curriculum would soon reflect the dimensions of not only the artist, but the art historian, art critic, and aesthetician, as well as reflect research being performed in the areas of psychology and cultural anthropology. Before this, the focus was on the child as artist. In the 1960's, art educators such as Manual Barkan (1962), and Elliot Eisner (1965), among others, supported a shift in the art curriculum from the artist as model to one that recognized "that the professional practices of experts in these four roles," i.e., artist, critic, historian, and aesthetician, "are appropriate sources for the content and design of educational activities unique to
the arts" (Clark & Zimmerman, 1978, p.35).

Boyer (1982) notes that "research in art education continued to expand in the 1970's and increased federal funding for the arts affected the direction of the aesthetic education movement" (p.2). These factors reflected a serious interest and commitment on the part of art educators as well as the federal government towards the continuing development of the aesthetic education movement. Concurrently, there was increased interest and funding for special populations, such as the handicapped and the elderly. The effect on art education was to cause the field to perceive itself as having a responsibility to provide service to these special populations; art for everyone. This sense of social responsibility is stressed by Marantz (1971) when he states that "art education must respond to the aesthetic needs of the individual and the broader society" (p.2). While there are few art educators who would disagree with this statement, it must also be kept in mind, as Kern (1970) notes, that "while it may be said that art in the twentieth century functions for aesthetic ends, it cannot be said with the same degree of certainty that this is how art is perceived" (p.6).
Another way of contributing to a better understanding of art teacher education and certification standards, is to look at a parallel situation -- the evolution of art education at a major institution such as the Ohio State University. Even though the description will focus on events that resulted in the development of art education at The Ohio State University, it also encompasses other dimensions because, as Norris (1978) notes, "a university is not a thing unto itself. It is affected by and, in turn, affects politics and other important social endeavors" (p.6).

When plans for the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College -- later to become The Ohio State University -- were drawn up in 1869, "the ninth department on that list of nine departments of instruction was to have been a commercial one in which bookkeeping, writing, and drawing would be taught" (Norris, 1978, p.20). When discussion took place as to what the orientation of the new college would be, there were basically two positions represented; those who wanted "an institution of practical importance to the farmers and industrialists of the state" (p.20), and those who were in favor of "a rather more general and
classical institution" (p.21). The eventual compromise was presented by Professor Edward Orton, President of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, in his inaugural address in the Senate Chamber on January 8, 1874. The curriculum would reflect the interests of industry by offering coursework that would be considered vocational in nature; it would be practical in that students would work in laboratory situations rather than relying on demonstrations and text; and it would be liberal in that students would be exposed to various dimensions of knowledge, keeping them up to date with contemporary changes (Board of Trustees of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1874).

When Joseph Sullivant proposed a second plan for the organization of the departments at the College, the Board approved. The departments represented the areas of: agriculture, mechanical and polite arts, mathematics and physics, chemistry, geology, mining and metallurgy, zoology and veterinary science, botany, horticulture and vegetable physiology, English language and literature, modern and ancient languages, and political economy and civil polity (Kinnison, 1970). While art was not included in the list of departments, it was at least conceptually acceptable (in the sense of mechanical and polite arts)
because of art's inclusion in the pyramidal seal which was to be the symbol for the college.

As early as 1865, E. White, School Commissioner, supported the notion that the college should prepare individuals to teach in the common schools such that "they might be prepared to teach therein the primary facts of natural history, drawing, etc., and train their pupils to habits of observation and inquiry" (Board of Trustees, 1872, p.12).

In 1874, the Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing was created and Thomas Mathew was placed in charge as instructor (Cope & Mendenhall, 1920). Mathew's background included drawing and painting as well as printing and photography (Norris, 1978). The classes Mathew was to teach were not required. They were electives which students enrolled in the college would have to choose to take. The content of the courses he taught included drawing and lettering in india ink, charcoal and pastels, and oil painting. Three months after he was employed to teach drawing, Mathew had approximately one-half of the entire college student body of fifty-nine working with him. In 1875, the College Catalogue listed mechanical and freehand drawing as a department. Sometime during that same year, Mathew
introduced lithography and photography. His concerns were not focused only on technique; he was also concerned with the aesthetic expressive aspect of the mediums, and noted that "in lithography and photography, some very pleasing pictures have been executed by the students" (p.41). By the following year, over one-half of the student body was enrolled in photography classes. Mathew interpreted this interest as "an increased interest in matters relating to art among our people" (p.41). This interest did not manifest itself as a college requirement until 1879, when drawing became a required component of the freshman year (Ohio State University, 1878-1879).

Norris (1978) describes Mathew's philosophy of art education as having evolved from a practical and work orientation to one of fine arts and culture (p.45). In his annual report of 1875, Mathew states that

a knowledge of applied art is becoming a necessity in connection with the educational institutions of the present day. The thronged art halls of our State and county fairs, industrial exhibitions, etc., are an evidence of improved popular taste, developed by the dissemination of good printed pictures at a trifling cost. Our students, whom we may reasonably expect will, in the future, be connected with such art displays, should be able to distinguish one kind of picture from another, and have at least a theoretical knowledge of the mode of reproduction. As a pleasant accomplishment, drawing is very desirable, but the ability to draw, in connection with
professions or mechanical trades, in money value, can hardly be overestimated...A taste for the fine arts is no plant of the desert, that will spring up unheeded and spread its blossoms where there is none to enjoy its fragrance, nor a sturdy weed that can struggle into vigor through rubbish and neglect; it is a plant whose seeds will remain inert until called into life by culture, and will spread its luxuriance exactly in proportion to the care taken of it.

Mathew was sensitive also to what was going on in the public schools of Columbus. Attempts to teach drawing were largely unsuccessful until 1873, when Professor Walter Goodnough, who came from the State Normal School of Massachusetts, became Superintendent of Drawing in Columbus; drawing became a regular subject (Norris, 1978). Mathew noted in his annual report of 1876, that "if this college is to supplement and complete the best work of the public schools, the establishment and maintenance of a department devoted to art training is seen to be a necessity." This is probably one of the first times that the issue of teacher training at the University was raised.

Mathew did not live to see the formation of a formal art department. Having set the groundwork for what would follow, he retired in 1880, continuing to function as a painter and photographer until his death in 1904.

In 1880, the Board of Trustees abolished Mathew's Department of Mechanical and Freehand Drawing and created
the Department of Art (Board of Trustees, 1880), where artisans, rather than artists, would be trained. The perception at this time was such that, art in the public schools would focus on the "study and representation of form, so well-understood and mastered that one would be able to express his thoughts in any plastic medium" (p.66). William Mason, Mathew's replacement, presented his plan for the Department of Art to the Board of Trustees. His conception of what this department should be most likely focused on the industrial arts with a recognition that no culture was without art, whatever form it might take. The orientation for this new Department of Art was to be one that centered on technical instruction in the useful arts, rather than the fine arts. Norris (1978) notes that "it may be unique, certainly it was prophetic that at Ohio State in 1880 the University's educational philosophy would envision in technology the expression of art culture as well as of science" (p.68).

Mason also recognized the need for art teacher training. In his annual report of 1880, he stated that "a good opportunity may now be offered to persons desirous of becoming teachers of drawing". At this time, however, the Board of Trustees saw no reason why the university should do the work of a normal school (Good, 1960, p.20). Where
Mathew introduced art to the college and imbued the subject with a sense of importance, Mason continued to show that a large percentage of students would take advantage of art courses, and that the discipline was here to stay (Norris, 1978). The orientation of the art courses that were offered was pragmatic in nature, the settler state of mind still being dominant. The concern was with how to do things in a more efficient manner, not with the aesthetic aspect.

In 1885, N. Bradford replaced Mason, who resigned; the attraction of returning to the East drawing him, and the political problems of a growing department pushing him. He became Vice-Principal of the Pennsylvania School of Industrial Art when he left Columbus, and eventually was to serve as the Director of Art Education for the Philadelphia Public Schools for thirty-four years.

In 1890, the Department of Drawing became officially recognized as a separate department. By the late 1890's, the Department of Drawing offered three areas of emphasis: Drawing, Architecture, and Art, and the number of courses being offered continued to increase, until, in 1906, the number of courses available to students in the Department of Drawing numbered forty-seven. In 1900, the Departments of Architecture and Drawing were absorbed by the College
of Engineering; in 1905, the College separated into three areas: the Departments of Architecture, Engineering Drawing, and Drawing; the Department of Art was authorized by the Board of Trustees to become a separate department from that of Architecture and Drawing; thus the notion and acceptance of Art grew from a pragmatic and vocational notion of Drawing.

While the United States was struggling to become an industrial nation, the sense of determination to develop manifested itself in the University in terms of a curriculum with a vocational orientation. Once attaining industrial status -- or at least seeing the light at the end of the tunnel -- an atmosphere resulted which was conducive to recognition of an aesthetic orientation to life. On the other side of the coin, one might argue that the conditions which allowed for a consideration of art education as a field of endeavor to exist, were a direct result of this vocational bent. There is support for this interpretation in that, recognizing that individuals would have to be trained for jobs in industry, there would therefore have to be some way in which to prepare manual training teachers for Ohio high schools. By 1893, there was such a vehicle at Ohio State for those students who wished to become manual training teachers.
The Board of Trustees had, in the past, and continued to resist the notion of a "normal" school being associated with the University. While the Legislature would eventually establish normal schools in 1906 at both Miami University and Ohio University, The Ohio State University did not want to offer, as part of its curricula, "any special vocational training which would exclude a 'liberal' dimension from its curriculum" (Norris, 1978, p.161). This is not to say that education would not, in some fashion, fit into the scheme of things, for in 1896, a chair of pedagogy was in fact created, its purpose "to rationalize the work of education; to give to intending teachers definite ideas of the purpose of education and intelligent opinions as to the methods by which this purpose may be attained" (Ohio State University, 1900, p.52). Norris (1978) notes that "teacher education most likely would stress clear ideas, while teacher training probably emphasized definite ones" (p.162).

In 1906, the Ohio Legislature passed a law making it possible for the creation of a teachers' college at The Ohio State University. Along with its inception came debate concerning its purpose. The question was one of whether the College of Education should be responsible for teaching subject matter or methodology. This issue
directly involved the Department of Art, because if art was to be a subject matter to be taught, should then it be located within the College of Education, Engineering, or within Arts, Philosophy & Science? Another implication was whether art was then to be perceived as one of the "liberal" arts or one of the "manual or vocational" arts? An examination of the orientation of art, as taught in the public schools, did not help, because in some cases it was approached with a cultural orientation, and in other cases, as a manual art. A committee appointed in 1906 to examine the problem recommended that the subject of art be affiliated with the College of Education, leaving drawing in the College of Engineering. When the College of Education formally became a reality in 1907, it housed, among other departments, the Department of Art, where it was to remain for sixty years.

Students wishing to major in art in 1906 were housed in the College of Arts and Philosophy for their first two years, and then transferred to the College of Education for their last two years. While in the College of Education, they would take their professional education courses, including a course called Theory and Practice of Art Teaching, which was the only course that distinguished them from other education majors.
Through the new College of Education, it was possible for students majoring in art to receive a Bachelor of Science degree in Education. The number of quarter credit hours required for graduation in this program was 180: sixty-three in art, seven in engineering drawing; six in art teaching methodology; six in educational psychology; nine in history of education; six in sociology; and the remaining hours divided among English, language, and electives.

Still, the dispute concerning the "nature" of art reigned within the university. While there were those who saw the subject closely allied to manual training and therefore a subject which should be associated with teacher education, there were others who felt that art was an academic subject that should be organized and housed in its own college. Meanwhile, the College of Education held on firmly to the Department of Art. During the following years, faculty would come and go, the curriculum of the Department of Art would change and grow, and there would be a continued effort among many to move from a predominantly art teacher preparation orientation to a "culturally-oriented, fine arts concept" (Norris, 1978, p.225).
When C.F. Kelley, who became the head of the Department of Art in 1914, made his annual report in 1916, he described changes that had occurred in the department since his arrival: there were now three areas of art in which students could major: drawing/painting, design, and history-appreciation; an additional two art faculty members had been hired; and there was an appreciable increase in student enrollment numbers attending art classes. He also described a number of art exhibits that had been set up under the auspices of his department.

Between 1917 and 1923, Kelley's goal was one of consolidating resources, and to have the arts organized within a single college. His approach was one of convincing the Board of Trustees that art could be perceived as a vocational endeavor and that it was, therefore, the university's responsibility to prepare artists, which would allow the department to grow. In 1919, Kelley again requested that the Department of Art be relocated in a college other than Education. Those who all along had felt that the substantive dimension of a subject matter should be taught within the confines of an academic unit, and the educational requirements taught within the College of Education, supported Kelley's petition. Kelley also argued that if the Department of
Art was housed in the College of Education for the purpose of training art teachers, but only a small percentage of those students enrolled in art classes intended to become art teachers, then the logical thing to do was to relocate the Department of Art. He also pointed out that a prerequisite to majoring in art at this time was enrollment in the College of Education, and that this requirement was excluding many students who would, otherwise, take courses offered by the Department of Art. His arguments were not strong enough to sway the decision-makers, who decided to keep the Department of Art housed in the College of Education. Norris (1978) believes that this decision was made because the Board of Trustees felt that "if an academic unit in a college clearly has demonstrated its ability to service its own college, to service other colleges in the University and to draw students into the University who otherwise might not come, then, to realign that academic unit could do possible damage to the balance of power among colleges in the University, defeating its aims" (p.245).

Seeing that it would be some time before the arts were housed in their own college, Kelley, in 1922, requested that the Department of Art's name be changed to the Department of Fine Arts. The reason most likely was
because of the continuing development of different areas in which students could major in art, such as painting and sculpture. This request was approved. To garner support for his notion of the fine arts as a vocation in other ways than art teacher preparation, Kelley began bringing in artists-in-residence, whose time was divided between teaching and art production. Even in the 1920's, there was concern among some faculty as to the value of time spent on creative endeavors versus original research; this dialogue still continues today.

In 1924, Charles Kelley left The Ohio State University to become assistant curator of the Chicago Art Institute. Following in the footsteps of his predecessors, he had continued to help set the stage for what would occur during the next twenty years: the development of specialized areas within the visual arts, and the accelerated growth of an art teacher preparation program.

James Hopkins, a Professor of Art who had been on campus since 1923 (p.314), followed Kelley as Chairman of the newly renamed Department of Fine Arts, whose faculty now numbered seven. Hopkins continued the push initiated by Kelley for a separate college for the arts, and along with it, a fine arts building. In 1925, there was serious discussion concerning the possibility of this new
configuration as well as what areas might be housed within it. Hopkins personally felt that the best solution would be to house the Department of Fine Arts within a new College of the Arts, and that it would make sense to include the existing Departments of Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Music, as well. A College of Fine Arts was not to be formed for another forty-some years, though.

In 1925, Hopkins was asked by George Rightmire, President of The Ohio State University, to draft a proposal for the conceptual content of an art teacher preparation program. Hopkins' response (see Appendix B) was to impact strongly on the direction that the art program would take. Hopkins' notion of art teacher preparation recognized the art teacher's responsibility to the community in the role that he or she would play, as well as a relationship between "a philosophy of art and philosophy of art education" (Norris, 1978, p.329). Hopkins supported a curriculum that stressed content as well as methodology, an approach that would professionalize art teaching.

Meanwhile, the Fine Arts faculty continued to grow; by 1928, it consisted of fifteen faculty as well as a number of teaching assistants. Hopkins continued to do what
he could to encourage specialization and growth in the Department of Fine Arts; the creation of a separate college for the Arts was always in the back of his mind. Enrollment, especially in the area of art teacher preparation continued to grow as a result of a law passed in 1921 that made school attendance mandatory for Ohio children ages six to eighteen (Roseboom & Weisenburger, 1973), and therefore created a need for additional teachers. Besides providing service courses for students in other colleges, the Department of Fine Arts grew in student numbers with individuals going into elementary education as well as art teaching. The continuing growth, a result of servicing the needs of students in art and art education as well as those outside of the college, benefited not only the Department of Fine Arts, but also the College of Education, which housed the Department of Fine Arts.

By 1930, a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree was made available to students, offered under the auspices of the Fine Arts Department, the degree given by the College of Education. Students majoring in art could study for a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in ceramics, commercial art, interior decorating, landscape architecture, or a combined emphasis in painting, sculpture, and design. Those with a
desire to teach art studied for a Bachelor of Science degree in Education. The curriculum leading to a B.S.Ed. included 32 quarter hours of professional education courses, of which only five credit hours had to do with methods, or specifically, art education. This changed in 1947 when art education students would be required to have at least 14 credit hours of art education methods courses.

During the 1920's and 1930's, teachers began forming associations. In 1947, the National Art Education Association was formed; its major goal "was the nationalization of art teacher associations across America. It was the first real step toward the national professionalization of art education in America" (Norris, 1978, p.403). The Art Section of the Ohio Education Association, in existence since 1936, became known as the Ohio Art Education Association in 1954. The coordinated effort to develop state, regional, and national associations of art educators reflected the desire to professionalize and gain acceptance as a field of endeavor. Realizing that political power could be generated by organizing, these associations provided a mechanism for discussion of common problems that were being faced by art educators. These efforts eventually manifested themselves in terms of research and
publications which began to focus on issues that art educators were concerned with. It was a time when books like Sir Herbert Read's *Education Through Art* (1941), Victor D'Amico's *Creative Teaching in Art* (1942), and Viktor Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* (1942), were published. Significant questions in art education were being asked: What are the aspects of art and in what order should they be taught? What type of foundation is necessary or essential for an understanding of contemporary art education? What methods of conveying information are most appropriate for the art experience?

During the period of years between 1920 and 1940, there was a lack of art education leadership. Specialization within the Department of Fine Arts was getting stronger and stronger; soon, fragmentation would occur. Norris (1978) notes that by 1944, three conditions existed which were to drastically affect the changes that were about to occur. Two of the three which concern us here are: "specialization which tended to divide faculty into separate interest groups; the lack of professionalization in the teacher training area which tended to hold faculty together superficially as 'art educators,' and confusion about the vocational aim of the teacher education area" (p.429). While the School of
Music would remain a single unit with different areas contained within, four distinct visual arts areas would develop within the coming College of the Arts: art, art history, art education, and industrial design.

Jerome Hausman served as director between 1959 and 1968. During his administration, the building of a new art building was completed; in 1962, the name of the Department of Fine Arts was changed to The School of Art.

On January 1, 1968, as part of a university-wide reorganization effort, the College of the Arts was created, with Dr. Lee Rigsby, former Director of the School of Music, named as Dean. Within the College, art education had the status of division, then department, with Dr. Manuel Barkan as chairman. History of Art was designated a division; the Division of Art consisted of sculpture, ceramics, drawing, painting and printmaking; and design, commercial art, and interior design formed the components of the Division of Design. Along with these four units -- Art Education, History of Art, Art, and Design -- were added the Department of Dance, the School of Music, and the Department of Theatre, to make up the new College of the Arts.
Table 3: State Normal Schools Between 1829 - 1926

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>Teachers begin to form associations as a vehicle for discussing educational problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Marietta Collegiate Institute and Western Teachers' Seminary are incorporated as training schools for the education of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Legislature allows for the incorporation of teachers' institutes in Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>At least 41 teachers' institutes have formed in Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Guidelines for the organization of teachers' institutes are created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>At least seven normal schools have formed in Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Standardized curriculum for normal schools is adopted by the State of Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Legislation authorizing the creation of two state normal schools is passed; Ohio University and Miami University are where they are to be located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>There are at least 51 county normal schools, 34 city normal schools, and 40 colleges offering coursework leading to teacher certification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4: Trends in Art Education Between 1840 - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Horace Mann includes the drawing lessons of Peter Schmid in <em>Common Schools Journal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Art and drawing are seen as synonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Art instrumental in cultivating good taste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Art as vocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Walter Smith becomes principal of the Massachusetts Normal Art School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Art academies begin to flourish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Arthur W. Dow's <em>Composition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Art academies are challenged by schools of decorative arts, trade schools, and normal schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>G. Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement provide the roots for the Progressive Education Association and John Dewey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Joseph Albers and Moholy-Nagy bring aspects of the Bauhaus movement to America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>John Dewey's <em>Art as Experience</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Art as therapy and a vehicle for social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Viktor Lowenfeld's <em>Creative and Mental Growth</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Art promotes creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Shift from Dewey's child-centered approach to subject-centered orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Art for special populations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Art Education and The Ohio State University Between 1869 - 1968

1850 -- -- --

1869 -- -- Plans for the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College are drawn up

1874 -- -- Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing is created

1880 -- -- Department of Art is created as Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing is abolished

1890 -- -- Department of Drawing becomes a separate department

1896 -- -- Chair of Pedagogy is created

1900 -- -- -- Departments of Architecture and Drawing are absorbed by the College of Engineering

1905 -- -- College of Engineering separates into the Departments of Engineering, Engineering Drawing, and Drawing. Department of Art becomes a separate department from that of Architecture and Drawing

1906 -- -- Ohio Legislature passes a law making it possible for the creation of a teachers' college at The Ohio State University

1907 -- -- Department of Education is formed, housing the Department of Art. Students majoring in art can receive a Bachelor of Science degree in Education.

1916 -- -- Art students can major in drawing/painting, design, or history/art appreciation

1922 -- -- Department of Art is changed to Department of Fine Arts

1930 -- -- Students majoring in art can receive a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in ceramics, commercial art, interior decorating, landscape architecture, or a combined emphasis in painting, sculpture, and design.

1936 -- -- The Ohio Education Association, with an Art section is formed.

1947 -- -- National Art Education Association is formed

1950 -- -- --

1954 -- -- Art Section of the Ohio Education Association becomes known as the Ohio Education Association

1962 -- -- Department of Fine Arts is changed to School of Art

1968 -- -- The College of the Arts is formed, made up of the Division of Art Education, Division of History of Art, Division of Art, Division of Design, Department of Dance, Department of Theatre, and School of Music

Dr. Manuel Barkan is appointed Chairman of the Division of Art Education.
CHAPTER VI

ART TEACHER CERTIFICATION STANDARDS IN OHIO

Teacher Certification

An assumption of the Ohio State Board of Education has been that teacher education and certification standards are intended to assure quality in the preparation of teachers (Ohio Board of Education, 1984). This statement raises at least two questions; What is the relationship between teacher certification and the notion of quality?; and, who determines what quality is, how it should be attained, and when is it reached? While the statement is not the focus of this study, it must at least be recognized, for it is, in theory and rationale, the basis for decisions that are made concerning art teacher certification requirements. Although the statement is presented in a clear "everyone knows this to be true" format, one must keep in mind that "state certification policy development is primarily a political process,
despite the qualitative considerations surrounding its discussion. Thus, the mere rationality of an argument is insufficient for its acceptance as policy. Effectiveness depends upon casting such rationality in political terms" (National Art Education Association & National Association of Schools of Art and Design, 1982, p.1). The perception of certification policy development as a political process carries with it several implications:

1. While the system or administration of that process for making decisions may be established, the actual decisions will be made based on a variety of factors including values, precedent, special interest groups representing various points of view, and protection of turf, to name a few. In other words, even though there is a formal mechanism whose purpose is to provide guidelines and steps leading to final decisions, the reality of the situation is one where those actual decisions are, in fact, based on a variety of factors, as listed above, which may have very little to with the actual topic being debated.

2. Individuals, groups, and interests involved in the decision-making process will be concerned with power: "the ability to create and maintain dominant coalition which can mobilize resources and get others to accomplish a
plan, prevent having that plan modified in undesirable ways, and induce most members to accept the dominant coalition's decisions as binding'' (Blanke). The level of competition for influence may not be based on the importance of the issue, as much as an exercise in domination and control. Oftentimes it is not the issue itself that is at the root of the energy being expended, but rather the implications of that issue.

3. In attempting to develop enough support so that one's own desired outcomes can be reached, it is inevitable that there is going to be conflict between various interests. In attempting to reach a decision or consensus, interest groups oftentimes band together or negotiate with one-another in order to form dominant coalitions.

4. When conflict is resolved and a "best" decision is made, questions such as "best for whom?" and "based upon what criteria?" must be considered, since these terms are relative. A decision that is best for one interest group may not be best, and in fact may be detrimental, for another.

Arnold, Denemark, Nelli, Robinson, & Sagan (1977) note that "effective quality control in teacher education is seen to require a coordinated, continuing effort of higher
education, school systems, governmental agencies concerned with education, the organized profession, and the individual teacher or teacher candidate" (p.7).

State agency certification is one of the eight critical factors involved in teacher preparation that they feel should be scrutinized carefully as a "critical control point" (p.8). In assessing and determining the specifics that affect certification standards, they have identified several forces which influence the outcomes of discussions that affect these standards (p.8). They include:

(a) Professional expectations of the field in which the certification area lies have an impact. In the field of art education, it is oftentimes the responsibility of members of the profession on the college and university levels who are responsible for teacher preparation, to interpret and implement standards that are set. Another aspect of this category is the manner in which incoming members of the profession are expected to be able to perform, not only by art educators already in elementary and secondary settings, but also by the newcomers who find, after a time, that they have not been adequately prepared for the situations in which they find themselves. These situations also directly affect expectations having
to do with the content of art teacher preparation programs.

(b) Community perceptions towards the value of art oftentimes varies from community to community. A community's perceptions concerning the value of art and art education will directly affect the amount of support that local school art programs receive. This "valuing" of art and art education can then affect art teacher preparation standard discussions, in that the more demanding a community is in terms of its expectations of art teacher performance and preparedness, the more pressure is brought about upon those who are responsible for setting standards to meet the needs that the community sees as germane.

(c) Institutional contexts also vary. The configuration of the department which houses the teacher preparation program, as well as where it is located within the college or university, also can affect input concerning standards. The orientation, approach, and philosophy of an art teacher preparation program that is housed within a School or College of Education will most likely differ from one that is housed within a Department of Humanities, or one that is located within its own Department of Art Education.
(d) Supply and demand realities are affected by a variety of factors including, but not limited to economic concerns, increases and decreases in enrollment in elementary and secondary settings, the ratio of students per art teacher, and curricular requirements which include an art component.

(e) Available resources not only refer to those of an economic nature, but staff and media resources as well as laboratory and field experiences. Standards must be based on resources as they exist, or as they might in a practical and realistic sense, potentially come into existence when needed. It makes little sense to set standards that cannot be attained with available resources or staffing.

Elam (1971), in writing about factors that should be considered when programs are involved in establishing goals, lists five considerations which also seem to be applicable in the case of establishing certification standards:

(a) Standards for certification and expectations of student performance should be based on teacher roles, and stated in such a fashion that evaluation can take place.

(b) Criteria that will be used for evaluation and certification must be clearly stated and understood by
both student and evaluator.

(c) Certification and evaluation should be based on actual student performance and be objective.

(d) Ability to perform competently should be the basis for assessing the student's progress and certification, rather than just time involved or coursework completed.

(e) Purpose of the teacher preparation program is to "facilitate development and evaluation of the student's achievement of the specified competencies" (p.34).

While certification standards are instituted in order to purportedly insure quality in teacher preparation programs, little research has been done investigating the pervasive influence of state requirements on teacher preparation programs. It is not the goal of this study to investigate the influence of state requirements on teacher preparation programs, but the issue must be raised since it is a rationale for the development and enforcing of certification standards.

Currently, the most common method of teacher certification is the approved program approach, which replaced transcript analysis some years ago. The approved program approach generally involves the following steps:
1. The college or university wishing to offer teacher education programming applies for accreditation from the state department of education.

2. An office of the state department of education prepares, with input from colleges, school systems, and interested organizations or associations, guidelines for the teacher preparation program.

3. The college or university develops a curriculum based on the guidelines, and submits it to the appropriate state agency for evaluation.

4. Proposed curriculum is approved or rejected by the state agency.

5. If the curriculum is approved, then designated faculty have the power to recommend students who have successfully completed the program for teaching certification to the state department of education.

While the standardization of certification standards is supposed to insure quality preparation of teachers, an unstated implication is that these same standards guarantee the competence of the newly graduated teacher. Competence, however, is a relative term. The particular abilities of a teacher in one setting might be considered competent, while in another setting, incompetent. If the role definition that certification standards are based on
are consistent with one school district, but not with another within the same state, how does this affect the notion of validity of statewide certification? Hopkins (1973) raises a number of legal questions having to do with implications of teacher certification.

1. By granting teacher certification to an individual, is the State certifying that that individual is qualified (a) by experience and/or (b) by academic preparation, to teach in a publicly accredited school in the State?

2. If it is proven to the State that an individual who has been certified to be qualified is, in fact, not capable of adequately performing the teaching responsibilities for which certification was granted, is the State legally liable?

3. Does a teacher who has been certified by the State to possess certain qualifications have a legal cause for action against the State, should, on-the-job performance show that individual to lack the actual qualifications which the State certified the person to have?

4. Does a State taxpayer have a legal cause of action against the State if certification standards are shown to be inadequate in terms of effective student learning?

5. Is it the State's responsibility to regularly evaluate and demonstrate that stated certification
standards are the most appropriate for effecting student learning?

6. Does the State have a responsibility to demonstrate that its' certification policies and procedures do not discriminate against minorities wishing to be teachers in public schools?

The various issues and questions that have been raised here do not end once certification standards have been established. They continue to be viable problems whenever the topic of revisions comes up.

Revision of Teacher Certification Standards

Sources offer various reasons as to why revisions of certification standards take place when they do. Howey, Yarger, and Joyce (1978) note that pressures to change oftentimes include the following: (a) criticism of the substance and process of teacher education from within and outside the profession; (b) changes in teacher supply and demand; (c) changes in specific areas of need for new teachers, and the demand for redirection toward those areas of need; (d) continuing recognition of a need for greater attention to multicultural and bilingual education, and to students who have learning disabilities
or are handicapped; and (e) an increasing need to provide better training for those teachers who will be working with the urban and rural poor. In Ohio, the State Board of Education has appointed the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission the task of determining and recommending, with input from a wide variety of interests, "needed revisions in current teacher education and certification standards" (Ohio Department of Education, introduction, 1984). For a revision taking place during 1985/1986 in Ohio, the Department of Education, in its Discussion Guide for Teacher Education and Certification Standards Revision (1984), offers the following reasons for the process occurring at this time: (a) the time is right; with the number of teachers approaching retirement and a need to recruit new teachers to replace them, it is a good time to update standards; (b) teacher preparation programs are currently involved in a Redesign of Teacher Education which should provide a sound foundation for recommendations made in a revision process; and (c) there is increased local support from citizens for good schools which rely on well-prepared teachers.

Another reason for the current revision of Ohio Teacher Certification Standards is the report of the
Teacher Education Assessment Project (TEAP), a study conducted by the Educational Research Council of America in 1970, in cooperation with the State of Ohio Department of Education. This investigation of secondary teacher preparation programs found that "few programs in preservice are appropriate for meeting the demands of new and emerging curricula or strategies of teaching and learning" (Educational Research Council of America, 1970, p.2).

The revision process is an involved one. Groups are formed of lay citizens, practitioners, higher education personnel and people from related education organizations who focus on a common set of issues (provided to them by the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission) in teacher education and certification, and make recommendations for new standards. The recommendations which result from these discussions are considered by the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission, who then develop a concept paper which is sent back to all participants. Regional meetings are held to discuss this concept paper. Based on these meetings, standards are drafted and then discussed at regional meetings. After reviewing the discussions that take place at these latter regional meetings, the Advisory
Commission finalizes standards for recommendation to the State Board of Education.

**Major Factors That Have Influenced Standards**

An examination of the development of the common school system in Ohio, legislation concerning teacher certification, the evolution of art teacher education, and art teacher certification standards has revealed factors that have influenced art teacher education and certification standards. They include:

Economic: the availability of monetary resources for retaining and/or hiring new art teachers, as well as obtaining adequate materials.

Social and Cultural: how society relates to and values art will affect the demand for art education.

Political: Political action in one arena can affect what occurs in another. An example of this can be seen in legislation providing for special populations; art education as a field became involved, and coursework having to do with the elderly, handicapped, etc., became part of art teacher preparation curricula.

Educational: Currents in educational methodology and philosophy permeate not only general education but areas
of specialization, such as art education, as well.

Historical: As discussed earlier, events in history not only set precedent, but also greatly influence what people value, manifested in the action they take, or decisions they make.

Colleges and Universities: There are certainly other factors that have directly or indirectly impacted on art teacher education and certification standards, such as the colleges and universities that prepare art teachers. For example, in 1921 the College of Education of The Ohio State University began to sponsor a series of annual educational conferences. These conferences were for the public, in order to increase their understanding of public education, gain their support, and to help find solutions to problems (Norris, 1978). The Art Committee, part of this annual educational conference, consisted of Charles Kelley who was the head of the Art Department at The Ohio State University, four art educators, two art supervisors, one art teacher, and a Board of Education member. In the Art Committee's meeting at the 1922 conference, three presentations were made: the first report presented the results of a survey of Ohio school personnel attitudes towards the value of art education in the schools. What was found was that the majority of those polled saw the
value of art education as a vehicle for developing taste, and there was a discrepancy between what these school personnel valued in art education and what was supposedly being taught. When Ohio school superintendents were asked to explain why this might be the case, they responded by attributing the situation to inadequate teacher training, and a "lack of responsibility shown by the state's art teachers in making art education of value" (p.276).

The second report, produced in response to the deficiencies listed in the survey, made recommendations concerning art teacher preparation programs. It was suggested first that students accepted into art teacher preparation programs be graduates of first-class high schools; and that their college curriculum consist of coursework "in art history and appreciation; drawing of both a creative and representational kind; painting and sculpture also of both a creative and representational kind; craft work; mechanical drawing; and pedagogical work in psychology, history, methods, principles, school management, practice teaching and observation" (p.276).

The Board of Education member of the Art Committee presented the third report. In it, he recommended two specific courses to be taught in the public schools of Ohio: one would be an art appreciation course required of
all students; the other would be a studio class for those students who were identified as being talented.

Currently, as discussed earlier, Colleges and Universities that are responsible for art teacher education and certification programming are involved in the revision process, having input towards the updating and evaluation of standards.

Associations: Another force which must be recognized as having an impact on standards is that represented by art educators. Teachers have realized for some time the need to have political influence in order to have input concerning decisions affecting education. Political organizations developed in the form of professional associations. In 1870, the National Education Association (NEA) grew out of the National Teachers Association, which had been formed in 1857. Within the National Teachers Association, areas of specialization developed as departments; art educators were represented with the formation of the Art Department of the NEA in 1884. After the establishment of a national association, regional associations began forming as well. The Western Drawing Teachers Association, later to change its name to Western Arts Association, was formed at the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 (Logan, 1955). Norris & Stankiewicz (1978) have
described this association as one of four which formed in different regions, its aim "to represent the interests of art, home economics, and related arts and manual training teachers" (p.8).

Following the formation of national and regional arts associations, eventually individual states began their own associations. Within Ohio was organized the Ohio Art and Manual Training Association in 1906, the equivalent of the Western Drawing Teachers Association. While there had been an Ohio State Teachers Association started in 1848, there was little coordination between associations until much later. The Ohio State Teachers Association later changed its name to the Ohio Education Association in 1936 (Norris, 1978). Just as the National Education Association had an Art Department to represent art educators, so did the Ohio Education Association form a similar Art Department to represent Ohio art educators. An example of another type of organization that developed was the National Committee on Art Education. This association was begun by Victor D'Amico in 1942, and was supported by the Museum of Modern Art in New York until 1964. "The philosophical position taken by the Committee was that of encouraging teachers of art to seek closer ties with the artists" (Logan, 1975, p.8).
In 1947, the National Art Education Association was organized, and in 1954 the Art Department of the Ohio Education Association changed its name to the Ohio Art Education Association. As an organization, a major goal of the newly formed Ohio Art Education Association was the establishment of an office of state director of art education who would lead and coordinate efforts for the continuing growth of art education in Ohio. That office was not to be created until 1966, when Jerry Tollifson was appointed State Director of Art Education. Other concerns included the production of guidelines for art educators at the elementary and secondary levels, building connections with other organizations, supporting legislation that would strengthen the position of art as a subject in the school curriculum, and becoming involved in the determination and evaluation of art teacher certification standards, to name a few (Norris & Stankiewicz, 1978). The development of these state and national art education associations represented a realization on the part of art educators that they, as professionals, had common interests, concerns, and problems to solve, and that the only way they could effect change was by working together.
This concerted effort has manifested itself in several ways, one of which was Standards for Art Teacher Preparation Programs (National Art Education Association, 1979), a series of guidelines which began to be discussed in 1970 and were, after a series of revisions, adopted by the Higher Education Division and the Board of Directors of the National Art Education Association in 1979. These guidelines have also been found to be acceptable by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (National Art Education Association, 1979).

Part One of Standards for Art Teacher Preparation Programs (1979) pertains to undergraduate art teacher preparation programs, and provides guidelines for the areas of curriculum, faculty, student advisement, facilities, and evaluation. While the quality of content in a paper cannot be evaluated based solely on length, it is interesting to note that the largest body of writing in Part One is spent on guidelines for facilities.

Within the content area of recommendations, are the components of studio as well as art history (including aesthetics and criticism). Where the NAEA recommends a minimum of 58 qtr. hrs./39 sem. hrs. in studio work and 18 qtr. hrs./12 sem. hrs. in history of art, the Ohio Department of Teacher Education and Certification requires
at least a minimum of 45 qtr. hrs./30 sem. hrs. in studio work and 15 qtr. hrs./10 sem. hrs. in history of art, with an additional 15 qtr. hrs./10 sem. hrs. in electives selected from either group (Ohio Department of Teacher Education and Certification, 1972). The NAEA also recommends that art education students take coursework in related arts areas such as music, theatre, dance, etc.; as well as in the social sciences, philosophy of education, general education, field and laboratory experience, and finally, student teaching.

Guidelines concerning faculty list competencies that are considered germane to education and art education, as well as statements concerning commitment, faculty service and development, and student advising.

The facilities and equipment section describes criteria for work spaces, instructional equipment, materials, safety, etc., and is, perhaps, the most detailed section of the guidelines.

In terms of how much the NAEA guidelines have impacted on art teacher certification standards and preparation programs, one can only guess. While "interested parties" such as the NAEA and OAEA have had the right to participate in the revision process of certification standards, little research has been done to investigate
the impact they actually have had. As far as affecting art teacher preparation programs or actual art teacher practice, surveys conducted by Chapman (1979) and Hardiman (1983) have not shown the guidelines to have had much impact upon state agencies, supervisors, or art teachers.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine some of the factors and events which have affected the development and revision of art teacher education and certification standards in the State of Ohio between 1802 and 1974. The period of time examined began with the Territorial Legislature passing ordinances in 1802 which allowed the incorporation of seminaries, religious and educational societies, and provided for the leasing of school lands; and ended with the State Board of Education of Ohio's adoption of Standards for Colleges or Universities Preparing Teachers in 1974.

The Common School System in Ohio

The description of the common school system of Ohio began with the formal settlement of Ohio and a discussion of how settlers' attitudes towards teaching and education
were a reflection of attitudes in the regions where they came from. While attitudes towards education, specifically art education in the twentieth century, cannot solely be attributed to geographical region, influences such as experience, environment, peer attitudes, and self-interest remain as major considerations which affect the degree of support that individuals and groups are willing to offer to art education. In the 1800's, even had there been a vehicle for centralized control of education, it is likely that it would have still been ineffective due to the frontier attitude concerning outside interference; settlers, used to relying on themselves, resisted for some time, the notion of outside controls being exercised upon them. In the same way today, even though there is substantial research and literature to support the notion that art and art education are valuable and basic components of education and life, it is unlikely that those who are ambivalent or negative will be receptive to reevaluating their feelings towards art and art education until their attitudes change.

The first legislation in Ohio having to do with education occurred in 1821, and simply stated that while parents had the right to have their children educated, it
was by no means obligatory. This piece of legislation was to set the tone of future legislation concerning education; for many years to come, acts having to do with education would be vague and incohesive. While a law of 1825 did commit the state to financial support of the common schools, it did nothing to help create a unified state system. It is significant that the initial legislation having to do with education in the State of Ohio was so vague, though not surprising since it merely reflected the attitudes of legislators who were, in turn, reflecting the attitudes and wishes of their constituents. The essence of political reality has not changed over the years; most legislation, while professing to be a harbinger of change, merely reflects what is popular among those interest groups who have the time and resources to lobby.

The configuration of common schools remained ungraded until the mid-1840's, when the free public school became recognized as a more efficient mechanism for educating the increasing numbers of students. Here again, a decision affecting the configuration of the educational system was not based necessarily on what would be best for the students, but rather upon economic and administrative considerations. This is not to indicate that students did
not benefit from the change, but merely to point out that their welfare was not the prime motivating factor. During this period, the school year was being lengthened to thirty-six weeks, and additional funding was being provided for teachers.

Up until 1850, Ohio was primarily an agricultural state with the majority of the population living in rural areas; thus the majority of school legislation dealt with districts, townships, and counties. When urban growth began to accelerate in the 1850's, the legislation shifted its focus to the concerns of the city population; legislators are always very conscious of where votes originate.

Public education in Ohio during the 19th century lacked any clear statewide policy; legislation was vague, and it was left to the individual communities to determine how they would regulate their educational activities. While this was due to the prevailing attitudes of the time concerning centralized control, as well as the lack of any mechanism to supervise education on a statewide basis, the situation was positive in that each community had the power to decide what aspects of education were most appropriate and necessary for its students. Since there was no office to effectively handle the responsibility of
supervision of education or teacher training, though, there was an absence of educational theory guiding the choices and practices of the various communities.

In 1855, drawing was included in the curricula of some schools in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus. Drawing became a part of the curriculum because it was felt by many that it would assist students in learning to read, count, and write. By 1876, drawing was a component of the curriculum in grades one through eight, as well as the first three years of high school. The content of the drawing courses was usually limited to copying and penmanship.

By 1900, art was firmly entrenched in the elementary and secondary school curriculum. While the subject of art has not carried with it the status or importance of the "basics," as discussed in Chapter I, it has remained in the curriculum in one form or another. While art has not been recognized to qualify as an "essential" in the curriculum, it apparently is essential enough to have been included thus far.
The Legislature and Teacher Certification in Ohio

In 1821 the Ohio legislature authorized district school committees to employ individuals as teachers. Prior to this time, members of a community would simply designate someone who could read and write as a teacher if there was sufficient support for a school. The notion of certification was first mentioned in the law of 1825 which required individuals who wished to be teachers to acquire a certificate of qualification which would entitle them to teach in a district school and receive public funds in payment for services rendered. The motivation for this law of 1825 seems to have been facilitated by a concern for finding a way to monitor monies paid out to teachers, i.e., record-keeping. While specifications concerning the "certificate of qualification" were quite vague and unspecific, guidelines concerning payment of teachers was quite detailed.

During the 1820's and 1830's legislation frequently changed the number of examiners that counties could appoint. Teacher examinations were administered by individual counties, and the certificates that were granted were recognized only within the county that granted them, not because examinations were site-specific,
but because of the "territorial imperative" that existed between the various counties. While the number of subject areas that teachers had to become proficient in continued to grow, a knowledge of education theory and practice was not required or considered important as a prerequisite to teaching until 1864.

Even though there was continued resistance to the notion of centralized control of education in the State, an effort was made to begin coordinating efforts statewide by creating the office of State Superintendent of Common Schools in 1837. The major responsibility of this position was to survey and gather information concerning the state of education within Ohio.

Because of the lack of supervision and centralized controls, teachers realized very early that they had to rely on themselves in order to solve problems that they faced, and began to form associations as a vehicle for discussing educational problems as early as 1829. In 1848, in response to pressure from teachers, the legislature finally passed an act which allowed for the incorporation of teachers' institutes. These teachers' institutes, which lasted for one-to-three weeks, provided assistance for a time, but eventually were recognized to be inadequate to deal with the problems that teachers were
facing. While the normal school was being instituted in America as early as the 1830's, it was not until the mid-1850's that private normal schools were started in Ohio, and 1902 before the Ohio legislature approved the formation of two state normal schools.

During the 1850's, cities experienced a surge of increased growth over that which occurred in rural areas. The Ohio General Assembly, realizing that it was becoming necessary to centralize control of education in the State, passed a law which resulted in the appointment of a State Board of Public Instruction. Here again, the decision was based on political, economic, and administrative concerns. Meanwhile, there was still no single authority responsible for the dispensing of teacher certificates, so in 1864 the State Commissioner appointed a State Board of Examiners whose responsibility would include the granting of state teaching certificates. It was still a confusing time for the area of teacher certification, however, because examiners were authorized to grant various types of certificates, and the requirements and powers of cities and villages concerning teacher certification varied, based on population. The teacher certification issue began to unravel itself when the village district examining board was phased out in 1904. In 1914,
statewide teacher certification examinations were offered centrally and only eight times a year; the legislature also required student teaching as well as the written examination as criteria for being granted a teaching certificate. Many of these changes were brought about because of pressure from teachers.

The Bing Law of 1921, besides making school attendance mandatory for Ohio children ages six through eighteen, also required that elementary teachers attend college in order to receive their certification.

Teacher certification was finally centralized at the state level in 1935 with the creation of the State Department of Education, whose responsibility it was to establish standards for the preparation and certification of school personnel in Ohio. In an effort to specialize even further in the supervision of teacher certification, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was formed in 1958.

**Art Teacher Education in Ohio**

Teachers were most likely among the first individuals who realized the need for teacher training and preparation. This is not surprising since it is teachers
who make up the "front line" in schools, and would most likely be the ones to be most aware of the inadequacies in their education preparation. As early as 1829, associations were being formed by teachers for teachers as a vehicle for discussing educational problems they were facing. In 1848, after much lobbying by teachers, the Ohio legislature passed an act which authorized the incorporation of teachers' institutes in Ohio. While these teachers' institutes did provide some assistance to teachers, some educators felt that more was needed than could be offered by the institutes. A reaction to this situation was the incorporation of the Marietta Collegiate Institute and Western Teachers' Seminary in 1832 as a training school which emphasized the education of teachers. In the 1830's, the concept of the normal school was brought to America. While originally developed in order to prepare elementary school teachers for the classroom, normal schools seemed the perfect vehicle for the preparation of secondary school teachers as well.

While Ohio was not to support the notion of state normal schools until 1902, by 1875 there were at least seven private normal schools in the State. These private normal schools were the result of efforts by educators, teachers, and others who saw them as a solution to the
problem of teacher preparation. Prior to 1900, when the State established a standardized curriculum for normal schools, there was little, if any, control or supervision, and it is difficult to determine the quality of training that aspiring teachers were receiving. When the legislature passed an act in 1902 that authorized the creation of two state normal schools, it was primarily because of the pressure brought about by organizations such as the Ohio State Teachers' Association and the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs. Since they would be state normal schools, there could be some state control and supervision of content and curriculum.

In the 1800's, drawing and art were perceived as synonymous with one-another. Drawing was seen as valuable because it was believed that the skill would aid the development of penmanship as well as contribute to better eye/hand coordination.

During the post-Civil War era, there was growth in American industry which was becoming competitive with its European counterparts. Art was introduced into the school curriculum for very practical purposes in an effort to develop good taste among students who would be consumers as well as to identify those individuals who had the potential to later be trained as industrial designers.
Walter Smith, late of South Kensington, was brought to America in the early 1870's to head the Massachusetts Normal Art School, and brought with him the notion of industrial drawing through systematic instruction.

Art academies flourished during the late 1800's and were the sole source of art instruction until the early 1900's when competition was found in newly developing schools of decorative arts, trade schools, and normal schools. Other influences also affected art training, among them the philosophy of the Bauhaus imported by individuals such as Josef Albers and Moholy-Nagy, and the progressive education movement represented by John Dewey, which considered the subject of art part of the general curriculum.

During the depression of the 1930's, many individuals involved in art production shifted professionally into art teacher training programs, and more of the public took advantage of art-oriented affairs which were free to the public. The changes and shifts occurred primarily due to the economic situation.

The interest in psychology during the 1940's impacted on the perception of art education as therapy and a vehicle for instituting change in behavior. This led to the use of art as creativity in the following decade,
along with a realignment of thought concerning the arena that art education encompassed.

The 1960's represented a time of continuing change in art education philosophy and methodology. Dewey's child-centered approach gave way to one that was subject-centered; where the focus had been on the child as artist, it grew to also include the roles of the critic, historian, and aesthetician as models upon which to base an art education curriculum. Manual Barkan was instrumental in helping to direct and point out the shift in focus from the child as focal point to art as focal point. While the use of these various roles as the basis of an art curriculum continued into the 1970's, the notion of what areas art education encompassed also grew to include special populations as clients, arts administration, and museum education.

In 1869, the original plan for the creation of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College, from which The Ohio State University was to evolve, did not include a consideration of the notion of teacher training or art education. In 1874 freehand and mechanical drawing courses were added to the curriculum because the skills developed in these courses were seen as beneficial to those students wishing to enter the field of industry.
College administrators saw these skills as very practical, with a vocational orientation that would allow them to be translated into dollars and cents. From this vocational orientation also grew the seeds of recognition that aside from the industrial arts, art, though playing a subservient role, also played an integral role in culture at large; the Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing became the Department of Art in 1880. This was also the period when discussion began concerning the need for art teacher training. Before the idea of art teacher training was to be accepted, though, there was pressure to deal with the problem of how to prepare individuals for jobs in industry. This concern was seen as more pressing and immediate. The solution was the formation of a curriculum which would prepare manual training teachers for Ohio high schools in 1893. The Board of Trustees were still resisting the notion of a normal school being affiliated with the University because they felt that any program that was vocational in nature and might be construed to not containing a liberal element was contrary to the purpose of the University. They did however, create a chair of pedagogy in 1896, its purpose to prepare teachers in methodology and the purposes of education.
When the Ohio legislature passed a law which would allow for the creation of a teachers' college at The Ohio State University in 1906, a great debate began concerning its purpose; i.e., whether the College of Education should be responsible for teaching subject matter or methodology. While this was the dialogue taking place on the surface, it is likely that the real or primary concerns of those involved, had to do with politics and "turf;" i.e., where the Department of Art was housed involved not only a philosophical and educational debate, but also involved funding, resources, and power. The dialogue directly affected the Department of Art in that there were those who argued that art was a subject and therefore should be housed within the College of Education while others argued that art was a manual or vocational subject; and still others that art was one of the liberal arts and should be housed in the College of Arts, Philosophy & Science. In 1906 students majoring in art began in the College of Arts, Philosophy & Science, and during their third year transferred to the College of Education. When the Department of Art moved to the College of Education, it was possible for art students to receive a Bachelor of Science degree in Education. Meanwhile the debate concerning art as a subject related to manual training and
therefore within the domain of education or art as an academic subject and therefore requiring its own college, continued.

In 1922, the name of the Department of Art was changed to Department of Fine Arts. While still housed in the College of Education, art students could major in drawing/painting, design, history-appreciation, and sculpture, as well as art teacher preparation. The development of additional art emphases was representative of a movement to show that the fine arts could be perceived as a vocation in ways other than art teacher preparation; by 1930 a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree was available to students studying ceramics, commercial art, interior decorating, landscape architecture, or a combined emphasis in painting, sculpture, and design.

During the 1920's and 1930's, teachers began to form associations. In 1947 the National Art Education Association was created, its major goal being the nationalization of art teacher associations across America. It was the first real step towards the national professionalization of art education in America. The hope was that by forming a professional association, collectively, more might be accomplished politically, as well as provide a vehicle for dealing with problems
specific to art educators. Locally, the Art Section of the Ohio Education Association, in existence since 1936, became known as the Ohio Art Education Association in 1954. These associations were challenged by questions having to do with art education practice and philosophy dealing with what aspects of art should be taught; how they should be taught; the type of foundation necessary for an understanding of contemporary art education; etc.

In 1968, the College of the Arts was formed. The College was made up of the Divisions of Art Education, History of Art, and Art, as well as the School of Music and Departments of Theatre and Dance. Manuel Barkan was appointed Chair of the Division of Art Education.

**Art Teacher Certification Standards in Ohio**

The rationale behind the institution of teacher education and certification standards has been the assurance of quality in the preparation of teachers. While educational theory and research have provided some of the data upon which decisions concerning standards have been based, it must be kept in mind that actual policy development has been essentially a political process. As such, various factors have influenced the outcome of
dialogues having to do with standards. These factors, discussed in Chapter VI, have included professional expectations, community perceptions, institutional contexts, supply and demand realities, available resources, as well as research in education and psychology, and the voices of special interest groups.

While the standardization of certification standards is supposed to insure quality preparation of teachers, there also is an implied guarantee concerning the competence of teachers who have been granted certification. It has been unclear, however, as to who has actually been responsible for determining upon which criteria this notion of competence should be based.

The revision of teacher certification standards has occurred for various reasons at various times. Reasons have included: pressures from within and outside the profession of teaching; changes in teacher supply and demand; changes in areas of need; greater recognition of a need for greater attention to special populations and different settings; to name a few. Again, each of these reasons are affected by the variables listed earlier, i.e., professional expectations, community perceptions, institutional contexts, supply and demand realities, and available resources.
A variety of individuals and groups have been involved in the initial phases of the revision process; lay people, professionals in the field of education -- both elementary and secondary as well as in higher education, and individuals in related fields who have had an interest in the outcome. These individuals traditionally have made recommendations -- based upon their personal and professional perceptions and interests -- which are presented to the Ohio Teacher Education and Certification Advisory Commission. After examining the recommendations, a concept paper has been developed and regional meetings held to examine and discuss it. The Advisory Commission then presents standards to the State Board of Education for approval. While much data is generated in this process, it is not clear how opposing points of view are evaluated and how consensus leading to the final recommended standards has been reached.

As of 1972, art teacher certification standards in Ohio were to be comprised of the following components: (a) Professional Education Courses, which were to include elements dealing with an understanding of the learner and the learning process, the role of school in society, and a basic understanding of the general curriculum which was to provide methods and laboratory experiences as well as
student teaching in the area of specialization in both elementary and secondary levels; (b) General Education Courses, which were to include coursework in science and mathematics, the social sciences, English and/or foreign language, and the fine arts, philosophy, and/or theological studies; and (c) Visual Art Courses, which were to include two-dimensional and three-dimensional studies, graphic communication, advanced study in film arts or one of the above areas, art history, and criticism.

**Factors That Have Influenced Standards**

While it was not the intent of this research to attempt to identify all of the factors and events that have influenced art teacher education and certification standards, there were certainly a number that needed to be mentioned that would be considered critical. While these have already been discussed more thoroughly in this study, they are worth mentioning again. They include economic factors which affect the retaining and hiring of art teachers as well as the availability of resources, materials, and facilities; social and cultural perceptions towards the value of art education; political actions,
which, in one arena usually affects another; educational methodology, philosophy, and research which permeates areas of specialization such as art as well as general education; historical factors, which not only set precedent but also affect the things people value; colleges and universities that prepare art teachers and are responsible for interpreting and implementing standards; and professional associations and interest groups which feel that they have something at stake in the outcomes of the decision-making process which results in the particular standards that are arrived at.
Table 6: Overview of Factors and Events Which Have Affected Art Teacher Education and Certification Standards in Ohio Between 1787 - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1787</th>
<th>1790</th>
<th>1817</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1822</th>
<th>1826</th>
<th>1837</th>
<th>1838</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Common School</td>
<td>Ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory</td>
<td>First school Settlement for the children of Ohio settlers</td>
<td>Governor Worthington recommends the establishment of elementary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Legislature and Teacher Certification in Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Normal Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Art Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education and the Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1822</th>
<th>1826</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First school act recognizes the State's responsibility for and need for education</td>
<td>School law provides taxation for schools</td>
<td>Organized state school system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District school committees are authorized to employ teachers</td>
<td>Teachers are required to possess a certificate of qualification</td>
<td>Townships become the unit authorized to grant teacher certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers begin to form associations</td>
<td>Teacher certificates specify areas of proficiency</td>
<td>Office of State Superintendent of Common Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta College and Western Teachers' Seminary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Common School System in Ohio</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1857</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fickett/Perkins Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First teachers' institute held in Sandusky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography and English Grammar are added to teacher examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing is included in the elementary curricula in several Ohio cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Legislature creates State Board of Public Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Normal Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature allows incorporation of teachers' institutes in Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 43 teachers' institutes have formed in Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends in Art Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhace Hens includes drawing lessons of P. Schmidt in Common Schools Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Drawing are seen as synonymous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education and The Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1863</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Commissioner appoints State Board of Examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School laws of Ohio are codified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for teachers' institutes are created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art as vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Smith becomes principal of Massachusetts Normal School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art academies begin to flourish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College are proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing is created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of art in 1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must meet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art academies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are challenged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools, normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing becomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing are absorbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by College of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art becomes a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Drawing/Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1922</th>
<th>1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school at­</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tendance of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children six to eighteen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide rooms for Progress­</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Dept. of Ed. is allowed</td>
<td>Dept. of Art. Teacher's Dept. of Art.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will</td>
<td>to offer the Ohio at B.S. degree be offered to State Univ.</td>
<td>art major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may major in drawing, photography, design, or</td>
<td>art appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history/art appreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsors an annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Art is changed to Department of Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event / Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Ohio Art Education Association is organized, Art Education Association of Ohio is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>established as the Ohio Art Education Association.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Changes to the Ohio Department of Education's Art Education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Shift from child-centered to subject-centered curricula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Art for Special Populations created changes to the Ohio Art Education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table and graph show changes and developments in the field of art education over several years.
Conclusions

This study has identified and examined factors and events which have influenced art teacher education and certification standards between 1802 and 1974, resulting in increased sensitivity towards the identification and understanding of factors which affect and influence such decision-making taking place today. By looking at standards that were established in the past, the process that led to their development, as well as factors and events that influenced their outcome, we may then be in a better position to judge whether the preparation of art educators today is determined by demands which will be made upon them in the classroom, by arbitrarily set requirements and historical tradition, or some combination thereof.

While there are formal mechanisms which appear to be logical and realistic in nature that are put into motion in order to research, evaluate, and organize resources in the revision and establishment of art teacher education and certification standards, the reality of the situation is, that when it comes right down to it, "state certification policy development is primarily a political process, despite the qualitative considerations"
surrounding its discussion. Thus, the mere rationality of an argument is insufficient for its acceptance as policy. Effectiveness depends upon casting such rationality in political terms" (National Art Education Association & National Association of Schools of Art and Design, 1982, p.1). This acknowledgment seems to be the key to achieving change; i.e., what is said is not as critical as how it is said. Since the process which leads to decisions being made which affect art teacher education and certification and standards is one that is political in nature, arguments which are presented to influence those decisions must therefore be made in political terms.

Norris (1979) has noted that the "role of art in schools has been determined by a variety of forces each of which has had its own aims, none of which have been intrinsic to art" (p.v). Even though Norris, in making this statement, was addressing the issue of art and not art education, in the light of the topic of this dissertation, it seems appropriate to rephrase Norris' statement in the following manner and ask the question: "Have decisions which have affected art teacher education and certification standards been determined by a variety of forces, each of which has had its own aims, none of which have been intrinsic to art education?" Based on the
data collected and analyzed in this dissertation, the answer would seem to be "yes" in many cases. An investigation of the common school system, the legislature and teacher certification, art teacher education, and art teacher certification standards in Ohio has shown that it has more often been the case than not, that decisions affecting art teacher education and certification standards have been, in fact, determined by a variety of forces whose aims have had little to do directly with art education. This study has shown that while a number of factors may influence such decisions, in terms of affect, considerations related to economics, administration, and the lobbying influence of interest groups seem to be prime movers.

Kern (1970) and others have noted that the history of art education in the United States has "undergone several radical shifts in emphasis serving first one function and then another as social, economic, or educational demands have changed. Consequently, art education has sought at one time or another to develop industrial designers, skilled craftsmen, aesthetes, home-makers, well-adjusted children, and creative people for science and industry. It would seem that art education programs can be developed to serve many different purposes" (p.4). If decisions
which have affected art teacher education and certification standards were made in response to or based on the demands being placed on the field and the professionals involved, i.e., art educators, it would be a simple matter to identify correlations between standards and practice. The truth of the matter, however, is that an investigation of what has actually occurred does not reflect decisions being made based on demands upon the field, but rather upon events which have had their own purposes.

While the Ohio State Board of Education has developed and revised teacher education and certification standards with the intent of assuring quality in the preparation of teachers, this notion presupposes several facts:

1. That there is a relationship between teacher certification standards, as determined by the Ohio State Board of Education, and the notion of quality.

2. That the Ohio State Board of Education, or their agents, are best qualified to determine what quality is, how it should be attained, and when it is reached. These two statements are, in fact, assumptions which have not been examined or researched, yet are presupposed to be true and are at the foundation of how the education system is organized.
Arnold, Denemark, Nelli, Robinson, & Sagan (1977) have noted that "effective quality control in teacher education is seen to require a coordinated, continuing effort of higher education, school systems, governmental agencies concerned with education, the organized profession, and the individual teacher" (p. 7). When revision of standards takes place, these various groups are, in fact, invited to participate, so at least on the surface, involvement includes those who should have input. The problem arises when one asks how the input generated by these various interest-groups is utilized by the actual decision-makers. For this question, there are no formal guidelines or answers. Although the decision-making process is portrayed as one that evaluates arguments on a quantitative basis, it seems that it is in the qualitative realm that actual decisions are made unless a clearly-stated criteria such as economics can be decided upon as the criteria for judgement; this is infrequently the case, since issues are rarely black and white in nature.

When attempting to examine factors that have affected art teacher education and certification standards, it becomes evident very quickly that trying to isolate and clearly identify specific factors and events is comparable to the situation of the blind men trying to describe the
elephant; each from his perspective described a different animal. It is not simply a matter of cutting away the flesh until you get to bone; rather it is like trying to unravel and make sense out of a spider's web that has been twisted around and around; once delving into the past, one finds that, in one fashion or another, everything seems to be connected and interrelated. For example, when investigating the development of the common school system in Ohio, it becomes obvious that it was not just a matter of the "settler" state of mind or the absence of attributed value towards education that inhibited the growth of the school system, but a lack of means for effective communication between communities as well. Once there was a mechanism for communicating between communities, a need which did not develop until urban growth accelerated, which was in turn the result of other events, then the potential for a centralized means of organizing and supervising education could be realized. Again, this evolution was intrinsically tied to changes in the population's attitudes towards the value of education.

Legislation specifically having to do with standards was also affected greatly by events and situations outside of the realm of education. While the largest numbers of the population lived in rural areas, it is not surprising
to find that the majority of legislation which occurred between 1803 and 1850 affected and acknowledged the district schools. During much of the 19th century, a lack of clearly defined statewide policy was not unique to education, but reflected a situation where, in general, it was left to individual communities to regulate many of their own affairs.

As early as 1821, the Ohio Legislature passed a bill which created district school committees which were responsible for employing competent teachers. When the notion of certification was raised in 1825, it was decided that a teacher, in order to receive payment from the public treasury, must have a certificate from an examiner; the certificate stated that the teacher was qualified to teach school. Until 1891, there were no formally stated guidelines as to who could serve as an examiner; in some communities these officials were elected, in others, they were appointed. While each community had some mechanism and criteria for electing or appointing examiners, these individuals were usually prominent and influential members of the community, chosen because of their status, power, and influence, rather than their being best prepared or informed about the issues which their decisions would affect. In the 20th century, we have a similar situation
where individuals, usually prominent members of the community, are elected or appointed to serve on various boards and committees that are responsible for teacher standards. While it has been mentioned previously that these individuals do consult professionals, interested parties, and others, in the process of making decisions, it still comes down to them evaluating and weighing evidence as to what should be.

When decisions are made, a variety of considerations and concerns are involved. Among them are: (1) the profession involved, in this case art education. Input is sought from art teachers of elementary and secondary schools, college and university professionals who are responsible for the interpretation and implementation of standards as well as contributing research which may shed light on art teaching and education, as well as the field of education which art education is a part; (2) the community in which the standards apply, since a role of the Board of Education is to respond to the needs of parents of children who will be taught by the teachers trained to meet the prescribed specifications; (3) the college and universities who must take the general guidelines and interpret and implement them, producing coursework and experiences which will prepare teachers for
the field; (4) economics and resources are considerations which affect not only the hiring of new teachers but the rehiring of veteran teachers. Student enrollment also has an impact as to the types of decisions made, as does the availability of resources, facilities, and materials needed in order to run a competent art program.

An examination of the various factors and events discussed here presents a fairly clear picture of some of the types of forces that cause change to take place. Again, these components seem to fall into natural categories:

(1) Criticism of the substance and quality of art teacher preparation programs and certification standards. This criticism takes the form of internal and external modes; internally, questioning of the "current" situation may be found originating with art teachers in the elementary and secondary schools, who, when faced with educational or political problems may voice discontent that they were not prepared for the reality of the teaching world by their preparatory education. Criticism may be heard from master teachers concerning the preparation of student teachers whom they are to evaluate.

Another group of "insiders" that have something to say, are the art educators in the colleges and
universities who are responsible for interpreting and implementing procedures in order to meet the State certification standards. The types of concerns voiced include questions concerning the "appropriateness" of some standards, how best to interpret and implement requirements, and how to adequately meet stated standards with a lack of sufficient time, resources, and faculty.

Externally, pressure might be exerted from parents who are not satisfied with the quality or content of the art programs in the schools attended by their children. Criticism may also be found originating with school administrators and supervisors who do not feel that art teachers are adequately prepared to meet the demands that they will face in the classroom and in the school. Another group of professionals who are put in this "external" category are educators in general, who, in fighting to gain more school-time for their own disciplines might criticize art education in an effort to have it removed from the curriculum. Educators also exert influence in terms of their research, and trends which may become popular and permeate various disciplines, including art education. An example of this is the required inclusion of a reading component in the art curriculum.
(2) Student population and teacher supply and demand affect and are affected by changes in art teacher education and certification standards. When student enrollment drops, there is less demand for teachers, yet when student enrollment increases, the opposite is not necessarily the case. That is, unless there is legislation that sets limits as to the number of students an art teacher can be required to teach in a single class, or that sets a specific teacher/student ratio, or provides limitations as to the number of classes an art teacher can be required to teach during the day.

The type of students that an art teacher will be required to work with also can have an impact on standards. The broader notion of "student" includes multicultural and bilingual differences, as well as those with learning disabilities and handicaps, as well as the gifted. With the notion of mainstreaming special students into regular classes comes a responsibility to prepare art teachers, as part of their preparation in college, to be able to work with these handicapped youngsters. The same holds true with being prepared to work in both urban and rural settings. As such, coursework in teaching the handicapped and with urban and rural populations becomes a component of the art teacher preparation curriculum.
(3) Developments in society and technology have an effect on standards. As the broader society's perceptions of what is valuable changes, so will the demands made upon the field change. The same is true with technological advances. This can be seen in the manner in which the growing popularity and availability of micro-computers has impacted on education in general, and art education specifically. Where, at one time, the only place one would find a micro-computer might be in a school's administrative offices or possibly in a mathematics classroom, now they are to be found in the art classroom as well, where they serve not only as a teaching tool, but artistic medium in which students work as well.

The examination of the various factors and events which have impacted on the development and revision of art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio historically, shows little consistency in terms of purpose and orientation. An analysis of the data collected and analyzed in this study has shown that, more often than not, decisions which have affected art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio have been determined by a variety of forces, each of which has had its own aims, few of which have been intrinsic to art education. In terms of the process and events which have occurred,
the sum of the parts is greater than simple addition suggests.

As to the field of art education, many different people have had many different things to say about what it is, who it is for, and what it's function is. One notable quote goes as follows:

Favored ideas and goals, which for some time have been assumed to be the proper bases for wise curriculum content and sound teaching practice are now being held up to question. Accepted assumptions about the proper characteristics and dimensions of both art and education are now being viewed with increasing skepticism and doubt (Barkan, 1962, p. 12).

While this article was written over twenty years ago, its sentiments are still being repeated today by both supporters and challengers of art education. Whether considered a profession, field of endeavor, or human services profession, the art educators who are and have been involved in this vocation, have spent years looking for a cause; a "raison d'etre." Over the years, this "commodity" has been accepted and sold for many avowed purposes: self-expression, creativity, growth in perception, emotional therapy, developing humaneness, reading, motivation, right brain development, and so on. It is one thing to claim that the art experience can be beneficial in developing these various qualities and
traits; it is quite another to claim that only art can do them, or do them best. Lanier (1980) feels that "the history of purposes in art education is one of its least impressive chapters" (p.18). He is critical about art education changing avowed purposes every few years. This trait of "going with the flow" might be considered a handicap or negative quality when compared to developments in other disciplines -- that is, subjects that are taught. Then again, it may not be so. Tumin (1967) suggests that "the problems of art education are in some significant senses the problems of education in general. All of education is afflicted and cursed by the worship of so-called efficiency; by the measurement of its success in terms of some very limited cognitive outcomes" (p.43). One quality of art education that has made it unique when compared to other disciplines, is its interactive nature; the manner in which it is interdependent with its environment, society.

Anderson (1983) argues that it is crucial for us to produce "solid arguments for the role of the arts in education" (p.26), but that before we can do that, there must be "universal agreement on the basic purposes of art education" (p.26). History has shown us that people rarely, if ever, achieve universal agreement on anything,
so it is doubtful that art educators will be any different. What makes art education unique, is the quality of -- as a discipline -- being different. Everyone has different values concerning what is good and what is valuable. While it may be possible to achieve consensus on some general issues -- the importance of visual literacy, or aesthetic sensitivity, for example -- a discussion of what those issues really mean and how best to achieve them will result in various factions each professing to have the right answer. This is not to say that dialogue should not take place. It is merely to acknowledge that people perceive and interpret the issues in different ways. This is as it should be.

Art education has changed over time as a reaction to external and internal forces. There do seem to be some general qualities which are critical to our area. These include an orientation to humankind, visual and aesthetic literacy, and an appreciation as well as responsibility towards our environment. It is true that these terms are vague and general in nature. A common definition and statement concerning them might be impossible to achieve. Why not accept the possibility that art education, while having some similarities to other disciplines, has qualities about it that are different and unique. There
is a difference between borrowing knowledge and research methods from other fields, and being chameleon-like and attempting to "become" them. Researchers have attempted to identify and state the seemingly elusive qualities which art education as a field represents. Art education involves everyone: from the three-year-old to the Ph.D. candidate. Upon closer examination, we may find that we have always known the answer, and that it has been the question that we were unsure of. We may be confusing the question of "Who and what are we?" with the problem of "How do we let everyone else in on it?" and "How do we become more politically knowledgeable and effective?"

Finding solutions to both questions is critical; merely identifying "who we are and what we are about" is not sufficient, for without the political know-how of how to convert that knowledge into action, the field of art education will remain inactive and ineffective.
Recommendations for Further Study

This study, while focusing on certain factors and events which have affected and influenced art teacher education and certification standards in Ohio between 1802 and 1974, raises a number of issues and questions which, while not discussed here at any length, are mentioned as recommendations for further study. They include:

(1) What is the relationship, if any, between teacher certification standards and the notion of quality; and who is qualified and should be responsible for determining what quality is, how it should be attained, and when it is reached?

(2) What is the actual influence that State art teacher certification standards have on art teacher preparation programs?

(3) By granting an individual a teaching certificate, what competencies is the State guaranteeing that individual will possess?

(4) Is it possible to develop standards that will ensure quality in teachers who must be able to function in a society with such varied contexts and different populations of students as ours?
(5) What are the key reasons for the failure of art education's stated goals and objectives to materialize in actual practice?

(6) What types of political action and strategies should be undertaken, how should they be conducted, and by whom?

(7) Would "better" art teacher certification standards solve the problems faced by the field of art education?

(8) What is the role of research in the process of developing and revising standards? What should it be? What happens to the guts and essence of research when it is translated into practice?
APPENDIX A

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN OHIO
Institutions offering teacher preparation programs in Ohio must meet the following criteria:

3301-25-01: Organization

(A) Before receiving approval from the State Board of Education to prepare teachers, the institution must first receive approval to offer the appropriate degree from the Ohio Board of Regents.

(B) The institution must show evidence that its "governing body, administration, and faculty regard teacher education as one of the integral parts of the college or university's total purpose and support teacher education commensurate with defined purposes and objectives" (p.1).

(C) For each field which is represented by a teacher preparation program, there must be clearly stated goals and objectives.

(D) State Board of Education approval shall be for specific teaching fields.

(E) Within the institution, a clearly defined instructional unit is to be responsible for the preparation of teachers.

(F) Students involved in teacher preparation programs will be provided with field-based experience in approved or chartered schools or school districts.

(G) An advisory committee made up of interests from within the institution, approved schools, and interested citizens, will advise on the "design, approval, and continuous evaluation and development of teacher education, including criteria, policies, and procedures pertaining thereto" (p.2).

(H) Recruitment and counseling of students shall be ongoing.
(I) The institution shall adopt criteria by which teacher education students will be selected for entrance into the program; i.e., those factors and qualities necessary for becoming an effective teacher.

(J) Teacher education students shall be retained pursuant to maintaining satisfactory progress in meeting requirements.

(K) Policies adopted by the institution concerning teacher preparation shall not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, political affiliation, religion, age, or socioeconomic status.

(L) Policies, procedures, and goals shall be available, in writing.

3301-25-02: Curriculum

(A) For each field in which teacher preparation is going to be offered, "the body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values determined essential for effective teaching shall be specified" (p.3).

(B) The curriculum of teacher education coursework will be based on these factors, and will include courses in education as well as in the area of specialization. Other concerns will be covered as well. These include:

(1) reading, as it relates to the area of specialization;

(2) an appreciation for individual differences among students of varying backgrounds of race, culture, socioeconomic level, and political affiliation;

(3) self-evaluation skills;
(4) discipline;

(5) effective use of educational media.

(C) Teacher preparation programs shall provide clinical experience for teacher education students as well as preparation in the use of diagnostic instruments for the evaluation of student performance.

(D) Teacher education students shall have the opportunity to "participate in a series of carefully planned, supervised, and evaluated field-based experiences for which specific learning objectives have been set" (p.4); this field-experience will take place in urban as well as rural settings.

(E) The curriculum shall include at least one quarter's worth of clinical and field-based experience with school-age children, in addition to that required in Part D.

(F) A description of the teacher preparation program for each area of specialization must be filed with the State Department of Education for approval every five years.

3301-25-03: Instruction

(A) Appropriate instructional methods shall be used which "contribute to the effectiveness of teacher education students' preparation" (p.5).

(B) Instruction will prepare teacher education students in the use of educational media.

3301-25-04: Faculty

(A) A designated administrator will be responsible for the academic unit designated accountable for teacher training.

(B) "Specific faculty competence shall be evidenced for each field in which teachers are prepared. Each member of
the faculty shall have academic preparation appropriate to each teaching and supervisory assignment" (p.5).

(C) Members of the professional education faculty shall maintain an ongoing relationship with elementary and secondary schools in terms of knowledge and practice, as well as have had at least three years teaching experience or the equivalent. Those faculty responsible for teaching courses having to do with specialized areas are required to have had at least three years teaching experience in the area or the equivalent.

(D) Faculty shall be responsible for teaching and advising as well as serving on committees and doing research, as required by the college or university.

(E) When special competencies are required, part-time faculty should be utilized.

(F) Faculty shall be responsible for supervising teacher education students; no more than fourteen students should be assigned to each faculty.

(G) Rank and salary of professional education faculty shall equal that of the faculty of similar academic units.

3301-25-05: Teacher Education Student Services

(A) Services for teacher education students shall include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) "Orientation to: (a) teacher education; (b) characteristics, rules, regulations and policies of participating elementary and secondary schools; (c) resources available to assist in acquisition of the requisite body of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values; (d) career options available through teacher education; (e) employment potential, conditions, and salaries in the various career options;"
(f) professional rights and responsibilities; (g) teacher and other education-related organizations" (p.7).

(2) Personal advising and counseling concerning coursework, career goals, etc.

(3) Maintenance of student records, including: (a) career goals, (b) coursework, and (c) assessment of coursework completed.

(4) Placement services

(B) Services and times that these services are available, as well as policies, shall be published and distributed to teacher education students.

(C) Only qualified individuals shall be assigned the duty of providing services to teacher education students.

3301-25-06: Facilities

(A) The college or university shall provide the facilities, materials, and resources necessary for effective teacher education to take place.

(B) The safety and health of students and faculty will be provided for.

(C) The library is responsible for maintaining and providing resources in support of each teaching area in which students are being trained.

(D) Laboratory resources shall be available for each area in which students are being trained.

(E) Facilities and resources shall be available for simulating experiences as needed by the various teaching areas.
(F) An educational media center, administered by a professional, shall be maintained as a resource center for teacher education students.

3301-25-07: Financial Support

(A) Financial resources must be able to support the needs of the teacher preparation program, as established by the State Board of Education.

(B) The president of the college or the university and the administrator responsible for teacher education will, annually, present a statement of the school's financial status to the State Department of Education at the end of each fiscal year.

3301-25-08: Evaluation

(A) There shall be a clearly-defined method of evaluation implemented in order to continually strive to improve the teacher education program; there will also be a vehicle for the follow-up of graduates of the program.

(B) Long-range goals for the teacher education program will be a component of the college or university design.

(C) The State Department of Education will evaluate each college or university at least once every five years.
Appendix B

LETTER FROM JAMES HOPKINS TO GEORGE RIGHTMIRE
My dear President Rightmire:

In accordance with your request, I am submitting the following suggestions for an ideal type of training for an instructor in art.

This outline is not advanced as a general project possible in every institution, but is based on conditions at this university where the Department of Fine Arts has an unusual relation to the university as a whole and contributes to an unusual extent toward the art life of the university community. All departments of the university co-operate to offer needed facilities, and we are therefore able to plan and carry through a program which would be impossible in most schools.

As you know the relations with the Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, are those which might be expected if the three departments were under one administration. I mention the following as more unusual facilities which have already been taken advantage of by students in the Department of Fine Arts:

- College of Medicine--dissection for students interested in human anatomy.
- College of Veterinary Medicine--horse dissection.
- College of Engineering--experimental work in ceramics.
- Department of Engineering Drawing--lettering and the use of instruments.
- Department of Home Economics--house problems.

Any fellowship or scholarship in the Fine Arts aiming to produce a competent teacher should provide opportunities for work in each of the three groups below. A student taking such training should be encouraged to specialize in one of the technical subjects.
I. Technical -- To be given by carefully supervised studio work in competition with other students.

Drawing -- As a means in the expression of beauty with lectures and problems in anatomy and figure composition.

Painting -- Distinctly a class in picture making. The organization and execution of pictures under the supervision of the teacher.

Modeling -- The conception and execution of sculpture, original compositions and work from life.

Design -- Lectures and problems illustrating theory combined with problems in organic design in which the decorative and structural uses of materials are considered. Execution of these designs in the various crafts. Lettering and the use of drawing instruments.

II. Cultural -- To be given in advanced courses related to art subjects. Such work could well be combined with European travel study such as is offered by the Bureau of University Travel.

History -- Social development in relation to the Fine Arts. Consideration of physical environment, religious, social, and political conditions and their effect on the Fine Arts. Styles and motifs of historic periods. Lectures, reading, laboratory work, and reports. Language and Literature -- A foreign language and its literature pertaining to the Fine Arts.

Science -- Color, light, and pigments. The materials of the artist and their structure.

Philosophy -- Aesthetics.

III. Professional -- The work offered in the College of Education.
Psychology

History of Education

Principles and Practice of Education --
Preparation of courses and practice teaching under the supervision of the Department of Fine Arts.

Public Contact -- The teacher of art should be the director of art interests in the community. The American people have unquestionably become conscious of the need for art expression. There was a time, following the disappearance of the home industries which gave an outlet to innumerable art impulses, when the public put up a decidedly antagonistic barrier between itself and works of art, because the specialization of the artist had led to a cult language which infuriated the public whose attitude toward art became as the anger "on one not invited." This is passing and the public, in the most genuine way, is holding out its hand asking for art. It should be one of the functions of the art teacher to supply this demand through the use of museum material and library collections (Hopkins, 1925).
Appendix C

ART TEACHER CERTIFICATION STANDARDS AS OF 1972
As of January 1, 1972, the following standards were required for certification in Visual Art, in order to teach grades kindergarten through twelve.

1. Professional Education Courses  
   (32 quarter hours/21 semester hours)  
   Coursework must include the following:  
   a. An understanding of the learner and the learning process  
      (5 qtr. hrs./3 sem. hrs.)  
   b. The role of the school in society  
      (5 qtr. hrs./3 sem. hrs.)  
   c. A basic understanding of the general curriculum; methods and laboratory experiences, including student teaching at both the elementary and secondary levels, in the area of specialization  
      (23 qtr. hrs./15 sem. hrs.)

2. General Education Courses  
   (45 quarter hours/30 semester hours)  
   Coursework must include the following:  
   a. Science and mathematics  
   b. Social sciences  
   c. English and/or foreign language  
   d. Fine arts, philosophy, and/or theological studies.

3. Visual Art Courses

A. Studio Studies  
   (45 qtr. hrs./30 sem. hrs.)  
   1. Two-dimensional studies (varied media in design, drawing, painting, and printmaking)
2. Three-dimensional studies (varied media in design, sculpture, and crafts, including fabrics, wood, metal, and clay)

3. Graphic communication (design and symbolic function of letters)

4. Advanced study in one of the above fields or in film arts

B. Art history and criticism
   [art appreciation]
   (15 qtr. hrs./10 sem. hrs.)
   1. Art history

   2. Advanced study in art criticism, aesthetics, art history, or environmental design.

C. 15 quarter hours/10 semester hours of electives from either group A or B.
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