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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the conditions and perception of change in conditions amongst Florida elementary art teachers in regards to federal and state education reform. To comprehend the impact of federal and state reforms on elementary art teachers in the state of Florida, the project compared elementary art teachers at high-performing schools with low-performing schools in the state of Florida. The study provided a descriptive overview of what it means to be an art teacher in the state of Florida at both high-and low-performing schools. The study examined teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and assessed the perception of change in their conditions under federal and state education reforms. The research provided an analysis of the status of teaching art in Florida and changes in the profession in order to better understand the challenges and opportunities facing art teachers in elementary schools in Florida. The study was a criterion group design that contrasted two groups: elementary art teachers in high-performing schools with low-performing schools. The criteria to participate in the study included teachers had to: 1) teach in one of the 13 districts containing both “A” and “B” and “D” and “F” schools, 2) instruct students in grades kindergarten through sixth in art, and 3) voluntarily complete the elementary art teacher questionnaire. Respondents from schools receiving an “A” or “B” were part of the high-performing group. Respondents from schools receiving a “D” or “F” were part of the low-performing group. Results from elementary art teachers in high-performing and low-performing schools were compared to provide the picture of teaching elementary art in Florida. The findings suggest that there are minimal differences between high-and low-performing schools that impacts elementary art teachers. With respect to indicators that determine the quality of art education there is little difference across the groups. The impact of grading schools and categorizing schools based on performance is having little impact on the quality of art programs offered. The quality of art programs is supported with adequate planning time, art teachers with art classrooms and not on a cart, and minimal non-art duties. Originally, the research set out to identify separation and inequity amongst the groups, yet surprisingly that was not the case.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The *No Child Left Behind Act* (*NCLB*) moved the United States toward a national standard in education. *No Child Left Behind* was based on state-determined standards and tests and a set of processes and consequences was federally mandated (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6). These federal government transformations of the public school system have impacted teaching art in Florida elementary schools. As the Florida public school system evolved based on government-inspired reform programs, so did elementary art teachers’ conditions in Florida public schools.

No one disputes that *NCLB* has reshaped federal involvement in American education (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6). States are required to ensure every child receives an adequate and appropriate education, but solutions to this problem to-date are unreliable (Rudo, 2001, p.1). The transformation of the educational system in Florida has had a radical impact on the role of art teachers and makes the exploration of this paradigm necessary. During my first year of teaching, the *NCLB Act* had yet to be implemented, Florida public schools were not yet on a grading system based on the *Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)*, and the *Class Size Amendment* had not been enacted. As a result of such reforms, alterations of the Florida public school system occurred. The changes resulting from the adoption of the Sunshine State Standards (*SSS*) and Grade Level Expectations precipitated assessment and portfolio documentation as part of art teacher responsibilities. But reforms in the public school system have changed the status of teaching art in Florida public schools beyond just documentation. Over the last few years, the workload assignments, expectations, and responsibilities of being an art teacher in Florida have expanded.

The implementation of corrective action to improve low-performing schools and school districts has varied across the nation from verbal reprimands to state and private takeover (Rudo, 2001, p.1). The teaching profession has evolved into a complicated system requiring data analysis, accountability, and standardized tests. Success, according to the State of Florida, is based on academic performance rather than one’s connection, appreciation, or love for children. We teach at a time when standardized test scores matter more than personality, talents, or abilities, and student growth is determined by the amount of academic progress made during the school year. One perspective of recent reforms is that the system neglects creativity and
prioritizes students’ opportunities according to standardized test scores rather than other creative and expressive performance. According to Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee, “if we don’t provide an arts education, at least an arts opportunity for each child, we are leaving a lot of children behind. In the true spirit of No Child Left Behind, leaving the arts out is beyond neglect and is virtual abuse of a child. It is certainly inexcusable” (Deasy, 2004, ¶1). On the other hand, student academic progress in the state of Florida has increased with record-breaking momentum. It is recognized that quality education should include the development of skills, knowledge, concepts, values, and sensitivities with which to understand and engage the culture of a nation, the arts offer significant opportunities for this development (Boyd, 1980, p. 24).

During my time as an elementary art teacher in the state of Florida, my duties increased with the educational reforms. During my initial year, the students came to art once a week for 45 minutes and my sole responsibility was to instruct art. Over the course of six years, the art period was decreased to a mere 30 minutes including transition time and cleanup. Over that same time frame, my responsibilities increased to include a 90-minute reading block during the instructional day, which as a result, decreased my art instructional time. Aside from decreased instructional time, my planning and preparation time, which was an entire period a day, was deducted altogether. Planning occurred on my own personal time. Although my duties increased, my certification and training was in art education and yet, I was responsible for activities in which I had little or no professional training or qualification. As part of the noninstructional day, my responsibilities included bus duty, Saturday tutoring, and student mentoring. Although these duties were valuable and necessary to operate a school, my credentials for such responsibilities were limited. As the school attempted to meet the requirements of federal and state educational reforms on a consistent budget, the administration used individuals for responsibilities outside of their certification area. Although my contract remained the same over the time frame, the daily routines and conditions changed dramatically until the part of the day devoted to my passion of teaching art was a mere four hours.

Based on my observations and experience, I anticipated the conditions and perceptions of conditions including assignments, responsibilities, and expectations of art teachers were negatively impacted by the implementation of federal and state education reforms. The findings supported the premise of the study and provided a realistic look at the impact of the federal and
state education reforms on elementary art teachers at high-performing schools in comparison to low-performing schools in Florida.

**Statement of the Problem**

The enactment of multiple federal and state education reforms has impacted the role of elementary art teachers in Florida. In Florida, the effects of *Annual Yearly Progress (AYP)*, *FCAT*, school grades, and other implications of educational reforms have changed the daily lives of art teachers in Florida. A school grade influences all operational procedures for the following year and as a result art teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations are changing. The school grades represent an increase of “F” schools from 49 in 2004 to 78 in 2005 (Dipietre & Etters, 2005, ¶ 3). The implications of being designated an “F” school include additional federal, state, and district assistance. Assistance includes corporations, assessment teams, and state and district administrators stepping in to help remediate the students at low-performing schools and assist in improving their scores and grade. “F” schools receive the greatest amount of assistance both financially and administratively in order to increase the school’s grade (Dipietre & Etters, 2005, ¶ 3).

Assistance has lead to a paradigm shift in the expected role of the elementary art teacher. Informal and initial observations of this practice suggested art teachers were losing jobs, art classrooms were transformed into other types of spaces, the length of art time was being cut, and planning and preparation time was diminished in order for schools to meet recent government requirements. According to discussions with colleagues, teachers had also been forced to assume new responsibilities and duties in order to remain in their positions. Other informal conversations suggested the implementation of these programs had art teachers spending a portion of their day teaching reading, language, and other academic subjects to justify their position as an art teacher. At state and national conferences as well as district in-services, teachers communicated that they were sacrificing planning time in order to gain instructional time and occasionally losing the art room space to a core subject teacher. Initial investigations indicated that art teachers in Florida had also lost teaching positions in favor of core curricula teachers.

The incorporation of these government programs is currently affecting the conditions of elementary art teachers and suggested an exploration of elementary art teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations as well as perceptions was appropriate. Understanding the
status of elementary art teacher conditions is imperative in the preparation for future art teachers, to guide and support current art teachers, and maintain equity in the art teaching profession.

**Research Questions**

1. What are the relationships between high-and low-performing schools’ art teacher conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations?

2. What is the relationship between high-and low-performing schools’ art teacher perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations with respect to federal and state education reforms?

**Research Hypothesis**

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

**Specific Hypothesis**

Hypothesis 1a states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments. Hypothesis 1a denotes assignments and includes the number of art classes per week, hours spent teaching per week, type of scheduling, and subjects taught other than art.

Hypothesis 1b states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: responsibilities. Hypothesis 1b denotes responsibilities and includes planning period, hours of planning per week, and before, during, after school, and weekend duties.

Hypothesis 1c states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including expectations. Hypothesis 1c denotes expectations and includes state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and training attendance.

**Null Hypothesis**

The Null hypothesis states that there is no difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.
Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Specific Hypothesis

Hypothesis 2a states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments. Hypothesis 2a denotes assignments and includes the number of art classes per week, hours spent teaching per week, type of scheduling, subjects taught other than art, and physical location of art room.

Hypothesis 2b states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: responsibilities. Hypothesis 2b denotes responsibilities and includes planning period, hours of planning per week, and before, during, after school, and weekend duties.

Hypothesis 2c states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including expectations. Hypothesis 2c denotes expectations and includes state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and training attendance.

Null Hypothesis

The Null hypothesis states that there is no difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Rationale

This study examined the effect of the federal and state education reforms on the status of art teachers in high-performing schools versus low-performing schools in the state of Florida. The research provided a descriptive overview of what it means to be an art teacher in the state of Florida at both high-and low-performing schools. The study examined teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and assessed the perception of change in their conditions under federal and state education reforms. The results provided an analysis of the status of teaching art in Florida and changes in the profession in order to better understand the challenges and opportunities facing art teachers in elementary schools in Florida. The research provided a
resource for teachers by addressing the issues and changes currently impacting elementary art teachers in Florida.

Future teachers rely on the content of college course work, observations, and internships to prepare them for their career. These experiences are not sufficient to meet the current state and federal requirements placed upon elementary art teachers. The reality of the situation is that most art teachers begin their career in low-performing schools as a result of limited employment opportunities. One of challenges of an art teacher in this situation is understanding the impact of education reforms on their jobs. This study provided information on the role of art teachers in high-and low-performing elementary schools.

Since congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965, the role of the U.S. government has expanded, leading to the bipartisan reauthorization of ESEA in 2001, the No Child Left Behind Act. The No Child Left Behind Act is clearly the most dramatic change in national school legislation since the ESEA’s inception (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6). These major programs in education may be causing changes that negatively affect the daily lives of art teachers. The changes presented in this study reflect federal and state requirements. The study investigated teachers’ perspectives on work day conditions and produced an account of the current responsibilities, assignments, and expectations of art teachers in high-performing versus low-performing schools in Florida.

Previously, little research has been conducted on the status of the impact of federal and state education reforms on art teachers. However the following research does support the need for such research and confirm the degree to which the educational reforms are affecting education, administration, and teachers.

According to Arts Education Partnership (2004, p.29), teachers cited three conditions crucial to incorporating the arts into their teaching: 1) adequate time to plan and deliver these new instructional approaches, 2) support from direct supervisors, and 3) appropriate space. Arts Education Partnership reported conventional wisdom holds that “what is tested gets taught” and anecdotal reports claim that arts and other school subjects are being denied time and resources as a result of time allocated to preparing and administering tests in reading and mathematics. These assertions need empirical scrutiny (Arts Education Partnership, 2004, p. 39).

Chapman (2005) cited a survey conducted by the Council on Basic Education that indicated 25% of principals had cut arts education, 39% reported decreases, and 42% anticipated them in
the near future. The survey claimed that 82% of parents of public school students and 80% of the general public are concerned that an intensive focus on tests in English and math will mean less emphasis is on the arts (Chapman, 2005, p. 14).

The *Complete Curriculum* (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003, p.5) formulated ten recommendations for state policymakers to ensure the arts and foreign languages are not lost:

1. Adopt high quality licensure for staff in the arts.
2. Ensure adequate time for professional development.
3. Ensure adequate staff expertise at the state education agency to work in areas of the arts.
4. Incorporate the arts and foreign languages into core graduation requirements.
5. Encourage higher education institutions to increase standards for admissions and include the arts when calculating grade point average.
6. Incorporate arts into the early years into standards, curriculum frameworks, and course requirements.
7. Advocate continuing development for curriculum materials in the arts.
8. Incorporate all core subject areas into improvement strategies promoted by *NCLB*.
9. Urge the National Assessment Board to increase the National Assessment of Education Progress assessments.
10. Urge congress and legislatures to make a greater commitment to the arts.

According to Bracey (2005), *NCLB* represents the largest single federal involvement in education. Bracey also found vested financial interests of scientific researchers and their connections to government policy are numerous and the handful of researchers do research that 1) supports their programs, 2) supports their own professional enterprises, 3) matches the assessments they designed, 4) supports their own learning programs, 5) aligns with government mandates, and 6) are based on their own scientific research (Bracey, 2005, p. 17). Bracey stated, “it appears to be a closed loop, hermetically sealed against outside influences. The old investor term ‘interlocking directorate’ also seems appropriate” (Bracey, 2005, p. 17). As of mid 2005, the financial impact from curriculum issues has been largely spent on reading (Bracey, 2005).

According to the report on the status and condition of art education (Arts Education Partnership, 2004) there are concerns for the lack of reliable data on the amount of time students
in the United States spend studying the arts, on who provides the instruction they receive, under what conditions, and on the money spent on school arts programs. The absence of data makes monitoring of compliance difficult and raises questions about equitable access to policy mandated instruction in the arts. The study also suggested that research in these areas would both help to better assess the impact on arts education of proposed policy changes and weigh the implications before either adoption or implementation, clarifying both the intended and unintended consequences of policy decisions (Arts Education Partnership, 2004).

In *No Subject Left Behind* (2004) a new framework for the federal role in public education both opened opportunities and raised questions related to arts education. “Since the arts are affected by all education reforms it is important to be informed of the ways that NCLB is influencing how states and school districts determine education policy” (*No Subject Left Behind*, 2004, p.3). The NCLB definition of core academic subjects includes the arts and in this respect they are equal to reading, math, science, and other disciplines. However the law does not include a definition of what the arts encompass as an academic discipline (*No Subject Left Behind*, 2004).

In *Complete Curriculum* (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003) it is reported that the passage of NCLB has further raised concerns about the narrowing the curriculum. The *Complete Curriculum* stated “many fear that there is an unintended consequence: that the states will focus their attention and resources on complying with the law’s primary emphasis on reading, math, and science, to the detriment of other curricular areas” (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003, p. 4).

The conclusions of *Complete Curriculum* (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003) examined the current status of curriculum in our nation’s schools, particularly in regards to the arts and foreign languages. The research uncovered two key conclusions: 1) the substantial benefits of including the arts and foreign language in the curriculum, and 2) the arts and foreign languages have been marginalized and are at risk of being lost as part of the core curriculum (National Association of State Boards of Education, 2003).

LaPierre and Zimmerman (1997) developed an overview of primary topics within art education research including teachers and how they teach art. According to these authors, there is little inquiry into types of teachers, teachers’ conceptions of students, classroom behaviors and classroom practices, and teacher preparation. This also proposed research on the types of art
being taught, including classroom setting, class size, classroom shape, field trips, and regulatory structures including state, federal, and local laws that govern the arts. This study was based on the suggestions of LaPierre and Zimmerman (1997) by investigating the context in which art is being taught as well as the state and federal laws that govern the arts.

The National Arts Education Association (NAEA) presented research initiatives in a publication titled, *National Art Education Commission on Research in Education* (1994). The authors stated that in order to advance visual arts education, research in eight areas was crucial including lists of general questions, suggested research methodologies, and ten recommendations for research efforts. The one area was the gathering of demographic information including data on the visual arts teaching force, certification requirements, state and local curricula, resources, and facilities. The suggestions in the report also included researching instruction methods such as problem solving, decision-making, instructional support mechanisms, instructional resources, teaching methods, collaborative methods, and art health hazards. Under the suggestion of instructional setting, the report suggested research on social and environmental factors, classroom settings, community environments, and other contexts beyond school, museum contexts, educational policies, supervision, and administrator support (National Art Education Commission on Research in Education, 1994).

The research provided answers to the questions of who teaches art in primary schools and what differences exist among high-and low-performing schools with respect to conditions of art teachers and the nature of elementary art programs. The findings of this research addressed educational environments, federal and state policies and how they affect art programs, and how educational reform movements affect art education practices.

This study addressed questions suggested by NAEA with descriptive information of teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations that provide a baseline of information about the demography of visual arts education in Florida. The research was aligned with recommendations of demographic investigation including data on the visual arts teaching force, certification, curricula, resources, facilities, and policies. The research analyzed data on the impact of federal and state government on arts education including time spent studying art, the quality of art instructors, and conditions under which art is being taught in line with suggestions and recommended research. The research also investigated the impact of policy on arts education changes and the marginalization of art in favor of other academic subjects.
An assessment of the conditions of elementary art teachers was gathered through the use of a questionnaire regarding the impact of the federal and state educational reforms on changes of Florida art teachers. The findings of this research documented the current role of art teachers as impacted by federal and state initiatives. The findings of the research illustrated an account of art teachers in Florida in response to the federal and state educational reforms. The data furnished by elementary art teachers in high- and low-performing schools provided evidence as to how current government reform programs have changed the responsibilities, assignments, and expectations of art teachers.

The results of the study may impact institutional decision-making by informing administrators, district supervisors, educational institutions, and art teachers of both the intentional and unintentional impact of federal and state reforms on elementary art teachers. The research offered implications of policies and research for more effective and efficient administrative strategies in order to ensure that the quality of Florida’s art programs are not adversely affected. Future art teachers may use this information to prepare for related obstacles. The findings may also be used to understand how arts instruction is affected and search for alternative options to ensure high-quality arts instruction.

The results of the study can be used by educational institutions in the development of School Improvement Plans to ensure that quality arts programs are offered. The results can also be used by accreditation associations such as the Southern Association for Colleges and Schools to ensure and support accreditation requirements are met. The results of the study may assist district officials, school administrators, and school boards in understanding the effects of federal and state reforms on elementary art programs and allow officials to construct administrative change to ensure art programs will meet state standards and expectations. The Department of Education and lobbyists may use the information to prevent a decline in the quality of art programs and offer solutions for Florida schools. Art teacher organizations, associations, and support groups can remain abreast of trends occurring in the classroom and offer recommendations for curricula and professional development.

**Procedures**

First, an understanding of the historical impact and its relation to practice of education reforms on art teachers was established. The second step was to select and survey Florida elementary art teachers on their current conditions including: assignments, responsibilities, and
expectations and perceptions of change in regards to federal and state education reform. The final step was to interpret and evaluate the findings to identify trends and patterns that exist and identify suggestions for further research.

**Overview of the Study**

To study the impact of federal and state reforms on elementary art teachers in the state of Florida a comparison of selected elementary art teachers at high-performing schools with low-performing schools in the state of Florida was conducted. The study used a questionnaire (Appendix A) to analyze the work of art teachers in six areas:

I) Demographics  
II) Population and scheduling  
III) Planning and physical space  
IV) Professional development  
V) Extra activities  
VI) Perception of recent changes

The analysis of six areas determined the teachers’ work conditions including a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations and perception of change regarding federal and state education reform. Results from elementary art teachers in high-performing and low-performing schools were compared to provide the picture of teaching elementary art in Florida.

**Scope and Limitations**

The research study was designed to examine the conditions of Florida elementary art teachers and their perception of change as impacted by federal and state education reforms. The study focused on assignments, responsibilities, expectations, and perception of change as resulted by federal and state education reforms.

**Population**

The population of the study was Florida elementary art teachers. Florida contains 67 school districts of which 13 contain both “A” and “B” (high-performing) and “D” and “F” (low-performing) schools for the 2005-2006 school year. To be included in the study teachers had to: 1) teach in one of the 13 districts containing both high-and low-performing schools, 2) instruct students in grades kindergarten through sixth, and 3) voluntarily complete the elementary art teacher questionnaire. The study consisted of a random sample from the 889 high-performing schools and a convenience sample from the 81 low-performing schools. The low-performing
group decreased to 55 upon learning that 26 of the 81 low-performing schools did not have an art teacher. The results provided 23 high- and 23 low-performing participants for a final sample of 46 elementary art teachers.

Limitations

The study recognized that only 13 out of 67 school districts were represented. These districts each offered a variety of diverse populations, resources, and locations however fail to encompass all the characteristics of any given school district. Enrollment, ethnical makeup, and socio-economic status were not identified in the selection of participants or the presentation of analyzed results. Art teachers were difficult to locate and contact even with the assistance of art supervisors and therefore the participants represent a limited description of the art teacher workforce. Equal effort was extended to both high-and low-performing schools, however responses from the high-performing group was larger and had to be randomly deduced to provided equal representation between the groups.

Research Design

The design of this study consisted of two groups; elementary art teachers from high- and low-performing schools as identified by their 2005-2006 school grade. Both groups completed the same questionnaire during the same time frame. The sample was a random sample for the high-performing group and a convenience sample for the low-performing group. Section I) demographic information from the art teacher questionnaire collected information on characteristics including: 1) gender, 2) race, 3) level of education, 4) certification, 5) National Board Certification, 6) years teaching art in Florida, 7) years teaching at selected school, 8) years teaching art at selected school, 9) enrollment, 10) average class size, and 11) art class location. Sections II), III), IV), and V) collected information on art teacher conditions and Section VI) gathered data on the perception of change in regards to federal and state education reforms.

Collection of Data

The independent variable was school performance, identified as high-performing for schools with an “A” or “B” or low-performing for schools with a “D” or “F” for the 2005-2006 school year. The dependent variables included conditions and perceptions of: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. The dependent variable assignments included: 1) the number of art classes per week, 2) hours spent teaching per week, 3) type of scheduling, and 4) subjects taught other than art. The dependent variable responsibilities included: 1) planning
period, 2) hours of planning per week, and 3) before school, 4) during school, 5) after school, and 6) weekend duties. The dependent variable expectations included 1) state and national conference attendance and 2) district art in-services and trainings attendance.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was developed to determine the conditions and perceptions of change for elementary art teachers. The questionnaire asked for information on art teacher’s conditions including assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and perceptions of the impact of federal and state education reforms. The instrument consisted of six sections for a total of 35 questions as a one page, but front and back instrument. The sections included:

I) Demographic information
II) Population and scheduling
III) Planning and physical space
IV) Professional development
V) Extra activities
VI) Perception of recent changes as impacted by federal and state education reforms

All sections are single response or short answer except Section VI) perception of recent changes, which utilized a Likert scale from not at all, slightly, moderately, significantly, to severely in order to determine the impact of educational reform on selected conditions.

Procedures

First, each selected district art supervisor was contacted. The initial contact provided the proper means for ensuring research approval and permission for the art teachers to participate in the study. The information from the district supervisor was used to obtain the elementary art teachers’ email addresses from both the high- and low-performing groups. The emails were assigned a number that would remain their identity though the duration of the study. Next, an introductory letter and request for permission to conduct research was sent to the officials of the 13 districts. After contact and approval from the 13 selected school districts, introductory letters and informed consent forms were sent to the selected elementary art teachers. Art teachers were sent a questionnaire through email or standard mail along with instructions for submitting their questionnaire and return postage. Non-respondents received a reminder email two weeks later and the following week another mailing to non-respondents was sent out. A final reminder was
sent the following week. At the conclusion of the survey collection, thank you notices were to all respondents.

Analysis of the Data

The results of the survey were translated into descriptive statistics to explain the assignments, responsibilities, and expectations of Florida elementary art teachers in high-performing and low-performing schools. The descriptive statistics were compared by high- and low-performing groups using t-tests and chi-square to interpret the data and identify trends and patterns. The analysis identified patterns, trends, themes, consistencies, and inconsistencies from each of the six sections of the questionnaire in relationship to a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. The data analysis provided inferential statistics between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary schools by investigating means, similarities, and differences of the comparable groups to determine to accept or reject the research hypothesis.

Organization of the Chapters

Chapter 1 presents an overview of the study including the statement of the problem, rationale, procedures, overview of the study, research design, limitations, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature including the history of art education, historical impact of education reform, *No Child Left Behind*, Florida education acts, standards movement, National Assessment of Education Progress Art Test, testing in the schools, teacher work conditions, teacher incentive programs, teacher effectiveness, and supporting research of art in schools. Chapter 3 explains the procedures for the study including participating schools, description of procedures, instrumentation, variables to be tested, reliability and validity, and data collection. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study including the results of elementary art teacher conditions and perceptions of the change in conditions as impacted by federal and state education reform including: a) responsibilities, b) assignments, and c) expectations in relationship to the research hypothesis. Chapter 5 reports the conclusion of the study including the results, discussion, limitations in the present study, implications for best practices, suggestions for future research, and conclusion.

Definition of Terms

*No Child Left Behind (NCLB)*: The *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* of 2001 is based on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted in 1965. *NCLB* is based on four principles: 1) stronger accountability for results, 2) increased flexibility and control, 3) expanded options for
parents, and 4) an emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work (National Education Association, *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)*).

**Adequately Yearly Progress**: The state definition of achievement necessary during a one year time span (Florida Department of Education (FLDOE), *Plan for Education*).

**A+ Accountability Plan**: *A+ Accountability Plan* is a comprehensive state of Florida accountability package based on the belief that all children can learn and therefore focuses on student achievement. Schools receive a report card and receive a grade of A through F based on students’ performance on standardized tests, the improvement of the lowest 25%, and the percentage of students tested (FLDOE, *Assistance Plus*).

**Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)**: The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test is an annual criterion-referenced assessment designed to measure how well students are learning the skills and competencies established in the Sunshine State Standards (Greene, 2001).

**Florida School Report Card**: An annual report card that assigns each school a grade based on student *FCAT* scores in reading, math, and writing as well as student progress. Grades range from A to F (FLDOE, *Plan for Education*).

**A+ Assistance**: The *A+ Assistance* program offers incentive and rewards for success and remediation and consequences for failure based on the Florida school report cards (FLDOE, *Assistance Plus*).

**School Vouchers**: School vouchers redirect the flow of education funding, giving it to individual families rather than to school districts. This allows families to select the public or private schools of their choice and have all or part of the tuition paid (FLDOE, *Plan for Education*).

**Low-performing**: A school receiving a grade of D or F on the Florida School Repot Card (FLDOE, *Plan for Education*).

**High-performing**: A school receiving a grade of A or B on the Florida School Report Card (FLDOE, *Plan for Education*).

**National Art Education Standards**: The National Art Standards outline what students should know and be able to do in the four art disciplines: dance, music, theater, and the visual arts in content and achievement (Artsedge, *Summary Statement*).

**Sunshine State Standards (SSS)**: The Sunshine State Standards were developed by the Department of Education in 1994 to give parents, students, teachers, and administrators an understanding of skills and competencies. The SSS covers mathematics, language arts, social
studies, science, the arts, health and physical education, and foreign languages. The SSS were implemented to create a system of high standards through the development of clear expectations to measure and monitor student progress (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

Public School: An institution that provides educational services for at least one of grades 1-12, has one or more teachers to give instruction, is located in one or more buildings receives public funds as primary support, and is operated by an education agency (Greene, 2001).

Elementary School: A public school that supports grades kindergarten through 6th grade (Greene, 2001).

In-Field Teacher: A teacher who instructs a subject that they are state-certified to teach for the entire school year according to their contract (Greene, 2001).

Out of Field Teacher: A teacher instructing a subject other than the area of state-certification for an entire school year according to their contract (Greene, 2001).

Teacher Assignment: The daily role of a teacher while at work regardless of their in or out of field contract status (Greene, 2001).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature examined: 1) history of art education, 2) historical impact of education reforms, 3) No Child Left Behind, 4) Florida education acts, 5) standards movement, 6) National Assessment of Education Progress Art Test, 7) testing in the schools, 8) teacher work conditions, 9) teacher incentive programs, 10) teacher effectiveness, and 11) supporting research of art in schools. A summary of literature is also provided.

History of Art Education

Art education throughout history has been an issue of access to instruction affected by class, gender, and the social status of the arts. Throughout history art education has been determined by a network of social structures dating back to the masters and apprentices of the early 18th Century. Each era’s political, cultural, scientific, and economic events shape society, the arts, and teaching practices. Each historical movement affects art education’s guiding principles, instruction, product, and public perception (Efland, 1990). The following section includes an overview of the history of art education followed by perspectives of the impact of change in art education.

According to Efland (1990), the roots of American art education can be traced to western culture. Education was limited to children of wealth and power and the arts were considered inferior, and not encouraged. Artistic skills were passed down from masters to apprentices rather than learned in a formal setting or institution. During this time, arts were valued as important for instruments of survival rather than for aesthetic quality. Art instruction was grounded in history and tradition, which resulted in a specific set of rules for teaching intended to provide function (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) accredits the 17th Century with the birth of scientific spirit. The philosopher John Locke believed the mind’s ideas could be communicated more precisely by images than languages. This belief justified drawing for cognitive purpose, however not as a career.

The 18th Century was devoted to the belief that God was the maker and obeying nature’s laws was obeying God’s laws (Efland, 1990). During the span of Absolutism, the primary purpose was to assert the power of the state and art was used to create an image of glory and grandeur.

The 19th Century saw an onset of change in the creation, perception, accessibility, and training of art. An increased value on scientific curiosity paired with religious beliefs and social
reform caused changes in everyday life and art. Over the course of the 19th Century, different teaching traditions developed, representing the diverse needs of a shifting society. Previously, artisans created aesthetically pleasing instruments, however during the Industrial Revolution machines replaced skilled artisans. However, the factory system failed to provide needed designers and as a result artistic quality declined. With the need for skilled designers recognized, drawing instruction developed based on exercises starting with basic geometric figures and proceeding to complex figures (Efland, 1990).

During the Industrial Revolution, the Common School Movement evolved between the early and mid-1800s as the result of social and political currents. According to Efland (1990), it became a belief that a well-educated society was essential to survival. Therefore states supported schooling for the purpose of learning to read and write. Drawing became an essential skill but was not yet part of the accepted curriculum. Boston became the heart of the Common School and was identified as the cultural and literary capital of America. As a trendsetter in education, Boston paved the way for schooling in America (Efland, 1990).

In 1870 Massachusetts’s legislature passed an act authorizing the teaching of drawing in public schools. The Massachusetts Drawing Act, prepared by John White, made the provision of free drawing classes for women, men, and children mandatory in all communities with populations over 10,000. As a result of this act, twenty-three cities provided these classes for their communities. Despite funds not being included in this act, this gave people the opportunity to take part in art (Efland, 1990).

As drawing classes in schools emerged, Walter Smith played a key role. Efland (1990) claimed curriculum during these times was devoted to a rigid sequence of freehand, model, memory, and geometric and perspective drawing. Rote learning, copying, and repetition were common aspects of the sequential curriculum. Smith justified copy work in two ways: 1) that it was the only rational way to learn, since drawing was essentially copying, and 2) that it was the only practical way to teach, since classes were large and only a very limited amount of time was allotted to drawing (Efland, 1990). According to Efland, Smith’s program broke new ground and gave art education in the United States a foundation upon which to build. Smith envisioned art education as one that embraced all levels from primary to high, reaching beyond public school. Smith also instituted the first art in-service for drawing teachers. Teachers learned under Smith’s direction and then shared their knowledge with regular teachers (Efland, 1990). Art supervisors
emerged in 1871 in Boston, hired as specialists to oversee drawing and art subjects. Art Teacher Associations appeared in 1874 under the guidance of Walter Smith (Efland, 1990, p.182).

Packard (1984) reported that more than one hundred years ago, the Industrial Revolution changed America and brought art education to the schools as a means for educating the new industrial working class. “In 1870, the Massachusetts Industrial Drawing Act distinguished between picture making and geometrical drawing in schools, opening the way for art education to focus on individual creative activity” (Packard, 1984, p. 266).

Previously art was believed to be a luxury for ladies, only for those of a certain status. The role of women in education was progressing and by 1860 women were using art to teach morality, especially in school decoration and picture study movements. Women were connecting art study with virtues and promoted the teaching of art as high culture. Women became teachers in large numbers during this timeframe (Efland, 1990).

After two decades of scientific dominance, art was again proclaimed as an important source of spiritual insight, an alternative to the previously accepted concept. According to Efland (1990), originality became the primary value in art and reflected the romanticism philosophy. Artists were recognized for imagination and insight and seen as superior to scientific knowledge. Idealism transformed arts from “ornamental” to subjects richly saturated with moral purpose (Efland, 1990, p.115). Patronage made room for a market system and art became a commodity. Society recognized that fine artists need special training separate from that of designers.

As the evolution of art education continued, Transcendentalism a largely religious, philosophical, and literary movement both romantic and individualistic, surfaced. Immanuel Kant asserted that our awareness of nature is made possible through the faculty of perception and no amount of perception can lead to the consciousness of God (Efland, 1990, p. 116). Kant supported that inspiration occurred in natural settings with human artifact and not around the artificial. As a reflection of this belief, Amos Bronson Alcott and Elizabeth Peabody opened a school in Boston focused on developing the rational, imaginative, and spiritual faculty. Since children for the school were located in cities, they were forced to hold class there but decorated the class with beautiful objects in line with the Transecendtalist view (Efland, 1990).

Friedrich Froebel designed a new type of institution for early-childhood education, which he called the Kindergarten. Froebel believed that mothers should take a leading role in the education of small children however, believed that most mothers were not qualified to perform this
educational task. Efland (1990) asserted that Froebel perceived every element as independent but part of a larger unity. He developed the “principle of activity” stating that “what the self is to be, it must become of itself” (Efland, 1990, p. 121). Froebel claimed the mind is a process of activities and created a curriculum based on the principle of play, as an interactive representation of the inner life of the self. According to Froebel, play is believed to be self-expression and allowed children to grow and become educated through their own activities. In this philosophy, the educator provides the proper conditions for growth, including didactic materials. Froebel created didactics he titled “gifts and occupations” which were used to find unity in diversity in the forms of patterns and things to understand mathematical principle (Efland, 1990, p. 122).

Near the end of the 19th Century, Efland (1990) acknowledged the appearance of fine arts education at the university level. Visual arts were introduced at Oxford, Cambridge, and London in 1868. Art in American universities emerged at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton and each approached art in different ways. Harvard believed the role of fine arts in education was to cultivate feelings and imagination and art was an integral part of the curriculum. Drawing at Yale was taught as a scientific subject. Yale’s first priority was to provide a school for the technical training of those pursuing art professionally. Yale’s second priority was to provide courses of art in all branches and third, to provide arts for the community. Art education materialized at Princeton and asserted that students only learn to draw and paint if the teach themselves, however they can learn the drawing, painting, and sculpture of others. Princeton’s philosophy supported that only facts can be taught, not appreciation (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) stressed that science influenced education at the start of the 20th Century and the demand for social reform escalated. Technology was impacted by the development of photography and introduced a new understanding of light and color, which influenced Impressionism. Change occurred in schools based on new theories of child development and learning. Discovery of the subconscious mind caused people to focus on inner psychology states and influenced Expressionism and then Surrealism. Cubism was introduced based on the belief that all visual forms could be reduced to cones, cubes, and cylinders. Handmade objects became fashionable, impacted domestic architecture and even personal homes. As a result design was seen as the foundation of art instruction (Efland, 1990).

By the 1920s and 30s, the art in “everyday” life concept was introduced and art curricula focused on design, home decoration, and skills for creating aesthetic environments (Packard,
John Rushkin an accepted art critic, perceived art as the means of maintaining balance between material and spiritual progress. Rushkin believed in two aspects of art: perception and invention. According to Efland (1990), Rushkin declared the power of invention is God given but perception can be taught. Rushkin supported that education existed to help people perceive the beauty of God’s work and believed drawing had practical function and should be a part of general education. He believed that through teaching art one could teach everything. Rushkin spearheaded the SchoolDecorationMovement, supporting the decoration of classrooms for aesthetic appeal to aid in learning and development (Efland, 1990).

According to Efland (1990) before World War I, art education changed from drawing instruction to inclusive education. The concept of art education developed from teaching drawing to a wider teaching of art including aesthetic appreciation, design, and craft. Industrial education became vocational education and separated from art education. During this time, art was taught for the purpose of appreciation of natural beauty. Art education sustained due to handicrafts and the arts and crafts movement. However with functionalism absent, its importance as a subject was diminished. A decline in the importance of arts began but students had greater access and could elect to take art (Efland, 1990).

The arts and crafts movement was a social mission to change the ideas of the Industrial Revolution, improve the quality of life of working people, and make culture available to everyone (Efland, 1990). The days of art being just for the elite had passed and the connection of art with craft was revived. The teaching of craft moved to university level as well.

By the middle of the 20th Century, educational philosophers such as John Dewey refocused the mission of art education from societal good to individual good (Packard, 1984). Dewey made a revolutionary impact on education. Dewey believed individuals perceived the world through previous knowledge acquired through experiences with the world and constantly revised the conception of reality (Efland, 1990). Dewey believed new knowledge increased the capacity for change and individuals were functioning in a complex environment and must modify their behavior in accordance with environmental change. According to Efland, Francais Wayland Parker held a similar view to Dewey and believed children learn what is meaningful in their daily lives and rooted in experience. Parker believed the arts were essential in the curriculum and attention and expression were key. According to Parker, attention involved the senses: look, listen, and touch and expression involved voice, gesture, modeling, and speech.
Efland (1990) asserted Francis Parker and John Dewey as the major founders of the Progressive Education Movement. The Progressive Education movement provided standardization in education that stifled innovation in public schools and led to private schools being experimental. Neither Parker nor Dewey believed subjects should be taught in isolation. The children who attended progressive schools learned in informal settings and adapted the curriculum to the interests and needs of each child. A more democratic model replaced the authoritarian approach. Dewey’s school was organized around occupations instead of formal subjects. Dewey described art as an attitude of spirit, state of mind (Efland, 1990, p. 170).

Dewey’s beliefs supported self-expression, which was based on Freudian psychology that the mind is the real source of human innovation (Efland, 1990, p. 192). Self-expression believed education was not intended to repress a child’s emotions but instead purify them. The Child Centered School released the child from social and psychological forces believed to constrain growth and offered a place for creative expression where the child was perceived as an artist.

As art education took on diverse curriculum structures, Henry Turner Bailey reported on the status of drawing with the publication *School Arts Book* (Efland, 1990). During his investigation of the status of drawing, Bailey found that art for the appreciation of beauty was being taught. According to Bailey, picture study and decoration were taught occasional and nature drawing was taught to appreciate beauty. Bailey also claimed that handicrafts were taught as a direct result of scientific study with a practical emphasis on subjects. Bailey found that model and object drawing were not taught as much as handicrafts. Bailey also found color and design, development of design theory, and Dow’s Synthetic Art Education were being taught. Dow’s Synthetic Art Education was based on elements of principles and design and called synthetic because he believed his elements were the building blocks for all forms of art past, present, and future (Efland, 1990). Dennman Ross and his theory of Pure Design also existed in Bailey’s study of the status of drawing. Ross’s theory was based on the elements and principles of design but started with the simplest element, a dot (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) accepted that the purpose of educator’s of the 1920s and 30s method of teaching appreciation for art was to expose students to paintings and sculptures that delivered a moral or religious message and fit within the definition of beauty. However, change was forthcoming. The stock market crash of 1929 began the Great Depression and poverty spread. The Museum of Modern Art also opened this year. The New Deal was established as a series of
programs implemented between 1933-37 under President Franklin D. Roosevelt with the goal of relief, recovery, and reform of the economy during the Great Depression. The Works Progress Administration was created in 1935 as a component of the New Deal. The Works Progress Administration employed mostly blue-collar workers in construction projects across the nation, but also employed artists. From the 1930 to World War II, Progressive Education moved away from creative self-expression and restructured with a focus on community and art became integrated with other subjects. The Progressive Education movement laid the groundwork for upcoming movements by relating the free and expressive aspects of art creativity to a theory of personality development (Efland, 1990).

The teaching of art changed when a team of educational innovators visited the Minnesota town of Owatonna. According to Efland (1990), the Owatonna Art Project in Minnesota was one of the most successful of several community art projects funded by the federal government in the 1930s. The objective was to create art activities based on the aesthetic interests of community members. The idea was to apply principles of art in everyday life for a richer experience. The Owatonna Art Project was interrupted by World War II and never reached its full potential. Efland asserted that the project had the potential to become a national model for art education, but the outbreak of World War II brought it to an end quickly. Following the war, many educators prioritized individual creativity rather than supporting a community’s aesthetic environment.

Efland (1990) stated another development during the 1930s was the Bauhaus in Germany, which integrated the technology of its day into the artist's work. The Bauhaus stimulated a growing interest in a multi-sensory approach to art as well as incorporated aesthetic concerns into environmental and industrial design. One of the main objectives of the Bauhaus was to unify art, craft, and technology. The school’s philosophy stated that the artist should be trained to work with the industry.

Efland (1990) associated Franz Cizek, as an educator that encouraged children to present, in visual form, their personal reactions to occasions in their lives. Cizek maintained that it was not his aim to develop artists and confirmed his goal the development of the creative power in all children, which he felt could grow naturally (Efland, 1990). His beliefs became well-known through his Exhibition of Children’s Art in London in 1934 and 1935. Cizek asserted that children left to their own devices in a school setting, without stimulus and guidance from a
teacher, provide minimal educational outcomes. Cizek alleged optimal learning can be fostered in a setting where a teacher balances individual expression and creativity with meaningful structure and guidance (Efland, 1990).

During the war, art was seen as a way to bring communities together but art education changed after the war. The years to follow led to a series of art education movements. Efland (1990) claimed three art movements developed after World War II: 1) Expressionism, 2) Reconstructivism, and 3) Scientific Rationalism. The Expressionism movement emphasized the expression of inner experiences rather than reality with a focus on emotion. Victor D'Amico's *Creative Teaching in Art* (1942) and Viktor Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947) were two of the most influential books published in 1940s and 1950s on the development of creativity. Art was being considered a field of study that could be learned by children through a series of developmental activities. Lowenfeld asserted that children develop through stages including: 1) scribble (2-4 years), 2) pre-schematic (4-6 years), 3) schematic (7-9 years), 4) gang age (9-11 years), and 5) stage of reasoning (11-13 years).

Lowenfeld was a driving force in education during the 1940s and 1950s, however was followed by challengers to his theories. Efland (1990) claimed Manuel Barkan saw self-expression as a means through which children interact and the environment as a place to encounter and grow into a social being. June K. McFee questioned Lowenfeld’s theory of “stages of expression” as insufficient. McFee argued that child rearing could also determine dispositions and both styles of perceiving should be taught in art education. Elliot Eisner promoted structured curriculum with instructional materials and emphasized content taught in art teaching (Efland, 1990).

The Reconstructism movement advocated the conscious rebuilding of reality, by breaking down something to its smallest elements and rebuilding. Efland (1990) claimed Reconstructivism supported education as a force that can transform society and reasserted many of Dewey’s ideas. John Dewey, was noted for believing each child should be taught to use critical thinking to create for himself the ideal world rather than passively accept what has already existed (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) accounted that the Scientific Movement sustained school reform should be based on scientific research. Psychological studies were being used for assessing artistic abilities in relation to general intelligence however revealed little correlation between art and intelligence. Attempts to measure and predict student performance on the basis of tests developed but since
the correlation of art and intelligence was minimal this weakened arts in education (Efland, 1990).

As the development of art education moved in the direction of curriculum development, Jerome Bruner was a major contributor to understanding the process of education and to the development of curriculum theory. Bruner dealt with curriculum content selection and sequence, structure of disciplines, and teaching the subject matter of art. Efland (1990) declared Bruner developed a theory of cognitive growth, which varied from Jean Piaget’s. Piaget described four stages of cognitive development related to a person's ability to understand and assimilate new information. Bruner looked to environmental and experiential factors and suggested that intellectual ability developed in stages through step-by-step changes in how the mind is used (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) claimed Howard Gardner worked briefly with Jerome Bruner before Gardner became part of the Project Zero research team on arts education at Harvard. Project Zero allowed Gardner to explore human cognition. Gardner is best known for his theory of multiple intelligences, a critique of the notion that there exists one single human intelligence that can be assessed by standard psychometric instruments. The work of Howard Gardner has affected education in the arts and led to diverse instructional delivery methods (Efland, 1990).

Efland (1990) associated an emphasis on accountability as the focus from 1972-1980. Behavioral objectives in curriculum were wide-spread and educators needed to offer concrete evidence that instruction resulted in change in behavior. National assessments were conducted to compare our educational progress with other nations (Efland, 1990).

The status of art during the 1980s focused attention toward quality in education. According to Efland (1990), Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) proposed content including production, aesthetics, criticism, and history should be included as part of art education. DBAE was associated with the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. DBAE is a conceptual framework, which involves all students in rigorous study of the arts as a part of their general education. It also serves a fundamental approach to integrating the arts into the curriculum. DBAE required students study music, theatre, dance and visual arts from the following four discipline perspectives: 1) production, 2) history, 3) aesthetics, 4) criticism. DBAE is not a curriculum, but rather a method of teaching and learning.
Gardener (1983) acknowledged that nearly a century after art education was first introduced, the mission is almost identical to that of its inceptions: the training of a work force and an adjunctive tool for learning other subjects and civilizing influence on society.

Lapierre and Zimmerman (1997) addressed how research had shaped the role of art education throughout history. Regarding Industrial drawing in the 19th Century, art education based on the elements and principles of design, the child study movements, creative expression through the 20th Century, and discipline based art education through the nineties. LaPierre and Zimmerman (1997) claimed the field is capable of evolving new forms and practices largely without the benefit of research and that entrepreneurship, conventional wisdom, practical experiences, and common sense serve as ways that ideas are presented within the field. LaPierre and Zimmerman (1997) stated:

The principal goal of art educational research is to provide knowledge about the ways art learners use special artistic insights to expand their conceptions of themselves, past and present worlds, imagined and future worlds, and the norms by which individuals govern their lives through writing the texts of art into the texts of their lives within and beyond school” (p. 4).

The history of art education in the United States continues to evolve post DBAE. Although DBAE still functions as a solid foundation for arts education in schools, new ideas are incorporated. Art education in the 21st Century includes new technologies, visual culture, and comprehensive art education. Strong attempts are being made to address the gap between theory and practice and provide a quality arts education for students taking in all the lessons from the past.

Historical Impact of Educational Reform

The following section provides a historical overview of educational reform and its transfer to educational practice. The section further addresses the impact on the teaching profession. Since many educational reforms are not in their original state and are a product of previous reforms the sequence of events is critical to understanding current educational reforms. This section explains how educational reforms have moved from a study of basics to reconstructive policy and includes the focus on student learning, teacher effectiveness, and student testing in an attempt to raise educational standards and compete with other nations.
Wieder (1990) stated “for the most part, arts and humanities education does not appear to be what the vast majority of the education reforms reported are about, neither primarily or secondary (p. 44). Weider also reported “apart from the occasional association with the academically more respectable literary and historical areas of humanities study, the visual arts remain as marginal embellishments on the fringe of the curriculum” (p. 47). Weider credited the first approach of calling attention to unsatisfactory outcomes with the political assumptions associated with the post-Sputnik era of the back-to-basic accountability movement.

In relation to educational practice, Reese (1999) stated “the relationship between education related research and changing and improving school practice is ambiguous, difficult to pinpoint and perhaps nonexistent” (p. 2). Reese added that historians have unfortunately written very little on the relationship between research and practice and that the task of writing about the literature is difficult, since the nature of the sources is scattered. However, Murphy (1989) added:

A common theme of the literature on educational reform is that these large cycles of reform and reaction have had little effect on the way students are expected to learn and the way teachers teach, the way students are expected to learn, and the way knowledge is defined in schools…most students of educational reform see the large, glacial changes as masking enduring continuity in what teachers and students do in classrooms” (p. 210).

Murphy (1989) cited the top-down nature of educational reforms are part of the reason that reforms fail as well as that they don’t affect the central activity of schools, which is teaching. Murphy also claimed that reform efforts are successful if they build improvement efforts upon existing organizational structure. Dorn, Madeja, and Sabol (2004) reported “although school reformers see testing as a significant part of reform, very little effort has been expended on determining how such testing relates to what teachers teach” (Dorn, Madeja, and Sabol, 2004, p. 75).

Carlson and Levin (2005) reported that three areas of education reform merit consideration including organizational changes, education research, and translation of research into practice. Carlson and Levin explained that the change in education from an office to a department, incorporation of research centers, systems, and committees support organizational change as education became a priority. The increase in investigations and endeavors, quantitative and qualitative research, and review of professional organizations and publication trends is useful in informing policy change. The translation of research into practice is identified through increased
standardized testing, which dominated educational policy and practice, and connecting educational practice and research are educational centers and laboratories that began in the 1960s (Carlson & Levin, 2005).

In support of the waves of educational reform, Packard (1984) reported that contemporary education reform was upon us and the implications for the role of traditional art education activities and objectives within the context of school mission is changing dramatically. Packard stated that “not since the Russian Sputnik was catapulted into the heavens, October 4, 1957, sending the U.S. government into a cold war tither to ‘catch up’ with the U.S.S.R. scientific supremacy has education and the contents of its curriculum held such national attention” (p. 1). Packard explained that threats also include the Japanese technological advances and therefore economic superiority and the inability for secondary and higher education to guarantee employment.

As education reforms progress, “the level of state policy activity is unprecedented in the history of American education, while states have assumed responsibility for educational policymaking, little is known about the effects of various reform policies or strategies associated with their implementation” (Kirp & Timar, 1988, p. 75). Dorn et al (2004) found that “American education, in terms of its overall design and framework, was and is being challenged in a way it has never been challenged before, with the charge that it is not delivering an acceptable product” (Dorn et al, 2004, p. 48).

Reese (1999) noted that the study of the relationship between educational research and practice begins with the progressive era in the field of education (from 1890 to 1920). “The lure of science was powerful in the Western intellectual circles and became the dominant approach to educational inquiry until the late decades of the 20th Century” (p. 2). Reese also stated that “the progressive era was the great age of scientific management in business and the schools, most early chroniclers of the evolution of education research applauded these developments” (p. 2). Reese also recognized that other than a reaction in the 1920s to intelligence testing, faith in science was largely unquestioned and criticized by only a handful of professional educators.

According to Lagemann (1997), the 1920s supported prominent writings on educational research emphasizing the power of science inquiry and pointed the obvious impact of school surveys, psychological testing, and related studies had on educational practice in the schools. Reese (1999) claimed that Hollis Leland Caswell published one of the best appraisals of his era
on the evolution of school surveys and revealed the positive image of science in his day. Caswell (1929) noted that the survey movement was integrally bound to the larger changes influencing modern education and that surveys were guided to action and provided clues to social change. Caswell reported the first school survey was conducted in 1910 in Boise, Idaho which began and heralded a movement that would sweep across the educational landscape, another example of the powerful hold of science upon leading educators in the progressive era. Lagemann claimed the school survey became a common means by which to attempt to measure change carefully and objectively, promoting the idea that science and systematic investigation would inevitably lead to social reform and educational improvement.

Brouillette (1996) described education reforms since the 1960s in the United States as confusing and reported that few of them are still with us in their original form. Brouillette found the 1960s as experimental, the 1970s as back to basics, the 1980s as reconstructing, and identifies the 1990s as dealing with shortfalls due to severe budget restraints. Brouillette explained that the list of education reforms that did not fulfill their expectations is long because policymakers did not take into consideration the complex interactions of the school setting.

Johnson (1969) reported “changes were unique in the history of education in that they are precipitate by the burgeoning discoveries in science and the nagging social crises of our times” (p. 14). Johnson also added that in earlier times in the history of education, change was nurtured by the genius of individual men such as Thorndike and Dewey; however, new concepts were evolving from researchers formed out of the scientific investigation of learning behavior, teaching strategies, and in-depth studies of meaning in content in relation to man’s needs. Johnson also reported that art teachers at regional and national conferences claimed “new ideas wouldn’t work into her situation because of their administrators, or their lack of time, space and supplies” (p. 14).

Johnson (1969) claimed that “When Congress passed the National Defense Education Act and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, it placed its faith in the value of the dollar to improve education” (p. 15). Although the sciences seemed better supported, art educators hadn’t previously seen such support (Johnson, 1969).

On April 9, 1965, the Elementary and Secondary School Act (ESSA) was signed and passed. The legislation constituted the most important educational component of the “War on Poverty” through funding of Title I because it allocated large resources to meet the needs of educationally
deprived students. The assumption of this bill was that more and better educational services would move low-income students out of poverty. The ESSA was amended in 1968 with Title VII, resulting in the Bilingual Education Act, which offered federal aid to districts that assisted students with limited English proficiency (The Elementary and Secondary School Act, 1965). The ESEA was an important part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s “War on Poverty”, which sought to compensate for educational deficits in the lives of the nation’s poor and minority children (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003 p. 6).

According to Phillips (2004), 1970 to 1974 was marked by a growing concern for teacher competency, which led to a focus on teacher education. The movement of Performance Based Teacher Education and later as Competency Based Teacher Education sought to provide better education for assessment of preparing teachers (Phillips, 2004).

Also Phillips (2004), stated that between 1975 and 1983, there was a decline of test scores. Upon the twelfth consecutive drop in spring College Entrance Examination Board test scores, it was clear that reforms had failed and these declines brought pressure on educators to be accountable to public demands for improvement.

Marche (1997) agreed with Phillips and reported, “the early 1980s saw a resurgence of dissatisfaction with American public schools, and called for educational renewal, school restructuring, and systemic reform” (p. 24). Similarly, Davis (1993) found that in the 1980s, a great deal of emphasis was placed upon teacher and program accountability.

Packard (1984) identified reports in the 1980s that called for a new curriculum including the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which as recommended learning the new basics. The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force advocated that every American student have the opportunity to acquire literacy in the English language and proficiency in a foreign language. The Education Commission of the States Task Force on Education for Economic Growth sought the elimination of “soft” nonessential sources and more intensive education courses. The Carnegie Foundation’s American High School Study specified a specific high school curriculum that didn’t even require art. The National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology called for a return to basics and adding the new basics of communication and problem solving skills. The focus on the College Entrance Examination Board Report: Academic Preparation for College established what students should know and be able to do was based on accountability and included the arts as one of six basic academic
subjects needed for students to have a fair chance at succeeding in higher education. The Education Commission prioritized the contents of school curricula and stressed cognitive skills and functional knowledge to the exclusion of artistic skills is all too common (Packard, 1984).

Boyd (1980) recognized that the role of arts education in the United States was embroiled in the argument about “basic skills” as well as fiscal priorities. The popular cry was for a “return to basics” in education. However, the arts meet a basic human need: creative personal expression (p. 24).

Davis (1993) reported that in 1985, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts published Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in American Schools (1985) which outlined the discipline based approach to art education and articulated critical elements needed to change perspectives on art education. Davis claimed throughout the 1980s teacher certification and teacher accountability were major areas of concern at the national and state level. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, established in 1987, appointed an Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood Art Standards committee to establish board certification for practicing art teachers.

In 1985, Congress mandated that the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) study the state of arts education and the concluding report recommended procedures to achieve quality control by means of standardized assessment of arts curricula (Weider, 1990). Davis (1993) reported that the 1988 report from the NEA, Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education, emphasized accountability in three major areas: programs, student achievement, and teaching. In the area of program accountability, state education agencies and school districts were called to develop consensus on what all students should know in the arts before graduating from high school. The report also called for state agencies to develop procedures to comparatively evaluate district and school art programs in relation to state arts education goals and for local districts to do the same. The report recommended that students should be tested in the arts and their work evaluated to determine what they have learned (Davis, 1993). “Toward Civilization, is above all else, a call for expansion of its own authority and that of the U.S. Department of Education” (Weider, 1990, p. 48).

The 1980s, under the Reagan administration, produced “the most significant event to hit educational reform efforts since the launching of Sputnik and Eisenhower’s National Defense Education Act” (Phillips, 2004, p. 55). A Nation at Risk spelled out the urgent need for education
reform at all levels (Phillips, 2004). According to Gardner (1983), *A Nation at Risk* identified the purpose of schools as to create a learning society.

Education Commission of the States (1983) defined the purpose of *A Nation at Risk* to assess the quality of time and learning, make comparisons with other advanced nations, examine the relationship of college admission to high school graduation, identify successful secondary school programs, assess the degree to which changes in the last 25 years have affected student achievement, and define problems to be faced and overcome if we are to pursue excellence. The impact of *A Nation at Risk* was severe as states raised standards and increased standardized testing and is reported as identifying an educational crisis that required desperate measures (Phillips, 2004).

According to Bloomfield and Cooper (2003), after the National Commission on Education released “*A Nation at Risk*” in 1983, during the Regan administration, federal reforms under ESEA aimed to improve the level of education for the general populace and the poor. When standards-based education policies gained favor in the 1990s, voters began to show frustration with a steady stream of low-test scores and the persistent achievement gap between whites and minority groups (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6).

According to Davis (1993), the national education goals are an indicator the demands for the 1990s focus on the accountability of what students were learning. On April 18, 1991, President Bush unveiled his national education strategy called *America 2000* (Davis, 1993). Phillips (2004) reported President Bush as continuing the approach of the Reagan administration by echoing *A Nation at Risk* in implementing *America 2000*. Phillips (2004, p. 96-97) explained that *America 2000* proposed a set of six voluntary national education goals to be obtained by the year 2000:

1. Ensure that children are ready to learn when beginning school.
2. Maintain a 90% high school graduation rate.
3. Demonstrate competence in core subjects at Grades 4, 8, and 12.
4. Maintain a ranking of first in the world in science and math.
5. Achieve complete adult literacy.
6. Ensure that schools are free of drugs and violence.

*America 2000* caused controversy in education because expectations were raised without addressing an increase in funding in order to meet expectations. Equally controversial was the implementation of a national achievement test according to goal three. *America 2000* was viewed
as an opportunity to increase federal involvement with education without increasing expenditure (Phillips, 2004). *Art Teachers in Secondary Schools* (National Art Education Association, 2001) reported that *The Goals 2000: Educate America Act* recognized the importance of the arts in schools and its vital role in student development.

President George W. Bush (2001) created the education blueprint to: 1) increase accountability of student performance, 2) focus on what works, 3) reduce bureaucracy and increase flexibility, and 4) empower parents. The seven priorities in this blueprint consist of: 1) improving the academic performance of disadvantaged students, 2) improving teacher quality, 3) moving limited English proficient students to fluency, 4) promoting informed parental options and innovative programs, 5) encouraging safe schools, 6) providing impact aid, and 7) encouraging freedom and accountability (President George Bush, 2001).

The promise of dramatic changes in education and acceptable professional practice within the nation’s schools have resulted in a “level of public, political and professional attention not seen since the outbursts accompanying the release of *A Nation at Risk* report in 1983, or possible the national pressure for school reform following the 1957 launching of the Russian Sputnik spacecraft” (Carlson and Levin, 2005, p. 89). The breadth of congressional and presidential commitment to the new political consensus is a call to shift control of standards for school programs and practices away from educational professionals and into the hands of social and cognitive scientists (Carlson and Levin, 2005).

**No Child Left Behind**

The following section explains the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)*, a reconstructed version of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. The section outlines the requirements and expectations of NCLB as well as the impact on the teaching profession.

George W. Bush introduced *No Child Left Behind* as his first legislative initiative (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6). The *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) of 2001 is based on the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* enacted in 1965 that was signed into law on January 8, 2002 (Carlson & Levin, 2005). NCLB is based on four principles: 1) stronger accountability for results, 2) increased flexibility and control, 3) expanded options for parents, and 4) an emphasis on teaching methods that have been proven to work (National Education Association, *NCLB*). The purpose of the act is to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach proficiency on challenging state academic
achievement standards and state academic assessments. 

NCLB calls for annual testing in all public schools in reading and math, a quality teacher in every classroom, and annual report cards on school performance to ensure that every child reads by the third grade. The goal of NCLB is to have 100% of students proficient by 2013 to 2014, with intermediate goals before this date (National Education Association, NCLB).

Under NCLB every state is required to: 1) set standards for grade-level achievement and 2) develop a system to measure the progress of all students and subgroups of students in meeting those state determined grade level standards (National Education Association, NCLB).

NCLB moves the United States in a direction of a national standard in education based on state determined standards and tests with a set of processes and consequences that are federally mandated (Bloomfield and Cooper, 2003). NCLB requires states to utilize state assessments to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Adequately Yearly Progress measures the progress of all public schools and districts toward enabling students to meet the state’s academic achievement standards. All students and eight identified subgroups, including each of the five race and ethnicity groups, free and reduced lunch, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) are measured for progress. These subgroups must have 30 or more students for inclusion in the calculation of school grades. AYP requires 95% of the students and all subgroups participate in the state assessment. Also the state must meet set objectives for students that are proficient in reading and math. Schools must demonstrate a 1% improvement in the percentage of students in writing (National Education Association, NCLB).

According to NCLB, schools not making AYP are in School Improvement Status. Schools then have to make AYP for two consecutive years in order to be out of School Improvement Status and after not making AYP for two consecutive years receive extra help and parents are offered public and charter school choices. After three years of not meeting AYP, school improvement continues with parents offered supplemental services and school choice. After the fourth year, the school enters into the school Corrective Action Plan and parental options continue. During the fifth year of not making AYP, the school is identified for restructuring and parental options continue (National Education Association, NCLB).

Another component of NCLB is Reading First with the goal to ensure that every child can read at grade level or higher by the end of third grade through the implementation of instructional programs and materials, assessments, and professional developed grounded in
scientific reading research (Carlson & Levin, 2005). Reading First is a formula grant program given to states based on the number of students ages five to 17 below the poverty line. The emphasis and expectation of reading by the third grade has implications to other subjects that are not required. The implementation of Reading First is a result in increasing parental choice to find suitable schools for their children at a time when the National Center for Educational Statistics reports that in fourth grade alone, 37% of students read below the basic level nationally with only 31% reading at a proficient level (Carlson & Levin, 2005).

Bracey (2005) explained that the 2005 to 2006 school year would mark the fourth year of the NCLB law. Therefore no schools have experienced the corrective actions the law calls for after four or five years. Olson (2005, Requests Win) reported that several states, including Florida and Tennessee, have already submitted proposals to the department that would enable schools to miss their achievement targets under the NCLB law to demonstrate that they are still making substantial progress by using such growth measures. Olson (2005, Requests Win) reported that federal officials granted 16 states approval to some of their changes to accountability plans under NCLB and 31 are awaiting notification. The approval of requests supports the reaction to U.S Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings pledge to take a more “common sense” approach to carrying out the law (Olson, 2005, Requests Win, p. 20). The Department of Education granted Florida approval to revise their annual achievement target for schools, replacing a large increase in targets with smaller annual increments (Olson, Requests Win, 2005).

Sclafani (2005) reported that NCLB far from marginalizes arts education in the K to 12 curricula and provides unprecedented recognition and support for learning in the arts. Sclafani added that under NCLB, the arts are listed in federal law as a core academic subject for which standards of teaching are expected to be as rigorous as those for subjects such as English. Sclafani admitted that NCLB has been portrayed as a threat to arts education because it doesn’t leave anytime for the arts and time and attention have been focused on reading and mathematics. However, Scalfani justified that the arts can be an important part of learning and enrichment programs supported by 21st Century Community Learning Center programs including before and after school, weekend, and summer programs which offer excellent opportunities to stimulate students’ artistic interests.

The most common NCLB implementation changes include, as of July 7, 2005: raising the minimum subgroup size, using a confidence interval of 99% in calculating AYP, using a
confidence interval of 75 percent under the law’s safe harbor provision for schools and districts that did not make AYP initially, averaging results across years, identifying districts for improvement only when they do not make AYP in the same subject for two consecutive years across the grade span, raising annual AYP targets to increase in 10 equal increments through 2014, and adjusting upward the percent of proficient students with disabilities in schools that failed to make AYP based only on their special education students (Olson, *Federal Government*, 2005).

According to Carlson and Levin (2005), NCLB is based on two assumptions. The first is that educations’ highest priority is assuring an acceptable level of basic skills in students toward the bottom end of the distribution of academic achievement. The second assumption is that educational reforms should be based upon sound scientific evidence.

The impact of NCLB on Florida is that it has heightened awareness among many school and district personnel about the need to be diligent and committed to improving the performance of their instructional programs (Bloomfield and Cooper, 2003). In addition, paperwork and data collection in education have increased and the curriculum has been narrowed to prepare for the annual testing. Personnel allocation has shifted as a result as well (Bloomfield and Cooper, 2003). According to Goldhaber and Hannaway (2004), shifting at the school and district level are occurring whether it is by replacing incompetent principals or teachers or increasing the responsibilities and altering schedules of those deemed capable.

**Florida Education Acts**

In reaction and compliance with NCLB, Florida implemented a major reform of its accountability system. This section outlines the components of Florida’s accountability including state testing, mandated assistance, and class size reforms.


A+ Accountability

A+ Accountability is a standards based accountability measure that assigns grades to each elementary, middle, and high school. Grades are reported on an annual school report card. The
plan allows students in low-performing schools to attend high-performing schools, including private schools through the use of school vouchers. Students in schools that received a grade of “F” for two consecutive years out of four years were eligible for school vouchers (Greene, 2001). For the school year 2004 to 2005 there were 13 districts with “D” and “F” elementary schools (FLDOE, Assistance Plus).

The A+ Accountability Plan calls for increased accountability and more control to local districts and schools (Christ, Grading Florida). The plan is created to motivate schools to improve their academic performance and includes multiple measures of public schools through the four principles of NCLB. Those meeting all standards are designated as highly effective and efficient (Greene, 2001). According to Goldhaber and Hannaway (2004), the simplicity of the A to F grading scale is easily understood and carries a certain amount of symbolic value. Also the implementation has had a significant impact on the instructional focus of high- and low-performing schools. An increased time for academics has also occurred, and in turn the amount of time spent on subjects not tested as decreased (Goldhaber & Hannaway, 2004).

According to NCLB, each state must have a standard for measuring AYP. Adequate Yearly Progress in Florida is based on four measures to a determine schools performance: 1) school grades, 2) individual student progress, 3) student progress toward annual learning targets, and 4) return of investment measure that links dollars to student achievement (FLDOE, Assistance Plus).

Proficiency in Florida is based on student achievement, progress, and the percentage of students being tested. In order to prove proficiency, the students are tested annually on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test is a criterion-referenced assessment designed to measure how well students are learning the skills and competencies established in the Sunshine State Standards (SSS). FCAT is administered yearly in grades third through tenth. Students must pass the FCAT at grade 10 to earn a high school diploma. The assessment is designed to measure students’ mastery and progress. The FCAT is a tool for evaluation of the SSS and demonstration of the standards (Greene, 2001).

The FCAT tests students on mastery of the SSS and uses five achievement levels to determine proficiency. Level 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest. Level 1 is below basic, Level 2 is basic, Level 3 and 4 are proficient, and Level 5 is advanced. Students scoring Level 3 and above are
proficient according to the state. Schools ranking a “D” or “F” are labeled as critically low-performing and receive an intervention plan (Greene, 2001).

According to Goldhaber and Hannaway (2004), in a case study of Florida schools, four general themes emerged in Florida based on the implementation of the *A+ Accountability Plan*. First, both “A” and “F” schools felt tremendous pressure as a consequence of the A+ Plan, resulting in the narrowing of the instructional focus. Second, districts with “F” schools were receiving significant amounts of additional resources. Third, the accountability triggered new dynamics in allocation of personnel. Fourth, it was the social stigma of the “F”, opposed to the school vouchers that caused the motivation for success (Goldhaber & Hannaway, 2004, p. 600). The cumulative effects of the new state standards, comprehensive assessment, and the rewards and consequences that accompany the accountability program have raised educators’ attention to academic outcomes to a level previously unfamiliar to Florida. The narrowing in curriculum is brought on by the increase of a standards focused curriculum in preparation for the *FCAT*. A sense of urgency has spread throughout Florida schools to ensure that student curriculum and training will lead directly to improved test scores (George, 2001).

**A+ Assistance**

The comprehensive State of Florida accountability package is based on the belief that all children can learn and focuses on student achievement. The *A+ Accountability Plan* assigns schools a grade of “A” through “F” based on students performance on standardized tests, the improvement of the lowest 25%, and the percentage of students tested (FLDOE, *Assistance Plus*).

The *A+ Assistance Plan* offers incentive and rewards for success and remediation and consequences for failure. Schools that receive an “A” or improve by one grade letter will receive up to $100 bonus per student. The highest performing schools are also trusted with the responsibility of managing their own budget and incorporating innovative curriculum. Schools that fail expectations and receive a “D” or “F” are provided assistance and remediation as well as consequences if continued failure. If schools receive an “F” for two years within four years, students become eligible for *Opportunity Scholarships* and can attend a qualifying school of their choice (FLDOE, *Assistance Plus*).
Class Size Amendment

In November 2002, Florida voters passed the *Class Size Amendment*. The amendment ensured that by the beginning of 2010 the maximum number of students in prekindergarten through third grade does not exceed 18. The maximum number of students in grades fourth through eighth does not exceed 22. The maximum number of students in ninth through twelfth grades does not exceed 25 students. The requirements do not apply to extra curricular classes. The state is responsible for the cost associated, not the local school district. Beginning in 2003-2004, the legislature provided schools the money to reduce the average number of students by at least two per year until the maximum is not exceeded (Florida Constitution, *Class Size*).

Progress towards class size reduction is measured in groupings of K-3, 4-8, and 9-12 at the district level for 2003 to 2006. For 2006 to 2008, the progress will be measured at the school level. For 2008 to 2010, progress will be measured at the classroom level. The amendment pertains to core courses and the arts are not included. The FLDOE is responsible for ensuring schools are in compliance (FLDOE, *Class Size*).

**Standards Movement**

The preceding section addresses the National Art Standards and the Florida Sunshine State Standards. The drive and impact of both the National Art Standards and Sunshine State Standards are explained and contents of each are outlined.

Of all the education reforms that have merged over the past 15 years, none has been more powerful and enduring than the push to establish challenging academic standards for students (Education Commission of the States, 2000, p.1), Dorn et al. (2004) explained that a majority of the national education reform has focused on the implementation of standards as a result of only minimal agreement of numerous issues central to the education of students.

National Art Standards

According to Olson (2005, *Federal Government*), the impact of federal and state policies on arts, standards based education and its related accountability systems have been the dominating policy response at the federal and state level over the past two decades. Olson also reported that virtually every state in response to the requirements and laws has adopted standards for student learning as well as incentives and sanctions to encourage local schools to provide curriculum and instruction aligned with these standards. Olson expressed that there are specific concerns about the impact of the standards movement on student access to arts education. Olson further
explained that virtually every state has adopted standards for art education however few states have incorporated assessments of arts learning into their accountability systems. According to Cornbleth (1986), people assume that higher standards somehow enhance both teaching and learning; that more is better and that quantity becomes quality.

The National Art Standards outline what students should know and be able to do in the four-art disciplines—dance, music, theatre, and the visual arts in content and achievement. The standards define a good education in the arts as a thorough grounding in the knowledge and skills required to make sense and make use of the arts disciplines. The standards provide a vision of competence and educational effectiveness. The standards provide a foundation for connecting art related concepts and facts across the curriculum. The National Standards for Arts Education outline basic learning outcomes integral to the comprehensive K to 12 education of every student (Artsedge, *Summary Statement*).

The Consortium of National Arts Education Associations published the National Standards in 1994 through a grant administered by the National Association of Music Association (Artsedge, *Summary Statement*). The National Visual Art Standards provide a framework for helping students learn about the visual arts by using wide range of subject matter, symbols, meaningful images, and visual expressions to reflect their ideas, feelings and emotions and to evaluate them on their efforts (Art Teacher Connection, *National Standards*). The standards are structured so that many of the broad elements can be accomplished through specific educational objectives. The standards present educational goals and it is up to the teacher to choose appropriately and develop the curriculum. To meet the standards students must learn vocabularies and concepts associated with various types of work in the visual arts (Art Teacher Connection, *National Standards*).

In kindergarten through grade four students experiment with art materials and investigate the ideas presented to them. Students work with various tools, processes, and media to learn to coordinate their hands and minds and explore the visual world. Students build on these abilities and develop skills of observation to examine events across time and places. The goal is to expand their ability to describe, interpret, evaluate, and respond to work in the visual arts and appraise value and purpose. Students begin to understand the meaning and impact of the visual world in which they live (Art Teacher Connection, *National Standards*).
The National Standards are divided into six content standards. The first Content Standard is to understand and apply media, techniques, and processes. This standard incorporates knowing the differences between the materials, techniques, and processes and how they cause different responses and communicate ideas, experiences, and stories. Students must also learn to use these materials in a safe manner. The second Content Standard addresses the structures and functions in which students must know the difference among visual characteristics and purposes in art in order to convey ideas and to describe how expressive features and organizational principles cause different responses and communicate ideas. The third Content Standard is the choosing and evaluating of a range of subject matter. The students explore and understand perspective content for works of art and select and use subject matter, symbols, and ideas to communicate meaning. The fourth Content Standard is the understanding of the visual arts in relation to history and cultures. The students learn that visual arts have a history and relationship to various cultures and identify works of art that belong to different cultures, times, and places and demonstrate how different cultures and times influence each other in the making of art. The fifth Content Standard is reflecting on and assessing the characteristics and merits of their work and the work of others. Students must understand that there are different purposes for creating works of art and describe how people’s experiences influence the development of specific artworks, and understand that these create different responses to specific works of art. The sixth Content Standard makes connections between visual arts and other disciplines. Students understand and use similarities and differences between characteristics of visual arts and other arts disciplines and identify the connection to other disciplines in the curriculum (Art Teacher Connection, *National Standards*).

Students in grades 5 to 8 engage in developmentally appropriate learning experiences to prepare them to achieve these standards. The standards are based on the preceding grades K to 4 standards but the curriculum is dependent upon the state, school districts, and teachers. Students continue to learn under a framework that aids in learning the characteristics of visual arts that become increasingly complex. As students develop their skills, they are encouraged to apply their knowledge and skills to their academic and personal world. Students’ expressions should be more personal and individualistic than previous grades and their art making include a variety of images and approaches and learn their personal preferences. They understand that art is influenced by aesthetic ideas, social, political, and economic factors (Art Teacher Connection, *National Standards*).
The Content Standards are titled similarly but develop on the foundation learned in the preceding grades. Students learn to analyze what makes techniques and processes effective or not and explain their choices and use art to express their ideas and experiences. Within structures and functions, students learn to use these to reflect upon their own artwork, analyze why or why not they are effective, and select and use qualities to improve their own communication of ideas. Students learn to choose and evaluate a wider range of subject matter, symbols, and ideas and integrate visual and spatial concepts to communicate meaning; and select these based on knowledge of context, values, and aesthetics. The relation to history and other cultures is increased to compare the characteristics of various eras and cultures and describe and place art objects in their cultural and historical contexts and analyze and describe how time and place influence the meaning and value of art (Art Teacher Connection, National Standards).

Sunshine State Standards

The Sunshine State Standards (SSS) are rigorous and with high academic expectations. The SSS were developed by the Department of Education in 1994 to give parents, students, teachers, and administrators an understanding of skills and competencies. The State Board of Education approved the SSS in 1996 to provide expectations for student achievement in Florida. The SSS cover mathematics, language arts, social studies, science, the arts, health and physical education, and foreign languages. The SSS have been implemented to create a system of high standards through the development of clear expectations to measure and monitor student progress. The standards are written for subject areas divided into grade clusters of PreK to 2, 3 to 5, 6 to 8, and 9 to 12. The SSS were further developed to include Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) that outline what should occur at each grade and are the basis for assessment at grades 3 to 10 in language arts, mathematics and science (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

The SSS for art are a direct reflection of the National Standards however they are categorized into PreK through 2nd grade and 3rd through 5th that relate to elementary schools. Skills and Techniques require students to apply media technique and process but specifically explain the use of two-dimensional and three-dimensional media, tools and processes to make art from personal experience, and observation and imagination. SSS require students to develop basic process and motor skills in a safe manners and distinguish within these the elements and principles of design and use good craftsmanship when producing works of art (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).
Creation and Communication uses subject matter, symbols, and ideas of structures and functions of visual art but specify that they must be used to communicate meaning and cause a variety of responses. Students must also know that art is created for a variety of purposes and use the elements and principles of design to communicate ideas (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

Cultural and Historical Connections requires students to understand the visual arts in relation to history and culture. Specifically, students must know that certain works of art belong to specific cultures, times, and places. Students must also understand that artists express their ideas according to their individual, cultural, and historical experiences (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

Aesthetic and Critical Analysis requires the students to assess, evaluate, and respond to characteristics of art through the use of age appropriate vocabulary to describe, analyze and interpret, and make judgments about art. Students must understand that works of art can be realistic, symbolic, or abstract and know the difference between an original and a reproduction (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

Applications to Life require students to make connections between the visuals arts, other disciplines, and the real world. Students must understand that people create art for various reasons and artists design everyday objects. Students must know that they can choose art as a career and understand and use appropriate behavior in a cultural experience (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

For students in the 3rd through 5th grades, the SSS retain the Content Strands but require students to build on their skills and expand on the previously learned foundations. Skills and Techniques require students to use and organize two-and three-dimensional media, techniques, and processes based on their personal experiences, observations, and imagination and to be able to control materials. Students must also know the effects and functions of the elements and principles of design and use good craftsmanship in a variety of media (FLDOE, Grade Level Expectations).

Creation and Communication requires students to understand the subject matter used to create works of art and also include themes as well as the previously learned experience, observation, and imagination. They must also understand what makes different media, techniques, and processes effective in communicating ideas. Students identify the intentions of artists and use the
elements and principles of design with sufficient manipulative skills, confidence, and sensitivity to communicate ideas (FLDOE, *Grade Level Expectations*).

Cultural and Historical Connections requires students to understand the similarities and differences in a variety of works and understand how the artists have used visual languages and symbol systems through time and across cultures (FLDOE, *Grade Level Expectations*).

Aesthetics and Critical Analysis develops and justifies criteria for the evaluation of visual works using appropriate vocabulary and uses different approaches to respond to and judge various works of art and understand the similarities and differences among different genres of art (FLDOE, *Grade Level Expectations*).

Applications to Life require students understand the influence of art of everyday life and know the types of tasks performed by various artists and some of their required training. Students must also understand the similarities and differences and contributions of galleries, studios and museums (FLDOE, *Grade Level Expectations*).

**National Assessment of Educational Progress Art Test**

In three decades only two national assessments of the arts have been conducted, in 1972 and 1997, with another proposed for 2008, yet few states include arts assessments in their accountability systems (Olson, 2005, *Federal Government*). The following section explains the National Assessment of Educational Progress’ assessment of arts including the content, framework, purpose, and administration of the assessment.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is often called the Nation’s Report Card and represents the only national representative and continuing assessment of what America’s public and private students know and can do in various subjects (National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), 2003). NAEP was designed as a survey assessment in 1969 to produce national results and expanded to produce state level results in 1990 and results of selected large urban schools have been available since 2002. NAEP’s two major goals are to measure student achievement and report change in performance over time. NAEP reports on nationally representative samples in grades 4, 8, and 12 and on state level samples of students in grades 4 and 8. NAEP assessments were conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (National Center for Home Education, *Issue Update*).

NAEP had assessed the arts in 1975 and 1978 prior to the NAEP 1997 arts assessment, which measures students’ knowledge, and skills in creating, performing, and responding to works of
dance, music, theater, and visual arts. Complex performance tasks were used to assess students’ abilities to create and perform works of art. The assessments also had students study artworks and then do exercises exploring aesthetic properties and expressive aspects of the works (National Center for Home Education, Issue Update).

The assessment content of the NAEP includes: 1) knowledge and understanding, 2) perceptual, technical, expressive, and 3) intellectual/reflective skills. The process portion includes 1) creating and 2) responding. The results measured students’ ability to analyze, interpret, and describe works of art (Askew, Persky, & Sandene, 1998).

The NAEP Arts Assessment Framework describes the goals of the assessment (NCES, 2003). The framework provides the theoretical basis of the assessment; directions for what kinds of exercises should be included in the assessment, how they should be designed, and how student responses should be scored. The framework is an outline of what art educators, curriculum experts, policymakers, and members of the general public thought the test should be (National Center for Home Education, Issue Update).

Educational Testing Service helped create assessment questions and scoring criteria. Four kinds of assessments were conducted. Student questionnaires examined background characteristics and subject area experience. Teacher questionnaires gathered data on the background and training of teachers and classroom-by-classroom information. School questionnaires asked principals about school size and other characteristics. Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency questionnaires asked about accommodations normally permitted. The NAEP was conducted nationally at grade 8 due to budgetary constraints but the intention was to assess at grade 4, 8, and 12. For music and arts, representative samples of public and nonpublic schools were assessed (NCES, 2003). The visual arts sample included 2,500 students in private and public school regardless of art background (Askew, Persky, & Sandene, 1998).

The purpose of the NAEP was to examine and report on developing abilities of students and connect with students’ real life experiences of the visual arts and evaluate students through performance including critical judgment. The test aimed to address the processes and products of the visual arts and expand the public’s awareness of the importance of each. Another goal was to produce information useful to a variety of audiences and reflect a pluralistic view of visual arts education with individual products and cultural bases. The framework is based on the vision of a
society that believes the arts are essential for every child’s complete development and education. Students must be able to draw on artistic experiences and knowledge as a means of understanding themselves and their world (NCES, 2003).

The NAEP was administered to make objective information on student performance available to policymakers at local, state, and national levels as part of the evaluation of the condition and progress of education. The National Assessment Governing Board was established to formulate policy guidelines and select subject areas to be assessed, develop assessment objectives, identify appropriate achievement goals for each grade level and subject tested, and establish standards and procedures for interstate and national comparisons (National Assessment Governing Board, 1997, *Arts Education*).

**Testing in Schools**

Assessment and testing has reached a historical high. Testing in all subjects affects the field of art education. The following section explains testing in the schools, its impact of school climate and art education.

According to the United States Department of Education (2004), the task of educating people has historically been left up to state and local governments. However, due to the universal importance of education, the federal government assumed a larger role in financing education with the passage of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* in 1965. In 2001, the reauthorization included *No Child Left Behind*, which asks the state to set standards for student performance and teacher quality (United States Department of Education, 2004).

As of the 2002 to 2003 school year, there were 14,465 public school districts in the United States and 95,615 public schools, which remain the primary educational delivery system. The majority of American public school students, 52%, attend suburban schools. Thirty one percent of public school students attend city schools and 17% attend rural schools (President George Bush, 2001).

A 2002 study entitled “Teacher Buying Behavior and Attitudes 2001-2002” found 61% of K-8 teachers said that their students spend “too much” time on standardized test-taking, while another 44% said the test-taking was having a negative impact on the learning experience in their classroom. In contrast only 12% said the effect of test-taking was positive (Bloomfield & Cooper, 2003, p. 6).
Dorn et al. (2004, p. 44) found that art testing programs are being designed and implemented; however, fewer than 25% of states are developing arts assessment components as part of their testing requirements. Skinner (2005) reported:

For the 2004 to 2005 school year, 46 states have standards based tests in place in reading and math at the elementary, middle, and high school level. Twenty-two states have standards based science tests in all three-grade spans. Only twelve states, down from 14 last year, have standards based social studies tests in all three spans. Twenty-two states report that their state assessments have undergone an external review since 2001 to ensure that the tests are aligned with academic content standards (p. 2).

Phillips (2004) claimed that testing is only one part of the overall field of education as an integral part of the practice of education and is often the most visible measure of the success or failure of the educational endeavor.

Dorn et al. (2004) summarized a list of student and personnel attempts at improving student performance on tests claiming that mandated testing programs are changing the climate of schools and these changes are not for the better. Dorn et al. continued to describe the current climate and context for assessment in our school as “testing mania” since state legislatures, school administrators, and the general public use to gauge school performance and success (p. 43). As a result Dorn et al. reported that test scores have become the judgment of a school’s quality and worth. They claim that although contracts exist to provide incentives to teachers, wage increases might depend on test scores. The question remains of whether learning within our schools has increased or if students have acquired the skills or competencies necessary to be considered literate.

According to Shuler (2003), the most obvious and important problem with chasing test scores is that they represent such a narrow range of what children need to know and should be able to do. Shuler addressed that another problem with focusing single mindedly on test scores is that the content of tests is determined by decisions that are often more political or economical than educational.

**Teacher Work Conditions**

The 67 counties in Florida provide a diverse set of teacher work conditions. Much of what happens on a daily basis is a representation of the counties’ union, and district and school administration. The following section recognizes the expectations and importance of teacher
work conditions and identifies the similarities, differences, and issues in regards to Florida teacher work conditions.

Loveless (2000) claimed that schooling in the 21st Century has taken on two different approaches. The first approach included the factory model in which district officials strive to effectively manage the operation of large, uniform schools, while teachers serve as workers in a production line process delivering standardized education to students. The second approach of the professional model gained prominence during the second wave of educational reform and recognized that schools must be responsive to their students, communities, and school’s needs and autonomy and flexibility should take precedent over the district pursuit of order and uniformity.

Loveless (2000) cited the first wave of educational reform from 1983 to 1986 as a response to *A Nation at Risk* which set out to change teachers by monitoring and assessing their practices and offering money for local programs and identified and rewarded teachers and schools. Since reforms affect teacher’s wages and working conditions, they were subject to legal negotiation and impacted teacher unions.

According to Loveless (2000), industrial bargaining emerged in the 1960s when teachers won the right to organize and negotiate about hours, wages, and working conditions. Loveless reported that the 1980s attempted a second approach called reforming bargaining in which they worked collaboratively for change with union leaders and administrators including implementing peer review for teachers.

Collective bargaining is a process in which the faculty and board of trustees interact as equals to negotiate wages, terms, and conditions of employment. The process results in a legally binding agreement. The faculty uses collective bargaining as a toll to strengthen faculty input in the decision making process. Collective bargaining causes a greater involvement in the decision-making process and increased shared governance. Collective bargaining also defines conditions of employment that minimize uncertainty and resolves disputes through a fair and effective procedure. Collective bargaining results in a negotiated agreement that is secure and legally binding and offers the opportunity for faculty to partner in decisions that affect salary, pay practices and working conditions (National Education Association, *Frequently Asked*).

According to the National Education Association (*Frequently Asked*), a collective bargaining agreement has the full force of the law behind it and will hold up in a court of law. A contract
cannot be changed during the negotiated agreement unless the school and union agree to the changes. The faculty and state can only authorize strikes. Faculty compelled to start a strike have to vote on the issue and in some states it is illegal to strike. Some contracts also have a no strike clause that prohibits striking during the time of contract. The National Education Association further explained the responsibility of a union under a collective bargaining agreement is to ensure that all faculties have the right to due process. A faculty should only be subject to discipline or discharge for just cause and the union and faculty should assure the right to due process or the integrity of the contract and procedural rights of the contract must be defended. All faculties do not have to join the union nor do they have to pay the union dues.

The terms of teachers working conditions are based on the collective bargaining of the union and certain districts unions have been more successful than others in seeking ideal working conditions for teachers (National Education Association, Frequently Asked). According to Bob Chase, president of the National Education Association, the “new unionism” was to expand the traditional role of the union to include issues of quality in teachers, support staff, and educational opportunities for students (National Education Association, 2000, ¶ 8). The “new unionism” was focused on student achievement, teacher and support professional quality, and school system capacity (National Education Association, 2000, ¶ 6). According to Chase, the “new unionism” was not to back away from the rights of members because salaries and working conditions are important components of student achievement (¶ 3).

An investigation into the Florida Union approved work conditions resulted in variability. The consistent factors found in work conditions is that teachers in the state of Florida work a 7.33 hour day and are assigned ten sick days that are distributed to them monthly (Florida Education Association (FEA), 2003). Recently, with the Class Size Amendment Act teachers can anticipate uniform class size in the future but currently class sizes vary (FLDOE, Class Size). Salaries, compensated planning and meetings, health care, and classroom conditions of are dependent upon the district (FEA, 2003).

The National Education Association (Make It Happen) claimed that an effort is in place to ensure the working conditions for teachers are attractive and include smaller class sizes, adequate attractive classrooms, and sufficient supplies and materials to assist learning. States are also providing teachers opportunities to attend classes to improve their teaching strategies and increase technology in the classroom.
According to the National Education Association (2000), teachers have flexible work schedules with most holidays and summers off. The National Education Association also claimed that teachers are gaining influence about decisions including coursework, textbooks, and expanding opportunities for creativity. The National Education Association also claimed that teacher pay is increasing as the country realizes the need to attract more qualified teachers but salaries differ from state to state and even district-to-district. Another claim was that teachers have attractive benefits including health, dental, and other insurances.

In research that dates back to the 1950s, teacher work conditions can almost be mimicked as for what research also supports today. According to Bradfield and Edwards (1958), a very close relationship exists between teacher working conditions and morale. Several of the main problems for teacher turnover include teacher salaries, excessive duties, overcrowded classrooms, lack of equipment and materials, student discipline, unhappy teacher relations, and inadequate supervisory assistance (Bradfield and Edwards, 1958). The four most popular reasons for quitting teaching, according to McLaughlin and Nicholson (1956), were clerical work, supervisory duties, inadequate salaries, and too many meetings.

The Status of the American Public School Teacher, a survey conducted by the National Education Association released in August of 2003, found that the average teacher has a master’s degree, 15 years of experience, and spends 50 hours a week instructing and 12 hours of noncompensated preparation time. The survey also determined that 77% of teachers participate in professional development and 35% participate during their summers. The amount of out of pocket expenses is averaged at $443 however 60% stated they would choose to become a teacher again if they could. The number one reason to leave is the complaint of salaries, which was supported by 37% (FEA, 2003).

**Teacher Incentive Programs**

Recent decades support struggling teacher salaries, a diminishing population, and increased accountability demanding higher teacher standards and numbers. In an attempt to attract new teachers, reward current teachers, and compete with other states, Florida has attempted and enacted several incentive programs for teachers. The incentive programs are a reflection of options policymakers believe will attract and retain highly qualified teachers. The following section outlines incentive programs and the perception and feedback of each program.
Pay for Performance/Merit Pay

Delisio (*Pay for Performance*) asserted that alternatives to the traditional teacher step pay system have been attempted with minimal success. Teachers have traditionally been paid for how long they have been teaching regardless of how well. The step system currently in place was implemented to equalize salaries in the profession. The process of developing a new system takes time and money for school boards and unions. Merit Pay is defined as individual teachers receiving bonuses based on improvements in their performance. Delisio added that Knowledge and Skill based pay is defined as teachers earning permanent increases for acquiring new skills and applying those skills. Performance Pay provides increases tied to improvements in students’ performance measured by standardized tests or other credit. School-based performance pay rewards all professional staff in a school a bonus if students meet particular goals. Previous models of performance pay have selected teachers based on subjective, rather than objective criteria (Delisio, *Pay for Performance*).

The National Education Association opposes Merit Pay unless certain criteria are met but does support additional compensation for teachers in hard to staff districts and those who earn national certification. The National Education Association is committed to a single salary schedule that rewards experience and knowledge, which are proven factors that increase student achievement (National Education Association, 2000).

The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) supports developing long-term goals, providing ongoing funding, and creating clear standards and objectives that teachers are familiar with in any performance pay plan. The AFT is not opposed to alternative pay structures if certain conditions are in place (American Federation of Teachers (AFT), 2001).

In 2002, Florida passed a law that requires school districts to provide bonuses to teachers and administration of up to 5 % of their salaries based on student performance. School districts determine the qualifications for bonuses but the state recommends the use of data from the reading and math assessments. However there is no separate funding and districts must allocate the existing funding to cover bonuses (Delisio, *Pay for Performance*).

According to the 3rd National Education Summit of 1999, Pay for Performance provides financial rewards to teachers with increased student achievement but there is a need to align the performance with standards, assessments and accountability (Business Roundtable and National Alliance of Business, 1999). Five models were studied including Denver, Pennsylvania,
Cincinnati, North Carolina, and Los Angeles and results deducted that in order for Performance Pay to work it must be fair and achievable and aligned with priorities and reforms. The study recommended that Performance Pay collaborate with all stakeholders, offer a variety of objectives, put support structures in place, and use acceptable indicators (Business Roundtable and National Alliance of Business, 1999).

American Federation of Teachers recognized several obstacles exist with any pay plan based on knowledge, performance, or merit. One obstacle is that plans are usually under funded and districts cannot support the current budget much less the incorporation of pay increases. Another difficulty is that the plan is not connected to outcomes or if they are it is based on standardized tests, which the unions disapprove of because it causes a narrowing of the curriculum. Another problem is that most systems have required an all or nothing plan without rewards for gradual performance development. Pay for Performance reward teachers for acquiring additional knowledge and skills related to standards. The current system does not reward additional skills and knowledge that benefits children (AFT, 2001).

Best Career Ladder

In 2003 Florida legislation passed the Better Educated Students and Teachers (BEST) Act as a reaction to failed Performance and Merit Pay Plans. Florida has enacted the BEST Career ladder, which implemented a salary compensated career ladder beginning with the year 2004 to 2005 (FEA, 2003). The program is designed to elevate the teaching profession and improve student achievement. BEST is based on seven principles: 1) to provide multiple career paths for teachers, 2) provide market based compensation, 3) performance based accountability, 4) support ongoing and applied professional growth, 5) school leadership, 6) high quality instruction of low-performing students, and 7) expand the supply of highly qualified teachers. The plan is composed of four levels: 1) Associate Teacher, 2) Professional Teacher, 3) Lead Teacher, and 4) Mentor Teacher (FEA, 2003). The major issue with the career ladder is lack of funding. Since Florida teachers currently make $5,649 less that the average salary and $5,552 below the neighboring state of Georgia most teachers are eagerly awaiting the implementation (FEA, 2003).

Teacher Effectiveness

The elusive qualities of what makes a teacher effective have lead to years of an analysis of teacher effectiveness. The debate over what makes a teacher effective as well as how to retain
these teachers has been an on-going debate. The subsequent section concentrates on the concept of teacher effectiveness in relation to art education.

The quality of arts in education depends ultimately upon the talented teacher working with creative students (Boyd, 1980, p 24). According to Gowan (1960), we must first assume that teacher effectiveness is observable and measurable before we accept that procedures lend themselves for such measurement. Gowan stated that the two methods for measurement of teacher effectiveness include self-reporting and observations done by third parties. Gowan also stated that the basic problem with addressing teacher effectiveness is determining the criterion for what makes and effective teacher.

McLaughlin and Nicholson (1956) claimed numerous attempts to understand the criteria for teacher effectiveness have been conducted to determine the relationship between teachers, students and educational situations with minimal acceptance of standards. Different instruments of either objectively tested or observed performance or subjective evaluations are used for measurement to teacher effectiveness. The options include supervisor observation in which the administration observes a teacher at a particular moment in time. Another form of measurement is peer observation from a more experienced and qualified teacher over a series of teaching situations.

National Education Association (NCLB) found a review of good and sound research shows that an effective teacher, and therefore teacher quality, is a critical determinant of how students learn. NCLB states that large-scale studies suggest teacher quality is more closely related to student achievement than other factors such as class size, spending, and instructional materials (National Education Association, NCLB).

According to NCLB, to be highly qualified a teachers must 1) hold a bachelor’s degree, 2) hold a certification or licensure to teach in the state of his or her employment, and 3) have proven knowledge of the subjects he or she teaches (National Education Association, NCLB).

**Supporting Research of Art in Schools**

Research on the status of arts education in public schools has been conducted from the United States Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics. This research served as a model for the current study. The following section highlights findings from research on arts education in the public school system.

Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools
The United States Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics (2002) found that as of 1998, there were no national data sources that specifically addressed the condition of the arts in the nation’s public schools. However, a study was conducted by the National Center for Education (NCES) in 1994 that provided national data concerning public schools’ approaches to arts education. The survey conducted in 1999 to 2000 was considered a follow up to the 1994 study and presented a more complete picture of arts education by providing information on educational backgrounds, professional development activities, and teaching loads (United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p. 2). Results of the study were embraced by the arts education community as the single source of national data on this topic.

The United States Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics (2002) survey provided a national profile on the status of arts education in the nation’s public schools from 1999 to 2000. The study, Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, focused on the characteristics of arts education programs including staffing, funding, supplemental programs and activities, and administrative support of arts education. The findings of the survey provided baseline information on the extent to which public schools were including the arts as core subjects in their curricula.

Key findings of Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools (United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p. iv) indicated that 55% of elementary schools employ a visual arts specialist and of those 56% had rooms dedicated to the instruction of visual arts. Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools also found that 65% of regular public schools sponsored field trips to art galleries or museums.

The United States Department of Education and National Center for Education Statistics (2002) also gathered information related to the preparation, working environments, and instructional practices of elementary visual arts instructors. In 1999 to 2000, 39% of visual arts teachers had a master’s degree and 79% reported participating in professional development (United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, p. iv). Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools also reported that on a typical day, visual art teachers taught an average on five classes and an average of 4.2 hours of planning per week.
The National Art Education Association released portions of the 1999 to 2000 study that focused on the results of the impact of testing on art teachers in secondary schools (National Art Education Association, 2001). Among the findings of *Art Teachers in Secondary Schools* (National Art Education Association, 2001, p.13) reported that 26% of teachers felt the state mandates had a negative impact on their instructional programs for the following reasons:

1. Students are not given opportunities to take art class unless they do well on standardized tests.
2. Students are discouraged from taking art and are encouraged to take math and other “tested” courses in preparation for the tests.
3. Art teachers can’t take students out of tested classes for field trips.
4. Some art teachers have to teach math and other courses in their classes.
5. Students are pulled out of art classes for remedial work, etc.

*Art Teachers in Secondary Schools* (National Art Education Association, 2001, p.14) reported that slightly less than one quarter of teachers believed the testing mandates had a positive impact on their instructional program for the following reasons:

1. Teachers and students are more concerned about their classroom work.
2. Expectations are higher.
3. Art classes help to reinforce math, writing, and other subject matter.

Finally, *Art Teachers in Secondary Schools* (National Art Education Association, 2001, p.14) reported that 41% of teacher felt there was no impact of the mandates on their instructional program for the following reasons:

1. There is no impact because art courses are not tested.
2. Integration of coursework was already occurring before testing mandates were issued.

**Learning in and through the Arts**

*The Learning In and Through the Arts* (1999) study of over 2,000 pupils in grades four through eighth claimed that schools with strong arts programs had supportive administrators that played a central role in ensuring the continuity and depth of provision, encouraging teachers to take risks, learn new skills, and broaden their curriculum. The study claimed that a narrowly conceived curriculum where the arts are limited or not offered exerts a negative effect on development of critical cognitive competencies and personal dispositions (Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 2000).
The Learning In and Through the Arts study (1999), found a significant relationship between rich in school art programs and creative, cognitive, and personal competencies needed for academic success. The study focused on three interrelated questions: 1) what is arts learning, 2) does it extend to learning in other school subjects, and 3) what conditions in schools support this learning? The findings support that children in high arts schools are more likely to have a good rapport with their teachers than those in low arts schools. As well, teachers in high arts schools demonstrate more interest in their work and participate in more professional development opportunities. The study also found that in high arts schools there is greater flexibility in curriculum design and less emphasis on conformity, formalization, or centralization (Burton, Horowitz, & Abeles, 2000).

Conclusion

The research consolidated in this chapter identified historical waves of education reforms and their affect on the educational system and teachers. The sequential explanation of art education established the foundation for which art education has progressed and the current direction the field is headed. The historical impact of educational reform explained previous reforms and their impact on the teaching profession to establish an expectation of how current reforms were predicted to impact the field. The research supported that NCLB and Florida Education acts have changed the teaching profession unlike any previous reform. The content collected for standards movement identified that the creation of challenging standards for students has become the dominating force in education. The National Assessment of Educational Progress provided the outline of what students know and can do in various subjects, including art. Testing in the schools has become an integral part of education and affects art education in the public schools. Teacher work conditions and incentive programs support teacher effectiveness and the research provided an overview of each. The literature review was created to provide an examination of how the status of being an art teacher has changed over time based on educational policy, school climate, and art education development. The literature review set out to understand historical patterns that may serve as a guideline for the impact of current reforms on education, specifically art education.

Art Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools served as a model for the research conducted. Although characteristics of the study were adapted, certain aspects used to determine areas of needed research and assist with the survey design. The review of literature
also served as the framework for the art teacher questionnaire providing historical reference on the impact of federal and state education reforms on selected Florida elementary art teachers.
CHAPTER III
METHODS

Statement of the Problem

The enactment of multiple federal and state education reforms has impacted the role of elementary art teachers in Florida. In Florida, the effects of AYP, FCAT, school grades, and other implications of educational reforms are changing the daily lives of art teachers in Florida. A school’s grade influences all operational procedures for the following year and as a result art teachers’ assignments, responsibilities, and expectations are changing. The school grades increased from 49 “F” schools in 2004 to 78 in 2005 (Dipietre & Etters, 2005, ¶ 3). The purpose of the study was to explore how the conditions of: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations as well as perceptions of change in conditions of elementary art teachers in high-and low-performing schools. The design of the study consisted of a questionnaire to examine trends of art teachers at high-performing and low-performing schools and examine the similarities and differences across sectors in relation to their perception of the impact of federal and state educational reforms. This study will add to existing knowledge of teacher work conditions and contribute to information on the current teaching status of art teachers in Florida.

Research Questions

1. What are the relationships between high- and low-performing schools’ art teacher conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations?
2. What is the relationship between high-and low-performing schools’ art teacher perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations with respect to federal and state education reforms?

Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Specific Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1a states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments. Hypothesis 1a denotes assignments and includes the number of art classes per week, hours spent teaching per week, type of scheduling, and subjects taught other than art.
Hypothesis 1b states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: responsibilities. Hypothesis 1b denotes responsibilities and includes planning period, hours of planning per week, and before, during, after school, and weekend duties.

Hypothesis 1c states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including expectations. Hypothesis 1c denotes expectations and includes state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and training attendance.

Null Hypothesis

The Null hypothesis states that there is no difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Specific Hypothesis

Hypothesis 2a states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments. Hypothesis 2a denotes assignments and includes the number of art classes per week, hours spent teaching per week, type of scheduling, subjects taught other than art, and physical location of art room.

Hypothesis 2b states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: responsibilities. Hypothesis 2b denotes responsibilities and includes planning period, hours of planning per week, and before, during, after school, and weekend duties.

Hypothesis 2c states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including expectations. Hypothesis 2c denotes expectations and includes state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and training attendance.
Null Hypothesis

The Null hypothesis states that there is no difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

**Participating Schools**

For the purpose of the study, grades from the 2004-2005 school year were used. The identified grade carried over to the designated 2005-2006 school year. Schools that received a grade of “A” or “B” were considered high-performing and schools that received a grade of “D” or “F” were low-performing. The total 1,842 high-performing schools in the state greatly exceed the 309 low-performing schools and a greater separation exists when deduced to include only elementary schools. There were only 81 low-performing elementary schools in Florida for the 2005-2006. The participants were Florida elementary art teachers from districts that have “A” and “B” and “D” and “F” elementary schools. Thirteen Florida districts out of 67 contain both “A” and “B” and “D” and “F” schools resulting in 889 high-performing elementary schools and 81 low-performing elementary schools. To be included in the study, teachers had to teach in one of the 13 districts containing both “A” and “B” and “D” and “F” schools, instruct students in grades kindergarten through sixth in art, and voluntarily complete the elementary art teacher questionnaire.

Elementary art teachers from all of the 81 low-performing schools were surveyed while 81 teachers were randomly selected from within the 889 high-performing schools. It was later learned that of the 81 low-performing schools, 26 did not have art teachers, therefore the number of low-performing elementary art teachers available decreased to 55. To accommodate for this difference, 55 responses from high-performing elementary art teachers were randomly selected to provide equal representation. At the conclusion of the survey distribution, 23 of the 55 art teachers (42%) from the low-performing group submitted their questionnaires. Therefore, 23 high-performing responses were randomly selected to provide equal representation with the 23 low-performing responses. The result was 23 participants from high- and low-performing schools for a total of 46 participants.

Descriptive statistical information was collected from section 1) demographic information of the questionnaire. This section identified the characteristics of the high-performing and low-performing groups as presented in Table 1, with the alpha defined as p<.01. All dimensions
could have occurred by chance with the exception of gender, level of education, and average enrollment. These characteristics potentially intervened the relationship between the school performance and dependent variables.

Composition of High- and Low-Performing Groups

The high-performing group had slightly more males than females and was statistically significant (see Table 1.). The race of the high-performing group included 4% as “Other”, which was not a factor with low-performing schools. The low-performing group reported a higher mean held their masters degree, which was significant. For both groups, 100% of the teachers were certified in art in Florida and reported equivalent mean scores of 8.7 for National Board Certification. An equivalent mean score of 10 was also reported for years taught in Florida from both groups. The low-performing group reported a higher mean score of 7.8 compared to the high-performing group mean score of 6.7 for years taught at this school. The low-performing group also reported a slightly higher mean score of 7.4 for years teaching art at this school. The high-performing group reported a mean score of 6.0 for years teaching art at this school. The enrollment of the high-performing group was higher with a mean score of 774. The low-performing schools reported a mean score of 757.

Other characteristics that identified high- and low-performing groups included average class size and art class location. These items required categorical responses as opposed to numeric. The average class size provided three responses: 1) 19 to 22 which was higher for the low-performing group, 2) 23 to 25 which was higher for the low-performing group, and 3) 26 and above which was higher for the high-performing group, which was significant.

The question regarding art class location provided three responses: 1) art room, 2) art cart, and 3) classroom. The high-performing group art location for art room was 91% and lower at 78% for the low-performing group. The art cart average for the high-performing group was 4% and higher at 17% for the low-performing group. The average for classroom was equivalent at 4% for both groups.
### Table 1.
Characteristics of High- and Low-Performing Groups by School Performance All Inclusive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Board Certification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years taught art in Florida</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years taught at this school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years taught at this school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average class size</td>
<td>26+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Room</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art class location</td>
<td>Art Cart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p&lt; .01</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures**

In order to obtain the proper contact information for the elementary art teachers in the selected districts, each district art supervisor was contacted. The initial contact of the district supervisor provided the number of elementary art teachers and their contact information,
including email, which was the main means for survey distribution. The initial contact also provided the proper means for ensuring research approval and permission for the art teachers to participate in the study. Although there are 81 low-performing schools in Florida, contact with district officials revealed that 26 of those schools did not have a full time art teacher. As a result, the number of art teachers surveyed from low-performing schools totaled 55. However, this information was provided after 81 surveys were distributed to the high-performing schools. As a result, 55 surveys responses were randomly selected from the 81 high-performing participants.

The information from the district supervisor was used to obtain the 55 elementary art teachers’ email addresses from the low-performing schools and the 889 email addresses from high-performing schools. The emails representing the 889 high-performing schools were randomly selected electronically to ensure 81 participants. The emails were assigned a number that would remain their identity though the duration of the study and ensure anonymity and accurate record and data computation without biases. The district supervisor provided the necessary information that resulted in the entire 55 participants of low-performing schools and 81 randomly selected participants representing the high-performing schools. As previously noted, the 81 randomly selected participants were deduced through random selection to arrive at 55 as a result of the lack of elementary art teachers in low-performing schools.

An introductory letter and request for permission to conduct research was sent to the art supervisors and district officials of the 13 districts. After contact and approval from the 13 selected school districts, introductory letters and informed consent forms were sent to the selected elementary art teachers explaining the research, commitment, and the expectations of the participants. Art teachers received their questionnaires through email or standard mail along with instructions for submitting their questionnaire and return postage. Non-respondents received a reminder email two weeks later and the following week another mailing to non-respondents was sent out. A final reminder was sent the following week. At the conclusion of the survey collection, thank you notices were to all respondents.

The procedure followed represented the Total Design Method (Dillman, 1999). The Total Design Method consists of a personalized cover letter, copy of the questionnaire, and reply method. After about two weeks, a reminder is sent to all non-respondents. After another two weeks, a second complete packet is sent to non-respondents. Following the Total Design Method a 40-60% response rate is expected (Dillman, 1999).
The survey was administered through art teachers’ school email addresses for equal feasibility and accessibility of teachers. However, electronic survey distribution was challenging particularly at the low-performing schools. As a result, surveys were mailed and faxed according to participant request. The convenience and needs of the respondents were considered to support high response rates. The pilot and field test suggested the most convenient time of the school year to conduct the survey. Therefore the questionnaire was distributed after the 2005 to 2006 FCAT since that is regarded as the busiest time of year. In order to assess the current school year, it was necessary to conduct the survey towards the end of the school year. However, the survey needed to also be distributed prior to the last month of school since teachers are completing their end of school requirements during this time and schools close on various days. The collection of data during the administration was key to the validity of the research. The goal was to collect data exactly as intended and not use questionnaires that had only partial responses, had been tampered with, or did not complete according to the directions since this will skew the data. Confidentiality and anonymity were kept as promised in the informed consent. School districts required that individual teachers and school districts remain anonymous and unidentifiable. Following the code of ethics as a researcher, numeric codes were assigned to each selected email address and used to identify respondents rather than names. Information and results will not be shared with other organizations in a manner that districts or individuals can be identified. The findings are presented to ensure anonymity of participants and validity of the study.

**Instrumentation**

Instrumentation included one questionnaire to determine the conditions and perceptions of elementary art teachers. The construction was designed to facilitate comparisons of elementary art teachers at high-performing and low-performing schools. The questionnaire obtained information on art teacher’s conditions including assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and perceptions of the impact of federal and state education reforms. The instrument consisted of six sections for a total of 35 questions as a one page, but front and back instrument. The sections included:

I) Demographic information

II) Population and scheduling

III) Planning and physical space

IV) Professional development
V) Extra activities

VI) Recent changes

All sections are single response or short answer except the section VI) recent changes, which utilized a Likert scale from not at all, slightly, moderately, significantly, to severely in order to determine the impact of educational reform on selected conditions.

The length of the art teacher questionnaire was taken into account to support a high response rate yet collect the necessary data. The questionnaire was concise to ensure teachers had time during their busy schedule to complete the survey. Questionnaires were emailed but additionally distributed based on teacher preference.

To answer the research questions of the conditions of selected elementary art teachers and test the hypothesis, the questionnaire was divided into six sections. Section I of the questionnaire collected demographic information from the teachers. Section I was answered in questions one through nine, including their name, school, and email but also asked if they are certified in art, or National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) certified, and years of teaching experience. The reason this data were necessary is to determine if the quality of teachers at the high versus low-performing schools. Rotherham (2005) stated, “in terms of addressing the inequities on teacher distribution, the dispersion of board certified teachers between high- and low poverty schools is abysmal” (p. 2). Only 16% teach in schools with more than 75% minority student populations and only 19% teach in a school in the bottom third of performance for its state (Rotherham, 2005).

Teaching experience was also a component of Section I. Teacher preparation and certification is only one component of the national teaching problem and other fundamental issues of teacher retention and turnover, salary increases, and changes in working conditions must also be addressed (Chapman, 2005). The Arts and Education: New Opportunities for Research (Arts Education Partnership, 2004) found national data indicated approximately half of American teachers leave the professional within the first five years of teaching.

Section II of the questionnaire collected data on population and scheduling in questions ten through 15c. This section addressed school enrollment, average art class size, the number of art periods per week, the number of hours per week that art is taught, type of schedule, and other subjects other than art being taught. The type of schedule an art teacher used such as block, weekly, rotation, or other determined how much time is devoted to the arts as well as possibly
allowing time for the art teacher to teach another subject. According to NCES (2003), NCLB embodies a philosophy of education that equates education with training. About 7 months of a school year is available for teaching prior to test preparation and administration. In elementary schools, test preparation and test taking may well exceed the 26 hours typically devoted to visual arts instruction in a year (NCES, 2003).

Section III of the questionnaire collected data on planning and physical space in questions 16 through 17a. This section identified the art teachers work conditions including if art is taught in an art room, classroom, or on a cart.

Section IV of the questionnaire was devoted to determining the level and amount of professional development in survey questions 18 through 19b. Florida teachers must acquire professional development points to remain a certified teacher. A teacher has a five-year time span to acquire six semester hours of college credit or equivalent including 120 in-service points (Department of Education, 2004). According to the Florida Department of Education (2004), sixty in-service points in an approved Florida master in-service program are equivalent to three semester hours of college credit.

Gaining the Arts Advantages, (Longley, 1999) a report on schools and school districts that have made competence in the arts and literacy fundamental purposes for schooling contained success factors for schools. The report cited critical success factors for achieving district wide arts education including supporting that effective teachers of the arts are allowed to and encouraged to continue and grow in mastery of their art form as well as in their teaching competence (Longley, 1999).

Jacobson (2005) found two recent surveys conducted in North Carolina included more than 30,00 teachers, 4,000 principals, and other administrators and in South Carolina included 15,200 educators supported that working conditions play a vital part in whether good teachers feel sufficiently satisfied to stay in their schools. According to the surveys conducted in North and South Carolina, a strong connection exists between professional development and a school’s adequately yearly progress. As an example from the survey on a scale of 1 to 5 with five representing strongly agree, the average teacher rating was 2.72 on the statement that they were “protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students” (Jacobson, 2005, ¶ 10).
Section V of the questionnaire surveyed extra activities that teachers are expected to complete in questions 20 through 23. These activities may occur before, during, after school, and even on weekends.

The sixth and final section of the questionnaire required teachers to identify the degree to which, in their opinion, federal and state reforms have impacted their conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. Section VI included each of the 12 conditions contained in the previous sections of the questionnaire in questions 24 through 35. The final section requested teachers’ perceptions on the degree of impact by federal and state education reforms. The data were collected in a Likert scale including not at all, slightly, moderately, significantly, to severely.

**Variables to be Tested**

To answer the research questions and test the hypothesis, the following variables were tested between high-performing and low-performing schools.

The first hypothesis states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

**Assignments**

For the purpose of this study, assignments are duties that art teachers are required to perform as a teacher, directly related to instruction. Assignments included Section II) population and scheduling numbers 12 to 15 from the art teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to assignments included: 1) the number of art classes per week, 2) hours spent teaching per week, 3) type of scheduling, and 4) subjects taught other than art.

**Responsibilities**

Responsibilities are defined as duties that teachers are obligated to complete aside from instruction. Responsibilities included Section III) planning and physical space numbers 17, 17a and Section V) extra activities numbers 20 to 23 from the art teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to responsibilities included: 1) planning period, 2) hours of planning per week, and 3) before, 4) during, 5) after school, and 6) weekend duties.

**Expectations**

Expectations are identified as appropriate duties of a teacher that are not required. Expectations included Section IV) professional development numbers 18a and 19a from the art
teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to expectations included: 1) state and national conference attendance and 2) district art in-services and trainings.

The second hypothesis states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. 

Perception of Changes in Assignments

Perceptions on changes in assignments included Section VI) recent changes numbers 24, 25, 27, 28 and 33 from the art teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to perception of change in assignments included: 1) the average art class size, 2) number of art classes per day, 3) length of individual art classes, 4) subjects taught other than art, and 5) physical space and location.

Perception of Changes in Responsibilities

Perceptions on changes in responsibilities included Section VI) recent changes numbers 26, and 29 to 33 from the art teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to perception of change in responsibilities included: 1) planning time per week, and 2) before, 3) during, 4) after school, and 5) weekend duties.

Perception of Changes in Expectations

Perceptions of changes in expectations included Section VI) recent changes numbers 34 and 35 from the art teacher questionnaire. Variables to be tested related to perception of change in expectations included: 1) state and national conference attendance and 2) district art in-services and training attendance.

Research Design

The study was a criterion group design that contrasted two groups: elementary art teachers from high- and low-performing schools. The criteria to be participate in the study included: teachers had to teach in one of the 13 districts containing both “A” and “B” and “D” and “F” schools, instruct students in grades kindergarten through sixth in art, and voluntarily complete the elementary art teacher questionnaire. Respondents from schools receiving an “A” or “B” were part of the high-performing group. Respondents from schools receiving a “D” or “F” were part of the low-performing group. The sample was a random sample for the high-performing group and a convenience sample for the low-performing group. Both groups completed the same questionnaire during the same time frame. Section I) from the art teacher questionnaire collected
information on school characteristics including: 1) gender, 2) race, 3) level of education, 4) certification, 5) National Board Certification, 6) years teaching art in Florida, 7) years teaching at selected school, 8) years teaching art at selected school, 9) enrollment, 10) average class size, and 11) art class location. Sections II), III), IV), and V), collected information on art teacher conditions and Section VI) gathered data on the perception of change with respect to federal and state education reforms.

Analysis

Descriptive statistical analyses were conducted to examine equivalencies of the two groups. Independent t-tests and Chi-square tests were used to determine if there was a difference between high- and low-performing groups and if the difference was significant p< .01. The alpha was set at p< .01 to decrease the occurrence of a Type I error since multiple tests were conducted on the data set (Somerville, 2004). The level of significance decreased the possibility of type I errors but still identified differences worthy of further exploration and consideration.

The research design called for a comparison of school performance with each of the designated variables. This approach was appropriate since the groups were considered comparable and the statistically significant characteristics were identified. The variables were tested against school performance to determine to reject or accept the research hypothesis. Independent Samples T-tests and Chi-square tests were conducted. Independent T-tests were conducted for nominal responses. Chi-Square tests were conducted on categorical responses. These comparisons and statistical tests determined if there was statistical significance with each variable and school performance.

The results of the survey were translated into descriptive statistics to explain the assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and perceptions on the impact of federal and state education reforms of Florida elementary art teachers in high-performing and low-performing schools. The results were reported in a series of tables. The analysis compared similarities and differences from each of the six sections of the questionnaire in relationship to a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations and perception of change in conditions. The data analysis provided inferential statistics between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary schools by investigating means and similarities and differences of the comparable groups.

The analyzed results provided answers to the research questions and determined to reject or accept the research hypothesis. Through quantitative data collected from questionnaires, the
assignments, responsibilities, and expectations and perceptions of Florida elementary art teachers in high- and low-performing schools were compared and contrasted and result in an analysis of the impact of federal and state education reforms.

**Reliability and Validity**

To ensure reliability and the consistency of the measurement, several precautions were taken during the course of the research. In preparation of creating the questionnaire, a pilot test was conducted with three art teachers representing a district not included in the research. The results and suggestions included: 1) specifically stating the time frame in which questions refer to, 2) making the questionnaire clear and concise so teachers in various districts could respond, and 3) using terms that are typical within the field. The changes were noted and amendments made based on the feedback.

A field test was then conducted with twenty elementary art teachers from another district not included in the research. The purpose of the field test was to ensure the questions were appropriate, clear and concise, and address any possible issues and correct prior to distribution. The pilot study was challenging because teachers made minimal remarks or suggestions and claimed it was clear and understandable. The teachers were confident that they could answer all the questions and claimed they understood the content of the questionnaire. Upon completion of the pilot and field test, confidence in the questionnaire was confirmed.

Several steps and actions were taken to ensure validity. The population was clearly defined as Florida elementary art teachers and a specific sample of high- and low-performing schools from 13 districts was extracted to represent the population. This confirmed that inferences made as a result of the study extend from the sample to the population. The data were also collected during the same time period for all elementary art teachers to ensure such variables as curriculum, school holidays, and testing days were marginalized. The data were coded to ensure anonymity and eliminate any possible biases. The responses were entered twice to confirm and verify any possible mistakes between the two entries. This ensured proper data entry and produced accurate findings.

Since several statistical tests were performed on the data set, the possibility of a type I error was greater, which affects the reliability and validity. The range of errors possible since multiple tests were conducted is the Familywise error. The collection of comparisons done is described as the "family". Familywise error rate is the probability of making one or more type I errors among
all the hypotheses when performing multiple tests. The familywise error rate is the probability that at least one of these comparisons will include a type I error. To accommodate for this, the alpha was set at \( p < 0.01 \). The decreased alpha \( p < 0.01 \) controls for Type 1 error separately for each family (Somerville, 2004).

Specific effort was made to ensure reliability and validity therefore the results of this study should represent art teachers in high-and low-performing schools in Florida. The teachers participating represented schools with diverse populations, locations, and backgrounds. The findings represent Florida art teacher conditions and perception of change in conditions including assignments, responsibilities, and expectations.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

In this chapter quantitative data gathered from the art teacher questionnaire is presented. A total of 46 participants, 23 high-performing and 23 low-performing were analyzed. Responses were not separated by specific schools or districts because the research addressed a comparison of high-performing to low-performing schools. Since the goal was not to identify specific issues within districts, the results were presented in high- and low-performing groups.

The results of elementary art teacher conditions and perceptions of the change in conditions as impacted by federal and state education reform including: a) responsibilities, b) assignments, and c) expectations are reported in relationship to the research hypothesis and then sequential order of the elementary art teacher questionnaire.

Research Hypothesis

Elementary Art Teacher Conditions

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Assignments

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments. Findings related to assignments included Section II) population and scheduling numbers 12 to 15 from the art teacher questionnaire as detailed below. Hypothesis 1a denotes assignments and includes 1) the number of art classes per week, 2) hours spent teaching per week, 3) type of scheduling, and 4) subjects taught other than art as reported in Table 2.

Table 2.
Differences Between High- and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of art classes taught per week</td>
<td>25.60 (8.56)</td>
<td>26.52 (7.57)</td>
<td>t = -.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent teaching art per week</td>
<td>22.02 (9.57)</td>
<td>18.67 (9.55)</td>
<td>t = 1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Schedule**</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subjects taught other than art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .01

**Due to limited frequencies, block, rotation, and other were collapsed for the Chi-square test.

Hypothesis 1a denotes the number of individual art classes or periods taught per week. The high-performing group reported a mean of 26 art periods or classes per week. The low-performing group reported a slightly higher mean of 27 individual classes or periods taught per week. There was no significant difference between the high- and low-performing groups with respect to art classes taught per week and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1a denotes hours spent teaching art per week. The high-performing group reported teaching a mean of 22 hours per week. The low-performing group reported a lower mean of 19 hours spent teaching art per week. There was no significant difference between the high- and low-performing groups and therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1a denotes the type of schedule, options included weekly, rotation, block, or other. The high-performing group reported an average of 52% on a weekly schedule and a higher average of 70% of the low-performing group were on a weekly schedule. An average of 35% on a rotation schedule from the high-performing group was greater than the 26% on a rotation schedule from the low-performing group. Respondents from both groups report an equivalent average of 4.3% on a block schedule. The high-performing group averaged 8.7% on a schedule not identified and zero teachers from the low-performing group reported being on schedule other
than weekly, rotation, or block. There was a statistical difference and therefore the research hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1a denotes subjects taught other than art. An average of 4% of teachers from the high-performing group taught a subject other than art while the low-performing group reported a higher average of 26% taught a subject other than art. An average of 96% of teachers from the high-performing group only taught art while an average of 74% of teachers from the low-performing group only taught art. A statistical difference existed between high- and low-performing schools with respect to non-art subjects taught and therefore the research hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1a states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments. Findings related to Hypothesis 1a: assignments that resulted in accepting the research hypothesis included type of scheduling and subjects taught other than art. Findings related to Hypothesis 1a: assignments that resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis included the number of art classes per week and hours spent teaching per week. Since only two out of four tests resulted in accepting the research hypothesis, the research hypothesis for assignments was rejected due to lack of statistical evidence.

Responsibilities

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: b) responsibilities. Findings related to Hypothesis 1b: responsibilities included Section III) planning and physical space numbers 17, 17a and Section V) extra activities numbers 20 to 23 from the art teacher questionnaire as detailed below. Hypothesis 1b denotes responsibilities and included: 1) planning period, 2) hours of planning per week, and 3) before, 4) during, 5) after school, and 6) weekend duties as reported in Table 3.
Table 3. Differences Between High- and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school non-art duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During school non-art duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school non-art duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend non-art duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of planning per week</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$

Hypothesis 1b denotes if respondents had a planning period. The high-performing group reported an average 96% have a planning period which is lower than the 100% of the low-performing group. The high-performing group reported that 4% do not have a planning period, which is higher than the low-performing group since no respondents reported not having a planning period. A Chi-Square Test was conducted between the high-and low-performing groups and planning period to determine no statistical significance existed and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis 1b denotes amount of planning per week. The mean amount of planning time for the high-performing group was 4.7 hours a week, close to the mean of 4.8 for the low-performing group. A significant difference did not exist between the two groups and therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1b denotes non-art duties before school. The high-performing group reported an average 74% have non-art duties before school, which is higher than the 61% average of the low-performing group. The high-performing group averaged 26% without non-art duties before school, which is lower than the 39% without non-art duties in the low-performing group. A Chi-Square Test was conducted to determine statistical significance between the high-and low-performing groups and non-art duties before school and revealed there was no statistical significance. As a result the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1b denotes non-art duties during school. The high-performing group reported an average 48% have non-art duties during school which is lower than the 57% average of the low-performing group. The high-performing group averaged 52% without non-art duties during school, which is higher than the 44% without non-art duties in the low-performing group. A Chi-Square Test revealed there was no statistical significance and therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1b denotes non-art after school duties. The high-performing group reported an average 74% have non-art duties after school which is lower than the 92% average of the low-performing group. The high-performing group averaged 26% without non-art duties after school, which is higher than the 9% without non-art duties in the low-performing group. A Chi-Square Test was conducted between the high-and low-performing groups and non-art duties after school to determine statistical significance. A statistical difference existed and therefore the research hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1b denotes non-art weekend duties. The high-performing group reported an average 26% have non-art weekend duties which is lower than the 44% average of the low-performing group. The high-performing group averaged 74% without non-art weekend duties, which is higher than the 56% without non-art duties in the low-performing group. A Chi-Square Test was conducted between the high-and low-performing groups and non-art weekend duties to determine a statistical significance and therefore the research hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1b states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: b) responsibilities. Findings related to Hypothesis 1b responsibilities that resulted in accepting the research hypothesis included after school non-art duties and weekend non-art duties. Findings related to Hypothesis 1b that resulted in rejecting
the research hypothesis included hours of planning per week, planning period, before school non-art
duties, and during school non-art duties. Since only two out of six tests resulted in accepting the
research hypothesis, the research hypothesis for responsibilities was rejected due to lack of statistical
evidence.

Expectations

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing low-performing Florida
elementary art teachers’ conditions including: c) expectations. Findings related to Hypothesis 1c
expectations included Section IV) professional development numbers 18a and 19a from the art
teacher questionnaire as detailed below. Hypothesis 1c denotes expectations and included: 1) state
and national conference attendance and 2) district art in-services and trainings as reported in Table 4.

Table 4. Differences Between High- and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Standard</td>
<td>Mean Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td>Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and national art conference</td>
<td>.348 .487</td>
<td>.348 .487</td>
<td>t = .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art in-service or training</td>
<td>2.000 1.414</td>
<td>1.870 1.660</td>
<td>t = .287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< .01

Hypothesis 1c denotes state and national art conference attendance. The mean score for both the
high- and low-performing groups was equivalent at .35. An independent sample t-test was conducted
and no significant difference existed therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1c denotes art in-services and trainings attended. The number of art in-services and
trainings mean score for the high-performing group was 2, which is slightly higher than the 1.9 mean
score for the low-performing group. An independent sample t-test was conducted and there was no
significant difference between the two groups and the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 1c states that there is a difference between high-performing low-performing Florida
elementary art teachers’ conditions including: c) expectations. No findings related to Hypothesis 1c:
expectations resulted in accepting the research hypothesis. The finding related to Hypothesis 1c:
expectations that resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis was state and national conference
attendance and district art in-services and trainings. Since none of the tests resulted in accepting the
research hypothesis, the research hypothesis was rejected with respect to expectations due to lack of statistical evidence.

Hypothesis one states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. The research hypothesis was rejected due to lack of statistical evidence since only four out of the 12 statistical tests produced statistical significant differences.

Perceptions of Changes in Conditions as Impacted by Federal and State Education Reforms

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

Perceptions of Changes in Assignments

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments. Findings related to Hypothesis 2a: perceptions of changes in assignments included Section IV) recent changes numbers 24, 25, 27, 28, and 33 from the art teacher questionnaire as detailed below.

Hypothesis 2a denotes perception of change in assignments and includes 1) the average art class size, 2) number of art classes per week, 3) length of individual art classes, 4) subjects taught other than art, and 5) physical space and location as presented in Table 5. Respondents provided answers on a Likert scale ranging from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely.

Table 5.
Difference Between High-and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Perception of Change in Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing</th>
<th>Low-Performing</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean**</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average art class size</td>
<td>1.913</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>2.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of art classes per week</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of individual art classes</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>1.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects taught other than art</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical space and location</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>1.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .01

**Likert scale scores from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely
The high–performing group mean score for the impact of state and federal reform on class size was 1.9 only slightly lower than the mean score of 2.0 for the low-performing group. An independent sample t-test was conducted and there was no significant difference with respect to the perception of change in class size therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

The change in the number of art classes taught per day as perceived by the art teachers in the high-performing group mean was 1.5, lower than the mean score of 2.0 for the low-performing group. The results of the independent samples t-test concluded there was no significant difference between the two groups and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.

The perception of change due to federal and state education reforms on the length of art class mean score from the high-performing group was 1.6, slightly lower than 1.8 from the low-performing group. The independent sample t-test concluded no significant difference existed and the research hypothesis was rejected.

The perception of change in subjects taught other than art reported a mean score of .65 from the high-performing group and a higher mean score of 1.7 from the low-performing group. An independent sample t-test was conducted and a significant difference existed, therefore the research hypothesis was accepted.

The change in art class location as impacted by federal and state reforms was 1.4 from the high-performing group and higher at 1.6 from the low-performing group. The independent sample t-test concluded, no significant difference existed and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments. The finding related to Hypothesis 2a: perceptions of changes in assignments that resulted in accepting the research hypothesis was subjects taught other than art. Findings related to Hypothesis 2a: perceptions of changes in assignments that resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis was the average art class size, number of art classes per week, length of individual art classes, and physical space and location. Since only one of the five tests conducted for the perception of change in assignments resulted in accepting the research hypothesis; the research hypothesis was rejected with respect to perception of change in assignments.
Perceptions of Changes in Responsibilities

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: b) responsibilities. Findings related to Hypothesis 2b: perceptions of changes in responsibilities included Section VI) recent changes numbers 26, and 29 to 33 from the art teacher questionnaire as detailed below. Hypothesis 2b denotes responsibilities and included: 1) planning time per week, and 2) before, 3) during, 4) after school, and 5) weekend duties as presented in Table 6. Respondents provided answers on a Likert scale ranging from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely.

Table 6.
Difference between High-and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Perception of Change in Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing Mean**</th>
<th>High-Performing Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Low-Performing Mean**</th>
<th>Low-Performing Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning time per week</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>t = -.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school non-art duties</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>1.506</td>
<td>t = -1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During school non-art duties</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>1.701</td>
<td>t = -1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school non-art duties</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>t = -1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend non-art duties</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>t = -.571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .01

**Likert scale scores from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely

The high-performing group reported a mean of 1.6 in regards to the perception of change in planning time, which is lower than the low-performing mean of 1.9. The results of the independent samples t-test conclude there was no significant difference, therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

The perception of changes in duties before school resulted in mean of .70 for the high-performing group and higher at 1.2 for the low-performing group. An independent samples t-test was conducted and revealed no significant difference and the research hypothesis was rejected.

The mean of impact of federal and state reforms on change in duties during school for the high-performing group was .87, again lower than the low-performing mean of 1.6. The independent samples t-test concluded no significant difference and the research hypothesis was rejected.

The mean of perception in change in after school duties for the high-performing group was .78, which is lower than the 1.4 mean of low-performing schools. A significant difference did not exist and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.
The perception of change in weekend duties for the high-performing group resulted in a mean score of .74 and slightly higher with a mean score of .96 for the low-performing group. An independent sample t-test was conducted and no significant difference existed and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: b) responsibilities. Findings related to Hypothesis 2b: perceptions of changes in responsibilities that resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis included planning time per week, before school, during school, after school, and weekend duties. All of the tests conducted for the perception of change in responsibilities resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis; therefore the research hypothesis was rejected with respect to perception of change in responsibilities.

Perceptions of Change in Expectations

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: c) expectations. Findings related to Hypothesis 2c: changes in expectations included Section VI) recent changes numbers 34 and 35 from the art teacher questionnaire as detailed below. Hypothesis 2c denotes expectations and included: 1) state and national conference attendance and 2) district art in-services and trainings as presented in Table 7. Respondents provided answers on a Likert scale ranging from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely.

Table 7. Difference Between High-and Low-Performing Groups with Respect to Perception of Change in Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>High-Performing Mean**</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Low-Performing Mean**</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State and national conference attendance</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>t = -2.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District art in-services and trainings</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>1.347</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>t = -1.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .01

**Likert scale scores from 0) not at all, 1) slightly, 2) moderately, 3) significantly, to 4) severely

The high-performing group perception of change in state and national conference attendance allowed by the district resulted in a mean score of .87, lower than the 1.7 mean score of the low-
performing group. An independent sample t-test was conducted and no significant difference existed therefore the research hypothesis was rejected.

The impact of federal and state education reforms on the perception of change in available in-service and training opportunities was lower for the high-performing group with a mean of 1.2 than 2.0 for the low-performing group. The independent sample t-test concluded no significant difference existed and as a result the research hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: c) expectations. Findings related to Hypothesis 2c: changes in expectations that resulted in rejecting the research hypothesis included state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and trainings. Since all tests conducted for the perception of change in expectations resulted in no significant differences, the research hypothesis was rejected with respect to change in expectations.

Hypothesis two states that there is a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations. The research hypothesis was rejected due to lack of statistical evidence since only one out of 12 statistical tests conducted had significant difference with respect to perception of change in conditions.

Additional Findings

The data gathered to determine to accept or reject the research hypothesis also lead to additional findings that address the conditions of elementary art teachers as impacted by federal and state educational reform. The following responses provided critical information to understanding the conditions of elementary art teachers but did not directly test the research hypothesis.

Population and Scheduling

In the study, Section II) population and scheduling four items (15, 15 a, 15b, and 15c) requested information on subjects taught other than art. Participants provided responses to: 15) subjects taught other than art, 15a) if they are certified in these subjects, 15b) the number of classes taught, and 15c) the hours a week instructed. Since the results did not provide at least five frequencies a test of statistical significance was not conducted. Therefore the raw data collected was presented in Table 8. The low –performing group reported teaching four more subjects other than art, with three additional as uncertified teachers for 14 hours, and 11 hours more than the high-performing group.
Table 8.  
List of Subjects Taught Other than Art Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Performance</th>
<th>Subjects Taught</th>
<th>Certified</th>
<th>Classes a week</th>
<th>Hours a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Performing</td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Performing</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yearbook</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Development

In this study, Section IV) professional development five items (18, 18b, 18c, 19, and 19b) requested information on professional development. Participants provided responses to: 18) district permission to attend state or national conferences, 18b) is “leave in line” of duty provided for conference attendance, 18c) portion of state or national conference fees paid, 19) district provided art in-service or trainings provided, and 19b) topics of art in-services or trainings conducted.

Item 18) requested participants to identify if they are permitted to attend state or national conferences. The high-performing group reported 91% permitted to attend state or national conferences and more of the low-performing group 96%, were permitted to attend. The high-performing group reported 8.7% were not permitted to attend state or national conferences and the low-performing group reported a lower average with 4.3% not permitted.

Item 18b) requested participants to respond to if their district provides “leave in line of duty” for state or national conferences. The high-performing group reported 65% were provided “leave in line of duty” for state or national conferences and the low-performing group reported a lower 61% were provided “leave in line of duty”. The high-performing group reported 35% were not provided “leave in line of duty” and the low-performing group reported higher with 40% not granted “leave in line of duty” for state or national conferences.

Item 18c) requested participants to identify the portion of state or national conference fees paid by the district. The high-performing group reported 8.7% had all fees paid, 44% partial fees paid, 31% no fees paid, and 17% were unsure. The low-performing group reported a higher average of 13% had all fees paid, lower partial fees paid with an average of 17%, higher 56% of no fees paid, and a lower 13% were unsure.
Item 19) requested if districts offered art in-services or trainings. The high-and low-performing group reported equivalent responses of art in-services offered with 83% of districts offering art in-service and trainings and 17% not offered art in-services or trainings.

Item 19b) requested participants to list topics of art in-services or trainings. The raw data were reported below in Table 9 due to limited frequencies. The high-performing group reported four additional responses than the low-performing group of art in-services and trainings conducted by the district.

Table 9.
List of Art In-services and Trainings Conducted by District Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing In-services</th>
<th>Low-Performing In-services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art careers</td>
<td>Art teacher meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art teacher meetings</td>
<td>Book binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art techniques</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art therapy</td>
<td>Crayola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book making</td>
<td>Harlem Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Integrating Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collage</td>
<td>Kimono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crayola</td>
<td>Literature in Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Paper making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk art</td>
<td>Photoshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Presentation of artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper making</td>
<td>Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print making</td>
<td>Watercolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppetry</td>
<td>Weaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raku firing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading through Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extra Activities

In the study, Section V) extra activities three items (20 to 23) requested information on activities performed outside of teachers’ art instructional hours. Participants provided responses to: 20) non-art duties before school, 21) non-art duties during school, 22) non-art duties after school, and 23) non-art weekend duties. The raw data for Section V) on extra activities 20 to 23 were reported due to limited frequencies and similar duties with various titles.

Item 20) requested participants to list their scheduled non-art duties before the school day as presented in Table 10. The high-performing and low-performing group reported an equivalent number of responses for non-art duties before school.

Table 10.
List of Non-art Before School Duties Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing Before School Duties</th>
<th>Low-Performing Before School Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast duty</td>
<td>Art projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus duty</td>
<td>Breakfast duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>Bus duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall duty</td>
<td>Cover classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency Meetings</td>
<td>Hall duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Parent drop off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing Before School Duties</th>
<th>Low-Performing Before School Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent drop off</td>
<td>Safety patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety patrols</td>
<td>Sidewalk duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 21) requested participants to list their scheduled non-art duties during the school day as presented in Table 11. The high-performing group reported two additional responses than the low-performing group with respect to non-art duties during school.

Table 11.
List of Non-art During School Duties Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing During School Duties</th>
<th>Low-Performing During School Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin boards</td>
<td>Behavior sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Cover classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee chair</td>
<td>Curriculum support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cover classes</th>
<th>Field Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Lunch Duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall patrol</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch duty</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint murals</td>
<td>School Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>Testing proctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student council</td>
<td>Work on projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 22) requested participants to list their scheduled non-art duties after the school day as presented below in Table 12. The high-performing group reported four less responses than the low-performing group in regards to non-art duties after school.

Table 12.
List of Non-art After School Duties Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing After School Duties</th>
<th>Low-Performing After School Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus duty</td>
<td>Bus duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Car duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event participation</td>
<td>Early literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended day monitor</td>
<td>Grade level meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty meetings</td>
<td>Faculty meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall duty</td>
<td>Hall duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent pick up</td>
<td>Outside duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety patrols</td>
<td>Parent pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Safety patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 23) requested participants to list their scheduled non-art weekend duties as presented below in Table 13. The high-performing group reported four less responses than the low-performing group for non-art weekend duties.

Table 13.
List of Non-art Weekend Duties Disaggregated by School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-Performing Weekend Duties</th>
<th>Low-Performing Weekend Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art shows</td>
<td>Art shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals</td>
<td>Campus cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Teacher Organization</td>
<td>Float design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>Parental support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Saturday school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings

The findings indicate that overall the conditions at high-and low-performing schools are similar. The only statistically significant differences with respect to conditions included type of schedule, subjects taught other than art, after school non-art duties, and weekend non-art duties. Since of the 12 tests conducted only four resulted in significant difference it can be determined that the difference in conditions between high-and low-performing schools are minimal.

The findings with respect to the perception of change in conditions at both high-and low-performing schools are also similar. The only significant differences occurred with perception of change in subjects taught other than art. Since only one of 12 tests conducted resulted in a significant difference it can be determined that the differences in perceptions of change in conditions are also nominal.

The findings identify minimal differences between the high- and low-performing group with respect to conditions and perception of change in conditions but yet the impact of change was rated as moderate for 7 out of 12 tests conducted. The change was rated as slightly for the remaining five tests.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study are contained in the first section below. The discussion and limitations in the present study are then presented. Implications for best practices in the field are recommended subsequently. In the fourth section, suggestions for further research and conclusions are reported.

Results

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated that there would be a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

The data does not reveal significant statistical difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations therefore Hypothesis one was rejected.

Although the research hypothesis was rejected since only four out of 12 tests conducted revealed significant statistical significance, the data reported practical differences in assignments between the high- and low-performing groups. The high-performing group reported that 96% only taught art while 74% of the low-performing only taught art, a 22% difference between the groups, which was significant. Concerning the type of schedule, 52% reported being on a weekly schedule and 35% reported being on a rotation schedule from the high-performing group, which was less than the 70% on a weekly schedule and greater than the 26% on a rotation schedule from the low-performing group, which was again significant. The type of schedule supports the hours spent per week teaching art since a rotation schedule involves more time with students per week than a weekly schedule. Although not statistically significant, the high-performing group reported teaching three additional hours of art instruction per week than the low-performing group. The high-performing group reported teaching one less art class per week than the low-performing group.

The findings related to responsibilities determined only two of the six tests conducted revealed significant statistical difference but supported practical differences between the two groups. The high-performing group reported 17% less non-art duties after school than the low-performing group, which was statistically significant. The high-performing group reported 26% had non-art weekend duties, 18% less than the 44% of the low-performing group with non-art weekend duties, also significant. Both groups presented similar data on the amount of planning time. The high-performing group reported a mean of 4.7 and the low-performing group reported a mean of 4.8 for amount of
planning per week. The high-performing group reported that 4% did not have a planning period while 100% of the low-performing group reported having a planning period. In regards to practical differences, the high-performing group reported 74% had before school non-art duties in comparison to 61% of the low-performing group, a 13% difference. The high-performing group reported 9% less had non-art during school duties than the low-performing group.

In regards to test conducted for expectations, no significant statistical difference existed with the two tests. Both high- and low-performing groups presented a mean of .35 for state or national art conference attendance. The mean reported for district art in-service or trainings attended was close at 2.0 for the high-performing group and 1.9 for the low-performing group.

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two stated that there would be a difference between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations.

The data revealed lack of statistical evidence between high-performing and low-performing Florida elementary art teachers’ perceptions of changes in work conditions including: a) assignments, b) responsibilities, and c) expectations therefore Hypothesis two was rejected.

Practical difference existed with the change of perception in assignments. The perception of change in assignments included the average art class size, number of art classes per day, length of individual art classes, subjects taught other than art, and physical space and location. The perception of change in average art class size, length of individual art classes, and physical space and location presented similar practical results with differences no greater than 0.2 and were interpreted as moderate according to the Likert scale. However, the perception of change in the number of art classes per day provided a .53 difference between the groups, yet each group ranked the perception as moderate according to the Likert scale. The high-performing group reported a mean of 1.47 and the low-performing group reported a mean of 2.0 for the perception of change in number of art classes taught. The high-performing group reported a mean of .65 and the low-performing group reported a mean of 1.8, a 1.15 difference in the perception of change in subjects taught other than art, which was significantly different. The high-performing group ranked the perception of change in subjects taught other than art as slightly while the low-performing group reported moderately.

Practical differences also existed for the perception of change in responsibilities with respect to federal and state education reforms. Perceptions of change in responsibilities included planning time per week, non-art duties before, during, and after school, and on the weekend. The practical
differences between the high-performing group and the low-performing group were minimal in regards to planning time per week which both groups reported as moderate and weekend duties which both groups reported as slightly. The differences were less than .2 for these dimensions. However the high-performing group reported a mean of .7 for non-art before school duties, a difference of .52 from the low-performing mean of 1.2. The high-performing group reported slightly while the low-performing group reported moderately on the Likert scale in regards to non-art duties before school. In regards to non-art during school duties, the high-performing group reported a mean of .87 while the low-performing group reported a mean score of 1.6, a .73 difference. Also the difference between slightly for the high-performing group and moderately for the low-performing group, according to the Likert scale. Also under responsibilities, the high-performing group reported a mean score of .78 for perception of change in non-art after school duties, a .62 difference than the mean score of 1.4 for the low-performing group. This was also the difference between slightly for the high-performing group and moderately for the low-performing group.

Practical differences existed with the change of perception in expectations. The high-performing group reported a mean score of .87, a .83 difference from the low-performing mean score of 1.7 with respect to state and national conference attendance. This difference also represented slightly for the high-performing group and moderately for the low-performing group on the Likert scale. The data revealed differences in the perception of changes in district art in-services and trainings, even though both groups reported the change as slightly. The high-performing group reported a mean score of 1.2 and the low-performing group reported a mean of 2.0, a .8 difference in regards to district art in-services and trainings attended.

Discussion

The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of federal and state education reforms on select Florida elementary art teachers in regards to their conditions and perception of change in conditions. Although not all findings are empirically confirmed, the research does suggest the following key findings.

In regards to the relationships between high- and low-performing schools’ art teacher conditions high- and low-performing schools are similar. Although the study revealed 26 of the low-performing schools had no art teacher, low-performing schools with art teachers reported similar conditions as their high-performing counterpart. As an example, the low-performing group reported teaching more art classes per day with less art instruction time per week. The high-performing group had more before school non-art duties while the low-performing group had more during, after school, and
weekend non-art duties. Conference attendance and trainings appear to be an issue across the board. Both high-and low-performing schools reported minimal conference or in-service attendance on an annual basis. For each group there are positive and negative conditions but the negative conditions are not weighted toward one group.

Another key finding was that high- and low-performing schools operate differently. Overall, the high-performing schools operate at a higher level of efficiency. There is a practical difference, even if not statistically significant, in the overall operation of the schools, which affects the art teachers. Elementary art teachers at low-performing schools were extremely difficult to contact. Originally, correspondence was sent to both groups via email, however low response rates with the low-performing group signaled a problem. As a result, attempts were made through phone calls to the school, principal contact, and fax. The response rate of the low-performing group was still lower than the high-performing group even with additional efforts. As a result the high-performing responses had to be deduced.

The study also revealed that within the groups, the level of impact for certain conditions occurred at the school level rather than the district. Prior research supported that state policies mandated implementation at the district level, yet the research revealed quite the contrary. Responses from participants in the same districts varied regarding professional development questions including state and conference attendance and in-service trainings.

In regards to the relationship between high-and low-performing schools’, the study found art teacher perceptions of changes in existed for both high- and low-performing groups. The perception of change in the number of art classes per day was greater for the low-performing group, which was supported with data that they actual teach more art classes per day. With respect to the perception of change in subjects taught other than art the low-performing group reported a greater perception of change, again the data supported a greater amount of subjects taught other than art. The high-performing group reported a greater perception of change for non-art before school duties and the data supported they in fact had a greater amount of before school duties. In regards to non-art during school duties, after school duties, and on the weekend, the low-performing group reported a greater perception of change and actually had additional duties. Concerning the change of perception on state and national conference attendance and district art in-services and trainings, the low-performing group reported a greater perception of change in conference attendance and in-service trainings. Yet both groups reported low attendance for conferences.
Limitations in the Present Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the conditions and perceptions of conditions of elementary art teachers in Florida. Although careful consideration of all aspects was taken into account certain limitations existed as detailed.

The sample size of the study was relatively small in consideration of the 1,686 elementary schools in Florida (FLDOE, Plan for Education). For the purpose of this study, selected elementary art teachers had to teach in a district that contained both high- and low-performing schools, which resulted in a small sample of Florida elementary art teachers. The study recognized that only 13 out of 67 school districts were represented. These districts each offered a variety of diverse populations, resources, and locations however fail to encompass all the characteristics of any given school district. Enrollment, ethnical makeup, and socio-economic status were not identified in the selection of participants or the presentation of analyzed results. As a result, the findings can be generalized to high – and low-performing schools in Florida, however not to average performing schools or beyond the state of Florida. Art teachers were difficult to locate and contact even with the assistance of art supervisors and therefore the participants represent a limited description of the art teacher workforce. Effort was extended to both high-and low-performing schools, however responses from the high-performing group was larger and had to be randomly deduced to provided equal representation between the groups.

Due to issues of the various roles of the art supervisors and art teachers, teacher turnover, and unforeseen issues such as schools without art teachers changing from the inception of the project, implementation resulted in limitations. It was challenging to survey the ideal number of art teachers during the appropriate time of the school year. The research recognized that the survey was conducted during a particular time frame and findings could be different at another time. The surveys were sent out according to the pilot and field test results but according to most teachers, there is never a good time. Teachers claim they are always busy but wanted to contribute to knowledge in the field and made time during their schedules.

The present research provided a quantitative analysis of the conditions and perception of conditions of Florida elementary art teachers. Over the course of the research, it became evident that teachers wanted to share insights into their opinions and specific circumstances. Numerous surveys were disregarded due to qualitative input, opinions, and personal feedback. Respondents were interested in sharing the how’s and why’s and specific examples in support of their responses. In
addition to the extra information provided on questionnaires, follow up emails were sent to the researcher with similar information.

The pilot test and field test determined teachers could clearly understand the questions and felt confident in the reliability of responses. However, the questions pertaining to extra activities provided discrepancies. Teachers offered similar descriptions but a variety of titles and terms. For example, bus duty, sidewalk duty, and morning supervision are similar activities in which students are supervised before the start of the school day. However, teachers termed them based on their school culture and language. This provided multiple responses for what could possibly be considered one item. As a result, responses could not be tabulated based on frequencies and the raw data were presented as part of the Additional Findings.

The elementary art teacher questionnaire was developed based on research that supported certain conditions were implemented at the district level and others at the school level, yet the study revealed a different scenario. Prior to conducting the study, issues such as conference attendance and in-service and trainings were identified as mandated at the district level. However the surveys revealed that within the high- and low-performing groups, teachers from the same districts were providing different responses. Therefore supporting these decisions were being made at the school level as opposed to the district level or that respondents were unaware of the options and opportunities available.

**Implications for Best Practices**

One strength of the study is that minimal practical differences were identified between high- and low-performing schools. With minimal differences identified policy makers, administrators, and pre-service teachers can prepare for the future of teaching art in Florida to continue to provide an equitable art education. An awareness and understanding of the implications in the field is critical to the equity of art education amongst teachers and students during a time of change in our educational system. There is a need to understand the status of teaching art in Florida and changes in the profession in order to better understand the challenges and opportunities facing art teachers. The research offered implications of policies and research for more effective and efficient administrative strategies in order to ensure that the quality of Florida’s art programs are not adversely affected. This information may also be used to understand how arts instruction is least affected and search for alternative options to ensure high-quality arts instruction.

Art teachers have a responsibility to remain aware of issues impacting art education to ensure high quality arts programs are offered across the nation and state. District officials, school administrators,
and school boards should understand the effects of federal and state reforms on elementary art programs and construct administrative change to ensure art programs meet state standards and expectations under acceptable and equitable conditions. A decline in the quantity and quality of art programs is possible for Florida schools if continuous awareness and evaluation are decreased. The marginalization of art for core subjects looms as schools, districts, and the state attempt to meet academic standards and testing requirements. It is imperative that elementary art educators evaluate their conditions in regards to federal and state education reforms to ensure they provide the most beneficial art classroom environment and educational experience as teachers for their students and schools.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Olson (2005, *Federal Government*) reported as of July 7, 2005, the United States Department of Education had approved at least some of the requested changes to 16 states’ accountability plans under the *No Child Left Behind Act*. A major issue with the federal and state education reforms over the course of the study was constant change. Each year and even during the school year, amendments were made and appeals granted at both the federal and state level. It was difficult and challenging to assess impact when the variables affecting the study changed continuously. Over the course of the study, test score expectations increased, class sizes decreased, and sub-grouping percentages changed. In order to provide further analysis of the impact of federal and state education reforms on elementary art teachers, additional research is recommended as detailed below.

A longitudinal study of at least two years should be conducted. This would allow the tracking of specific teachers that remain at their school under similar conditions for a longer duration of time. The longitudinal study should include a larger sample size and increased consistencies so that extraneous variables would be minimal.

Qualitative research should be collected on conditions of elementary art teachers. The study revealed that respondents were interested in sharing insight into the specifics of their situations. The inclusion of qualitative follow up would also address the inconsistencies with the questions involving extra activities. The qualitative addition would assist to determine possible terms and titles to identify extra activities and other conditions that were difficult to categorize and eliminate discrepancies in the short answer response. Qualitative research would also be a valuable accompaniment to the quantitative data to conceptualize the impact of federal and state education reforms on elementary art teachers.
Originally, the research study included examining teacher effectiveness and ability to meet national and state standards under the conditions as related to federal and state reforms. Due to the amount of research, this portion of the study was eliminated however suggested for further research. Since minimal practical change has been identified, it would serve the field well to know how this affects teachers’ perceptions of their ability to effectively meet the federal and state education reforms.

The present study identified certain characteristics that were considered statistically different. Art teacher gender, level of education, and average class size provided statistically different results between the two groups. It is recommended that these characteristics be examined in future research to determine any correlation between the groups and other dependent variables. Investigations of such issues as budget, Title I, and socio-economic status would add to the value of future research, especially as the importance and change of these become increasingly separated across high- and low-performing groups as the federal and state education reforms are implemented.

It is recommended to revisit policy issues mandated at the district level that are being implemented at the school level. Further research is suggested on federal and state education reforms and the level at which implementation is realistically occurring versus theoretically. The present study revealed a discrepancy in actual level of implementation that made it difficult for respondents to provide accurate answers to questions including state and national conference attendance. Also the availability of in-service trainings offered within districts should be reexamined. Respondents provided various answers within certain districts, which identified an issue of either discrepancies in in-services being offered at the district or school level or lack of awareness of opportunities.

The research provided minimal practical differences from both the high-and low-performing group however revealed that respondents from each group reported slight to moderate impact by federal and state education reforms. As a result, an investigation of elementary art teachers with traditional classroom teachers is suggested. This research would identify if art teachers feel solely impacted or if issues existed across subject areas.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of the present study was to determine the change and perception of change in Florida elementary art teachers in regards to federal and state education reform. The findings suggest minimal differences between high-and low-performing schools that impact elementary art teachers. However further research is recommended to obtain a more thorough understanding of art teacher conditions and their change in conditions as a result of federal and state education reforms.
Overall, the status of art education in Florida is acceptable. With respect to indicators that determine the quality of art education there is nominal differences across the groups. The impact of grading schools and categorizing schools based on performance is having little impact on the quality of art programs offered. Although the differences between high- and low-performing schools are minimal the perception of impact due to federal and state education reform is still negative. With the differences minimal and attitudes negative, the question is why we believe as art educators that things are so bad. Is the school climate, gossip, or rumors to blame? The quality of art programs is supported with adequate planning time, art teachers with art classrooms and not on a cart, and minimal non-art duties, yet we continue to complain and acknowledge the need for change. Art education has made leaps and bounds since its inception the study revealed consistent progress during a challenging time in education. Originally, the research set out to identify separation and inequity amongst the groups, yet surprisingly so that was not the case. With art education alive and well, regardless of the school’s grade, it questions the affect of grading schools on art programs. Do school grades affect only our perception of teaching, the students, and the school system? The school climate for the entire year is based on this single school grade, a snap shot of the teaching efforts, and school morale is directly correlated. In regards to art education, teachers are receiving an equitable situation and although there will always be certain factors art teachers wish would change, the grading of schools seems to only affect the perception of art programs as opposed to actual conditions. Art teachers at both high-and low-performing schools wish for the ideal situation but the good news is that we don’t have it as bad as once perceived. The evaluation of actual art teacher situations concluded that teacher counterparts at high-and low-performing schools are in similar situations and students are receiving quality art education programs even during the trying time of education reform.
APPENDIX A
Elementary Art Teacher Survey

Please respond to the following.

Name __________________________ District ______________ 2005-2006 Florida School Grade ______

School __________________________ Grades Taught: __________________________

Phone (____) __________________________ Email __________________________

I. Demographic Information

1. Gender ___Female ___Male
2. Race ___White/Non-Hispanic ___African American ___Asian/Pacific Islander ___American Indian ___Hispanic ___Other
3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? ___GED/Highschool ___Associate Degree ___Bachelor’s Degree ___Graduate Degree
4. Are you certified to teach art in Florida? ___Yes ___No
5. Are you National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certified in art? ___Yes ___No
6. How many years have you taught art in Florida? __________________
7. How many years have you taught at this school? __________________
8. How many years have you taught art at this school? __________________
9. During the 2005-2006 school year, what grade levels did you teach? ___K-5 ___K-6 ___Other

II. Population and Scheduling

Please respond to the following questions based on the 2005-2006 current school year.

10. How many students are enrolled at your school? ______________
11. What is your school’s average class size? ___Below 18 ___19-22 ___23-25 ___26+
12. How many individual art classes/periods do you teach a week? __________________
13. How many hours do you spend teaching art per week? __________________
14. What type of scheduling are you on? ___Weekly ___Rotation ___Block ___Other
15. Do you teach a subject other than art? ___Yes ___No
   If no, go to #16.
   15a. If yes, what subjects other than art do you teach and are you certified in these subjects? Subject Taught Certified Y/N?
       __________________  __________________
       __________________  __________________
       __________________  __________________

15b. If yes, how many classes in these subjects do you teach a week? __________________
15c. If yes, how many hours per week do you teach these subjects? __________________

III. Planning and Physical Space

Please respond to the following questions based on the 2005-2006 current school year.

16. Where do you teach art? ___Art room ___Classroom ___Art cart ___Other
17. Do you have a planning period? ___Yes ___No
   If no, go to #18.
   17a. If yes, how much planning time do you have per week? ____________

Continue to next page!
IV. Professional Development

Please respond to the following questions based on the 2005-2006 current school year.

18. Does your district allow you to attend state/national art conferences? ___Yes ___No

If no, go to #19.

18a. How many state/national art conferences will you attend? __________

18b. Does your district provide “leave in line of duty” for conference attendance? ___Yes ___No

18c. What portion of state/national conferences fees does your district provide?
   ___All ___Partial ___None

19. Does your district offer art in-services or trainings? ___Yes ___No

If no, go to #20.

19a. How many art in-services or trainings will you attend?
   __________

19b. List the topics of art in-services or trainings conducted this year.
   ___________________
   ___________________

V. Extra Activities

Please respond to the following questions based on the 2005-2006 current school year.

20. List your scheduled non-art duties before the school day. ____________ ____________ ____________

21. List your scheduled non-art duties during the school day. ____________ ____________

22. List you scheduled non-art duties after the school day. ____________ ____________ ____________

23. List your scheduled non-art duties during the weekend. ____________ ____________ ____________

VI. Recent Changes

In your opinion, how have federal and state education reforms (NCLB, FCAT, A+ Plus Plan, etc.) affected the following. Please choose your answer. You may underline or bold your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
<th>Severely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Average art class size?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of art classes taught per week?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Amount of planning time per week?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Length of individual art classes?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Subjects taught other than art?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Non-art duties before school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Non-art duties during the school day?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Non-art duties after school?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Non-art duties during the weekend?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Physical space and location of art room?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. State and national art conference attendance?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. District in-service and training opportunities?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Elementary Art Educator,

Hello. My name is Nicole Crane and I am a graduate student at Florida State University in the Department of Art Education. I spent the last six years as an art teacher in Gadsden County until starting a position at The John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art. I would like to request your time and cooperation with my Doctoral Dissertation. I am interested in investigating the impact of state and national educational reforms on elementary art teachers and request your participation for my study. The requirements for participation include the completion of one survey. Your cooperation would be greatly appreciated and assist in the continuation of quality art programs at elementary schools in Florida.

I know your time is valuable and you are pulled in many directions therefore the questionnaire will only request a minimal time requirement. The survey will be sent through email but I will gladly send a hard copy upon request. Directions are included and the survey should take no longer than fifteen minutes.

In conjunction with Florida State University rules and regulations, all information will remain anonymous and confidential. Your opinion and input will be greatly appreciated and a valuable part of my research. As a teacher from a previously graded F school, I understand the situation and requirements put upon art teachers and I hope to investigate these issues through your assistance. Thank you in advance for you time, cooperation and input.

Sincerely,

Nicole Crane
Informed Consent Form

I freely and voluntarily and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research project entitled “The impact of federal and state educational reforms on teaching art in selected elementary schools”

The research is being conducted by Nicole Crane, a doctoral student in the Department of Art Education at Florida State University. I understand the purpose of this research project is to better understand the requirements of elementary art teachers. I understand that if I participate in the project I will be asked questions about my daily routines, requirements, and assignments as an art teacher as well as my opinions concerning new educational reforms.

I understand I will be asked to fill out one questionnaire. The total time commitment is less than one hour.

I understand my participation is totally voluntary and I may stop participation at anytime. I understand that all information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. All my answers to the questions will be kept confidential and identified by a subject code number. My name will not appear on any of the results. No individual responses will be reported. Only group findings will be reported.

I understand that there is less than a minimal level of risk involved if I agree to participate in this study. I am also able to stop my participation at any time I wish. I understand that there are also benefits for participating in this research project. I will be providing insights into the tasks of elementary art teachers as well as offering opinions on the impact of educational reforms on art teachers. This knowledge may assist in the promotion of quality art programs at elementary schools.

I understand that this consent may be withdrawn at any time without prejudice, penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I have been given the right to ask and have answered any inquiry concerning the study. Questions if any, have been answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that I may contact Nicole Crane through email at ncrane@ringling.org or by phone at (850) 322-8108, for answers to questions about this research or my rights. Group results will be sent to me upon request.
I have read and understand the consent form.

____________________________________ ____________________________________
(Participant)      (Date)
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