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Abstract:
The purpose of this study was to determine procedures and time consumed in the different activities of
the summer program of work by instructors of vocational agriculture. The study was designed to assist
supervisors, administrators, teacher trainers, and experienced and beginning instructors in building a
complete summer program of work for vocational agriculture.

A questionnaire was sent out to 322 departments of vocational agriculture in eleven western states
where the instructors had "been in their department for two years or longer. The departments were rated
by the state supervisors into high, medium, and low groups as to the excellence of the supervised
farming programs of students in these departments.

Data was obtained on the amount of time that instructors spent on different areas in their summer
program. A separate questionnaire was sent to all state supervisors to determine what types of reports
they required from instructors of vocational agriculture.

The study revealed that about 70 percent of the instructors in the high and low group prepared a written
plan of activities they planned to carry on during the summer. Instructors in both the high and low
groups spent about 20 percent of their time attending summer school. Teachers rated in the high group
averaged $534.61 more annual salary than those in the low group, in the high group 20 percent more of
the instructors visited their students during the summer than did those in the low group. Fifteen percent
more of the instructors in the high group than in the low group had adult farmer classes during the
summer. In the low group 45 percent more of the departments had advisory committees than did those
in the high group.

Activities for improving the summer program of work are recommended. These include planning an
effective summer program of work; visiting all students, and prospective students of agriculture during
the summer! keeping the public informed of activities carried on by the department! and reporting
monthly the activities carried on to the school administrators, school boards, and state supervisors of
vocational agriculture. A form was devised for reporting the summer program of work which would be
of help to instructors to keep the public informed of activities carried on during the summer.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine procedures and time consumed in the different activities of the summer program of work by instructors of vocational agriculture. The study was designed to assist supervisors, administrators, teacher trainers, and experienced and beginning instructors in building a complete summer program of work for vocational agriculture.

A questionnaire was sent out to 322 departments of vocational agriculture in eleven western states where the instructors had been in their department for two years or longer. The departments were rated by the state supervisors into high, medium, and low groups as to the excellence of the supervised farming programs of students in these departments. Data was obtained on the amount of time that instructors spent on different areas in their summer program. A separate questionnaire was sent to all state supervisors to determine what types of reports they required from instructors of vocational agriculture.

The study revealed that about 70 percent of the instructors in the high and low group prepared a written plan of activities they planned to carry on during the summer. Instructors in both the high and low groups spent about 20 percent of their time attending summer school. Teachers rated in the high group averaged $534.61 more annual salary than those in the low group. In the high group 20 percent more of the instructors visited their students during the summer than did those in the low group. Fifteen percent more of the instructors in the high group than in the low group had adult farmer classes during the summer. In the low group 45 percent more of the departments had advisory committees than did those in the high group.

Activities for improving the summer program of work are recommended. These include planning an effective summer program of work; visiting all students, and prospective students of agriculture during the summer; keeping the public informed of activities carried on by the department; and reporting monthly the activities carried on to the school administrators, school boards, and state supervisors of vocational agriculture. A form was devised for reporting the summer program of work which would be of help to instructors to keep the public informed of activities carried on during the summer.
PART I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis study was to determine time consumed in the different activities of the summer program of work by high school vocational agriculture instructors. The study was designed to assist supervisors, administrators, experienced instructors, teacher trainers, and beginning instructors in building a complete summer program of work for vocational agriculture by revealing desirable characteristics and practices.

The problem was designed to include (1) a library study of literature related to the summer program of work of vocational agriculture instructors, (2) a status study to determine the amount of time that teachers of vocational agriculture spend in the different areas of work, and (3) a study to determine numbers and kinds of reports that were required by the state departments of vocational agriculture.

This problem involves the following questions:

1. What are the areas of work in which teachers of vocational agriculture spend their time during the summer?

2. How much time during the summer do teachers of agriculture spend in the above areas of work?

3. What are the areas of work that should have the most time devoted to them during the summer?

Need for Study

The following statements further indicate the need for this study:

1. School administrators and the public may lack information with regard to the summer duties of agricultural instructors.
State supervisors of vocational agriculture and the agriculture instructors may not be in full agreement as to what constitutes a good summer program of work.

**Design of Status Study**

In an attempt to discover the status of the summer program of work 322 1/ vocational agriculture departments were surveyed in Oregon, California, Washington, Idaho, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, Arizona, and New Mexico. A separate questionnaire was sent to the state supervisors of vocational agriculture in forty-eight states, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. The instructors and schools selected were those in which the instructors had been in residence for two or more years because they were established and had a summer program of work in operation.

**Department Ratings** — Ratings were obtained from the state supervisors on each of the 322 departments. The instructors were rated on the general excellence of the supervised-farming programs of the students in their departments. 2/ The schools evaluated were divided into three groups — high, medium and low. The groups were designated as Group I, Group II, and Group III, respectively. There were 104 schools in Group I, 143 in Group II and 75 in Group III.

The schools were designated by number so that the writer would not be biased in rating results and so that the schools would not be subject to unpleasant recognition.

1/ See Appendix page 72 for list of agriculture departments.

2/ See Appendix page 76 for letter requesting ratings on agriculture departments.
Means of Obtaining Data — A questionnaire was devised for the collection of primary data from the instructors in the 322 departments included in this study. The questionnaire was arranged to give information on the following phases of work of the instructors and departments in each program:

1. General information about the instructor and the department.
2. Supervised farming programs of the students.
3. Equipment and facilities.
4. Future Farmers of America activities.
5. Professional improvement of the teacher.
6. All-day high school teaching program.
7. Out-of-school program for veterans, young farmers, and adults.
8. School and community relations.

A questionnaire was also sent to fifty state supervisors of vocational agriculture to determine the following information:

1. Were teachers required to submit to the state office a plan of summer activities?
2. Were teachers required to submit to the state office a report of activities carried on during the summer?

Limitations of Study — From the interpretation of the data, there appear to be no discrepancies or willful intent by the instructors to pad their reports in order to present a better picture of themselves.

The questionnaire in many cases had to be filled in from memory by the instructors. In many cases teachers had but few records of their activities.

\(^3\) See Appendix page 80 for copy of questionnaire sent to instructors.

\(^4\) See Appendix page 78 for copy of questionnaire sent to state supervisors.
Summary of Parts

Part I of this study includes a statement of purpose, procedures, and a description of the design of the status study.

Part II includes a review of (1) statements of objectives in vocational agriculture, (2) legislation, (3) literature and studies pertaining to summer programs in vocational agriculture.

Part III includes an analysis and interpretation of the questionnaire studies.

Part IV includes recommendations for improving the summer program of work of vocational agriculture instructors in eleven western states, and the need for further research.

Summary

The activities of the teacher of vocational agriculture and those of the students enrolled in vocational agriculture undergo a change during the summer months from the systematic group instruction conducted during the regular school year. The effective utilization of the summer period may, and frequently does, determine the success of the entire program of vocational agriculture. The summer program is a subject that deserves careful attention on the part of all persons concerned with instruction in vocational agriculture. Teachers of vocational agriculture may take one or two extreme positions with relation to summer activities. There are those who may regard summer activities as unrelated and separate to the rest of the course. They may think of the work during the academic year as one
program and that during the summer as another; one for "instruction" the
other for "supervision of the farming program and organization activities
of students."

Summer activities should not be planned or thought of as a separate
program. Much instruction can and does take place out of the classroom
during the school year and summer. The summer program needs to be
planned if opportunities for learning are to be realized during this
period of the year.
PART II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STUDIES

This section reviews objectives of vocational education in agriculture; legislative provisions; policies of federal and state agencies; literature, and studies pertaining to the summer program of vocational agriculture. Studies and reports have dealt more extensively with supervised farming and the all-day school program than with the summer activities of teachers.

Objectives of Vocational Education in Agriculture

The purpose of vocational education in agriculture is to increase proficiency in farming on the part of those now engaged in farming and the prospective farmers.

The major objectives of vocational education in agriculture are to develop effective ability to:

1. Make a beginning and advance in farming.
2. Produce farm commodities efficiently.
3. Market farm products advantageously.
4. Conserve soil and other natural resources.
5. Manage a farm business.
6. Maintain a favorable environment.

These objectives were set up by a committee of the American Vocational Association and the Federal Board for Vocational Education in September 1929.

Legislative Provisions

The National Vocational Education (Smith-Hughes) Act was approved February 23, 1917. This is the basic act. The act provides annual appropriations for distribution to the States for the promotion of vocational education in agriculture, trades and industry, home economics, and for the training of teachers for those fields. This act is still in effect.

The Vocational Education Act of 1946, known as the George-Barden Act, is the latest of many subsequent acts which provided additional funds for vocational education. All of the acts were passed for the same general purpose — to promote and develop vocational education of less than college grade.

Federal and State Agency Policies

The Federal vocational education acts contain two mandatory provisions which are peculiar to instruction in vocational education in agriculture. They are:

1. The instruction must be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age who are preparing for farming or who are engaged in farming.

2. Provision must be made for at least 6 months of supervised practice in agriculture each year.

5/ Public No. 347 Sixty-fourth Congress S.703

7/ Public No. 586 Seventy-ninth Congress S.703

For a complete program in vocational education in agriculture the element of time should be considered in terms of years as well as in terms of minutes and days per week or month. The in-school youth needs instruction in agriculture to lay a better foundation for his farming career. The out-of-school young farmer needs systematic instruction dealing with the problem of becoming established in farming. Finally, as an adult farmer he should have an educational service which will keep him informed on the latest developments and the most recent approved practices that affect the enterprises in his farming operations. Therefore, a school should provide an uninterrupted program of instruction in agriculture.

It is recommended that in developing effective supervised farming programs instruction and assistance be provided for students on all of their important farming activities. This requires that provisions be made for the teachers of vocational agriculture to visit farms of students throughout the year.

In view of the fact that the Smith-Hughes Act requires that schools offering instruction in agriculture shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, for at least six months per year, and that farming is a year-round activity, a school shall provide such direction or supervision by a qualified vocational teacher on a twelve month basis. 9/

The Montana State Plan for Vocational Education provides that teachers of vocational agriculture shall be employed on a 12-month basis. The purpose of employing a teacher of vocational agriculture for twelve months is to provide a program of vocational agriculture during the summer months as well as during the period of year that school is in session.

Review of Educational Literature

Present concepts of writers on the summer program of work of vocational agriculture instructors show the necessity for a relationship between the summer program and that of the regular school year. Roy A. Olney pointed out in 1948 that the following activities will demand the attention of the teacher of agriculture during the summer months: (1) supervising pupils, (2) improving the facilities of the department, (3) maintaining public relations and self-improvement programs, and (4) participating in recreational activities.

Sherman Dickinson has stated that the alert teacher of vocational agriculture will not fail to recognize that summer affords his greatest opportunity for effective teaching. Schools are closed, class-


rooms are empty, and shops are silent; there is every reason to expect that the teaching not only will continue, but that it will become more intensified than during the regular school period.

Garsie Hammonds 13/ states that a teacher of vocational agriculture has little difficulty in justifying, in the minds of his patrons and employers, his salary from September to May. Tradition has it that teachers do not teach during the summer. Many of those with whom we work, live in the realm of tradition. Vocational agriculture teaching with its year-round program represents a digression from the old idea of "school teaching" — a digression from what has been custom. It is up to the men engaged in teaching vocational agriculture to prove that the summer salary is justified. He further states that the agriculture teacher is employed on a 12-month basis primarily for the purpose of efficiently directing and supervising the farm practice work of his students. The close of the school term gives the student an opportunity to carry forward farm practice under more favorable conditions.

F. E. Heald 14/ stresses that teaching by the best teachers occurs on the job rather than in the classroom, often times during the summer months. The field or barn is the laboratory in agriculture. Here the boy learns the technique, but he also encounters problems which no amount of classroom teaching would have made so real. Farming is both


an occupation and a mode of life. Teaching during the summer, or on the
project at any time, must not omit either of these phases, and the
interest of the teacher must be real rather than perfunctory if he
expects to get results. This would indicate that an instructor should
plan carefully to make each visit as profitable to the pupil as possible.

H. M. Hamlin recommends that monthly, as well as annual reports
by teachers of vocational agriculture should be made, but no matter what
other reports are made, a report of summer activities is needed. Employ­
ers often have little idea of the summer activities of the teacher. The
community may also wonder what the teacher does in the summer. A plan
for the use of summer time and monthly reports of summer activities
protect the teacher from criticism and also from a temptation to be
more lax in his summer work than in his work at other times of the year.

In Montana the teacher of vocational agriculture is required to
submit an outline of his proposed program of work to the state supervisor
of vocational agriculture in May. In September he makes a report to
the state supervisor of activities carried on during the summer.

W. F. Stewart stated that some time in May it is appropriate
for the teacher of vocational agriculture to take an inventory of the
many activities which he recognizes he must perform or will want to do

15/ H. M. Hamlin, "The Community Program of Agriculture Education",
Published by Illini Union Bookstore, Champaign, Ill., 1943, p. 206.

16/ W. F. Stewart, "Planning a Summer Program of Work", Agricultural
during the summer. It will help doubtless to classify these under such headings as:

1. Supervision of all-day students.
2. Supervision of part-time students.
3. Supervision of evening-class members.
4. Future Farmers of America supervisory duties.
5. Publicity.
6. Preparation of reports.
7. Improvement of physical equipment of classroom and shop.
8. Reorganization of courses.
9. Professional improvement.
10. Miscellaneous

Aretas W. Nolan 17 has stated that during the school year conditions for teaching vocational agriculture seem most ideal, but we have even a more nearly perfect teaching situation during the summer in connection with project supervision. During the summer the student is in the presence of actual farm problems, with a trained teacher at his side and a father as a cooperating assistant. If real teaching and learning cannot be achieved under such circumstances, the fault lies not in the situation.

M. C. Gaar 18 maintains that during the summer the major part of the time should be taken up by farm visitations for the purpose of aiding the students in using superior practices as planned in class during the school year. He further suggests that the teacher of vocational

---


agriculture select one day each week to remain in the department to take care of correspondence, maintain files and records, make up requisitions for supplies, work on the course of study, check references, check shop tools, work in shop, prepare news articles, and plan F.F.A. meetings. Gaar recommends that teachers spend four days each week visiting and teaching students (all-day, young farmers, and adults). While out on supervisory trips the teacher should visit prospective students, new farmers in the area, and make occasional surveys as opportunities arise.

Arthur M. Ahalt 19/ reports that through diplomatic home and public contacts with farmers, teachers of vocational agriculture are enabled to develop respect and good will for the public school system. The contacts of the teacher in his summer program are often responsible for the cooperative attitudes of parents toward the school program in rural communities. A good teacher can promote the work and program of the school. A teacher with a poor attitude can likewise do much harm.

Arthur Mellor 20/ states that beginning teachers sometimes hesitate in making project visits, not knowing how they will be received. There isn't much to justify this attitude according to reports in literature and from the writer's own experience. First of all, a boy is glad to be visited. He is grateful and frequently will say so. Furthermore, his


20/ Arthur Mellor, "Plan for On-Farm Teaching This Summer", Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 23, No. 10, April 1951, p. 238.
mother and dad are pleased that their son is getting some attention. In addition to this, the teacher is a busy man, so the only sensible thing is to make the most of every minute.

Stanley S. Richardson \(^{21/}\) stated that reports of summer activities are of value for the following reasons:

1. They furnish a definite record of the activities and may be submitted to the superintendent or other school officials who are anxious to know what the teacher did during the summer.

2. There is a definite record to show what is being done for the Federal, State and/or district money expended.

3. When a teacher leaves the job during the summer, there is a definite written record to show what has been done.

4. There is an excellent chance to find out what has been or is being done in part-time and evening class follow-up work, and other activities may also be checked.

5. As a basis for further research work they will aid in determining what has been or is being done and what can be done to improve the department.

6. Reports serve as an aid in the teacher-training program.

7. They keep instructors conscious of the job ahead of them.

8. The instructor has a written record as insurance in case of unfair or unjust criticism that may be given of his summer work.

Glen C. Cook \(^{22/}\) brings out that the teacher of vocational agriculture is employed on a twelve months basis because of the need for


instruction the year-round. He lists the objectives of the summer pro-

gram as:

1. To provide for an effective follow-up program of the instruction of all-day, young farmer, and adult farmer students. This provides for teaching on the farm while supervising the farming programs.

2. To provide opportunity during the summer to discover and select farm problems of the students to be included in the instruction.

3. To provide additional opportunity to render educational service to farmers in the community.

4. To provide organized class instruction for farmers in the community on a year-round basis.

5. To provide for the development of leadership abilities of FFA members through conducting summer meetings, education tours, and camping trips.

6. To provide opportunity for the instructor to contact prospective students of vocational agriculture.

7. To provide for continuity of the instruction.

H. M. Hamlin 23/ states that the summer program needs especially careful planning. The summer work of the teacher of vocational agriculture is unstandardized and it is often unorganized. The summer may be one of the most fruitful periods of the year for educational work and for preparing for the year of teaching ahead.

N. E. Wilson 24/ maintains that if we accept the philosophy of vocational agriculture as set up, we are forced to the conclusion that

---


the summer program must be a continuation of, or closely related to, the basic instructional program. There are certain activities in adult work that may be best engaged in during the summer. He further states that it is his opinion, and also the opinion of those consulted, that we don't need a winter program and a summer program each independent and complete. We need a sound, continuing program that utilizes all of the time required to make satisfactory improvements. The activities involved in an adult-farmer program may be viewed by the teacher as follows:

1. Teaching.
2. Supervision.
3. Evaluating results.

**Review of Thesis and Non-thesis Studies**

A study was made of the "Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education" to determine what studies have been made on the summer program and it was found that very few people have made any studies in this field even though there is a great need for investigations.

P. G. Frazier found that the pattern of high school activities based on days of work varied considerably in 120 different types of departments, but as a general pattern, test plots and visitations ranked first; office second; professional improvement third; tours and trips fourth; and meeting fifth; with an average of 157.3 different types of activities carried on.

---

M. W. Wallace reports his findings in a study of the summer teaching load of twenty-seven teachers of vocational agriculture in Southwestern Ohio, Table I.

### Table I. Percent of Time and Average Number of Hours per Teacher Devoted to the Various Areas of the Summer Program of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Percent of Total Time</th>
<th>Average Number of Hours per Teacher for Each Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Improvement®</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>135.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; Community Relationships</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised Farming Programs</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Farmers of America</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Facilities</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Day Teaching</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records and Reports</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Farmer Education</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Farmer Education</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>561.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

® Includes time devoted to special technical training courses

Wallace recommended that greater emphasis should be placed on project supervision; planning the all-day teaching program for the year; that every Future Farmer chapter should be active throughout the year;

that during the summer there is an opportunity to further the Young Farmer, and Adult Farmer programs; that every teacher should provide time for cleaning, arranging, and replacing the physical equipment in his department; and that more teachers should utilize the opportunity to keep local school boards informed of their summer activities through the use of monthly reports.

C. W. Hill \(^{27/}\) reports that the teachers of West Virginia average 54.2 hours of work per week. During the summer the all-day pupils received 40.5 percent of the teacher's time. 13.1 percent of the vocational agriculture instructors time was spent teaching and/or supervising out-of-school groups, while 23.1 percent of their time was spent keeping the department in operating condition, office work, and promotional activities. 12.0 percent of the time was spent attending meetings and in community service while only 6.7 percent of the teachers time was spent in professional study and improvement.

Julius F. Thomas \(^{28/}\) found that negro teachers of vocational agriculture in Alabama spent 35 percent of their time supervising the farming programs of students in organized instruction. The remaining 65 percent was distributed as follows: Preparation for classes in voc-

\(\text{\textsuperscript{27/}}\) C. W. Hill, "Time Used for Professional Activities by West Virginia Teachers of Vocational Agriculture", Agricultural Education Magazine, Vol. 22, No. 5, November 1949, p. 118.

\(\text{\textsuperscript{28/}}\) Julius F. Thomas, "A Study of the Summer Activities of Negro Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Alabama", Problem, M.S. in Agriculture, Cornell University, Rural Education, Ithaca, N. Y. 1949, p. 121.
national agriculture, 16.79 percent; professional improvement, 13.23 percent; community services, 8.41 percent; New Farmers of America activities, 6.96 percent; campus improvement, 5.83 percent; publicity work, 3.51 percent; records and reports, 3.26 percent; visiting prospective students 2.19 percent; tours and trips, 1.68 percent; meeting, 1.1 percent; follow-up of former students, 0.75 percent; teaching veterans classes, 0.49 percent; and emergency automobile repairs, 0.47 percent. The average teacher devoted to his work 50.33 hours per 6-day week, or 8.48 hours per day.

Marion W. Wallace found in a study of 27 teachers of vocational agriculture in Southwestern Ohio areas of work ranked in the following order:

1. Professional improvement.
2. School and community relationships.
3. Supervised farm practice.
4. Future Farmers of America.
5. Physical facilities.
6. Preparation for all-day teaching.
7. Records and reports.
8. Adult farmer activities.
9. Young farmer activities.

The division of time was influenced considerably by the fact that the

---

major portion of the study was made during the year when a number of special training courses were held in connection with the Emergency Food Production program, hence professional improvement ranks much higher than it would rank during a normal year. Fifty-two percent of the 27 teachers took less than 10 day's vacation. The study indicated that while the majority of the teachers reporting were busy, there was opportunity for improvement in the budgeting of their time.
PART III. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY

This part deals with the analysis and interpretation of the questionnaire study of summer practices and work of teachers of vocational agriculture in eleven western states. Different questionnaires were sent to teachers and state supervisors of vocational agriculture.

Questionnaires were sent to 322 vocational agriculture departments of whom 258 replied for a total of 81.23 percent. The data has been analyzed and interpreted under the following headings:

1. General information about the instructors and the department.
2. Supervised farming program of the students.
3. Facilities and equipment.
4. Future Farmer of America activities.
5. Professional improvement of the teacher.
6. All-day high school program.
7. Out of school program for veterans, young farmers, and adults.
8. School and community relations.

General Information About the Agriculture Instructors and the Vocational Agriculture Departments Studied

In dealing with the general information about the instructors and the department, the following information was studied: (1) enrollment and teacher load, (2) number of students per department, (3) salaries, (4) time spent teaching vocational agriculture, (5) equipment owned by the school for use by the department, and (7) written plan for summer program of work.
Each of the 322 departments selected for this study were rated by state supervisors of vocational agriculture on the general excellence of the supervised farming programs of the students. The schools evaluated were divided into three groups; high, medium, and low. In this report, the high, medium, and low groups are referred to as Group I, II, and III.

Enrollment - No appreciable difference exists in the average number of high school students enrolled per teacher between the three groups rated according to the excellence of the supervised farming programs in their departments. (Table II). However, Group I, the high group, has an average enrollment of 87.8 students as compared to Group III. The low group has an average enrollment of 47.3 students. Group II, the medium group, ranks between Group I and Group III with an average enrollment of 55.4 students. The high group also has a higher average number of teachers per department. This study indicates that departments rated higher were those with larger enrollments and the largest number of teachers per department.

It was found that in Group I there were more town boys than farm boys enrolled in vocational agriculture. This situation is not in accord with the general opinion of educators in vocational agriculture. They believe that to have a superior supervised farming program there must be a high percentage of farm boys in the department. In this study it was found that about 15 percent of the students enrolled in all three groups were town boys.
TABLE II. AVERAGE NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER DEPARTMENT, ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER TEACHER IN 258 DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN ELEVEN WESTERN STATES BY EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment and no. of teachers</th>
<th>Enrollment according to excellence of supervised farming program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town boys enrolled</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm boys enrolled</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average total enrolled</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. teachers per department</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average no. students per teacher</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 schools; 116 schools; 62 schools

Salaries and Length of Service - There is a large variation in salaries paid to instructors of vocational agriculture. (Table III).

The average for all 258 instructors for the school year 1948-1949 was $3,941.30, with Group I averaging $4,210.61, Group II averaging $3,937.29 and Group III averaging $3,676.00. There is a difference of $273.32 between Group I and II, and Group III averages $261.29 less than Group II. There is a difference of $534.61 between Group I and Group III.

Part of the difference is due to the amount of time spent teaching vocational agriculture. Some vocational agriculture instructors are required to teach other subjects in the school. In such cases the school receives less federal and state reimbursement. Schools in this category appear to pay their vocational agriculture instructors less
yearly salary than schools in which the full time of the teacher is devoted to vocational agriculture.

TABLE III. RANGE OF SALARIES PAID TO 258 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS RATED ACCORDING TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM OF THEIR DEPARTMENT 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>$5610.00</td>
<td>$5000.00</td>
<td>$4500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>$3200.00</td>
<td>$2500.00</td>
<td>$2850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$4210.61</td>
<td>$3937.29</td>
<td>$3676.00</td>
<td>$3941.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>30 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

Teachers with higher salaries have more experience. (Table IV).

Instructors in Group I have an average of 12.6 years of experience teaching vocational agriculture, while Group II has 10.6 years experience and Group III, 7.6 years experience teaching vocational agriculture.
TABLE IV. GENERAL EXCELLENCE OF THE SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM IN RELATIONSHIP TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE OF 258 INSTRUCTORS 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

Time Spent Teaching Vocational Agriculture - Teachers of vocational agriculture spent the following amounts of time teaching vocational agriculture in 1948-1949:

- Group I: 81 percent of the time
- Group II: 77 percent of the time
- Group III: 74 percent of the time

The instructors who are full-time or nearly full-time vocational agriculture instructors are doing a better job of teaching according to the ratings given them on the excellence of the supervised farming programs.

Equipment Owned by the School for Use by Instructors of Vocational Agriculture - The amount of equipment (movie projector, camera, and farm machinery) available to vocational agriculture instructors varies. (Table V). Most of the schools provide a movie projector for use by the vocational agriculture instructor. In Group I, 100 percent of the
instructors had a movie projector available for their use; in Group II, 98.3 percent of the instructors had a projector available; in Group III, 93.5 percent of the instructors had a projector available. A camera was available to 62.5 percent of the instructors in the High Group; the Medium Group had a camera available to 44.9 percent of the instructors; and in the Low Group a camera was available to 25.8 percent of the instructors. A farm tractor and machinery were available to 50 percent of Group I; to 33.6 percent of Group II; and to 22.5 percent of Group III. The large variations in equipment available to instructors is evidence that those instructors who rated in the high group have more varied equipment available for their use.

TABLE V. EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM IN RELATION TO KINDS OF EQUIPMENT OWNED BY SCHOOLS FOR USE BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS IN 258 SCHOOLS LOCATED IN ELEVEN WESTERN STATES 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
<th>Kinds of Equipment Owned by Schools by Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film Strip Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>30 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

In Group I the school owned or Future Farmer owned machinery and tractor was made available to 42.5 percent of the students on their home
farms; in Group II, 18.1 percent of the students had use of farm machinery; and in Group III, 12.9 percent of the students were able to use school or FFA owned machinery. Group I schools may have rated high on the excellence of their supervised farming programs because equipment was available to give the boys a good start in farming.

Written Plan for Summer Program of Work - A written plan of summer program of work was prepared by 75.5 percent of the instructors in Group I as compared to 44.8 percent in Group II and 64.5 percent in Group III. (Table VI). One hundred and seventeen of the 258 instructors had no written plan of their summer program of work. The variation in the three groups apparently indicates that teachers in the high group consider it more necessary to have a written outline of their summer program than the teachers of the lower groups.

### Table VI. Percentage of Vocational Agriculture Instructors by Groups Who Plan a Summer Program of Work and to Whom Submitted in 258 Departments Rated According to the Excellence of Supervised Farming Programs of Their Departments 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Program of Work And to Whom Submitted</th>
<th>Percentage complying according to Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare written plan of summer program</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply copy of plan to superintendent</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply copy of plan to school board</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply copy of plan to state supervisor</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools
Advisory committees were used by 30 percent of the instructors in Group I to help plan their summer program of work. In Group II, 75 percent of the instructors made use of advisory committees, and in Group III 24.4 percent of the instructors made use of advisory committees. This study indicates no marked relationship between the use of advisory committees and the excellence of the supervised farming programs of the students. A more definite relationship may exist than is shown by the questionnaire study.

A proposed summer program of work is submitted to the superintendent of schools by 48.7 percent of the instructors in Group I, 41.3 percent of the instructors in Group II and 53.3 percent in Group III (Table VI).

In Group I, 11.7 percent of the instructors present a copy of their summer program of work to their school board as compared to 12 percent in Group II and 11.2 percent in Group III (Table VI). It appears evident that a large percentage of the instructors in all groups either fail to submit a plan of their summer program of work to their school boards or consider it unimportant.

A copy of the summer program of work was sent to the state supervisor of vocational agriculture by 41.2 percent of the instructors in Group I; by 46.5 percent of the instructors in Group II; and by 50 percent of the instructors in Group III (Table VI). Even though 75.5 percent of the instructors in Group I make a written outline of their summer program of work less than half of them present it to their superintendent, school board or state supervisor. Teachers in Group II and
III make even less use than those in Group I of the written plan of their summer program of work.

Of the eighty instructors in Group I, 78.7 percent of them kept the public informed of the types and kinds of activities that they carried on during the summer months. Of the 116 instructors in Group II, 69 percent kept the public informed of the work they were doing during the summer months. Of the sixty-two instructors in Group III, 67.7 percent kept the general public informed of their activities during the summer. In all groups, 71.8 percent of the instructors kept the general public informed of their program during the summer months by use of the radio, newspapers, news letters, and personal farm visits.

A written report of the summer activities was submitted to the school administrators by 42.5 percent of the instructors in Group I; 43 percent of the instructors in Group II; and by 43.5 percent of the instructors in Group III. (Table VII). In Groups I, II, and III, respectively, 15, 13.8, and 12.8 percent of the instructors present a copy of their summer activities and program to their local board of education. In Group I, 41.2 percent of the instructors sent a report of activities carried on during the summer to the state supervisor of vocational agriculture. In Group II and III respectively, 39.7 and 37 percent of the instructors sent a report of activities carried on during the summer to the state supervisor of vocational agriculture. The lack of reports to superintendents of schools, school boards, and the state supervisor of vocational agriculture may indicate a serious weakness in school and community relationships.
TABLE VII. PERCENT OF 258 VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS RATED ACCORDING TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM SUBMITTING REPORTS TO ADMINISTRATORS, SCHOOL BOARDS, AND SUPERVISORS 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons or Groups Reporting To</th>
<th>Percent According to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>42.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Boards</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisors</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

In Group I, 4.6 percent of the instructor's time during the months of June, July, and August was spent doing the following types of service activities for their communities: (1) Managing local fairs and shows; (2) Making veterinary service calls to farmers; (3) Managing community auction sales; and (4) Operating a labor employment office. In Group II, 7.3 percent of the time of the instructors was spent doing similar activities and in Group III, 8.8 percent of the time of the instructors was spent doing service activities. Instructors in Group I rated superior regarding supervised farming programs, appear to find less time to devote to service activities not directly related to vocational education in agriculture.

**Supervised Farming Program — Summer Only — 1948-1949**

In an attempt to discover the differences in the activities carried on by the three groups of instructors rated as to the excellence of supervised farming programs in their departments, an analysis was made of
the amount of time spent in on-the-farm supervision of farming programs of students. This study also includes an analysis of the number of visits per student, number of projects per student, and average length of each visit.

The instructors in Group I spent 31 percent of their time supervising projects of their students, as compared to 13.4 percent of the instructor’s time in Group II, and 10.6 percent of the instructor’s time in Group III. (Table VIII). This part of the study appears to indicate a direct relationship between the excellence of the supervised farming program and amount of time devoted by the instructor to on-the-farm visits.

### Table VIII. Percent of Vocational Agriculture Instructors Time Spent Supervising Projects in 258 Departments Rated According to Excellence of Supervised Farming Programs of Students 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percent of Teachers Time Spent Supervising Farming Programs by Groups</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of time spent supervising farming programs of students</td>
<td>31.0% 13.4% 10.6% 13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*80 schools; b116 schools; c62 schools

**Time Spent Contacting Prospective Students** - The instructors of Group I spent an average of 9.6 percent of their time contacting prospective students of vocational agriculture in comparison to Group II instructors who spent 4.3 percent on their time and Group III instructors who spent 2.5 percent of their time contacting new students of vocational
agriculture. Instructors in Group I made the greatest effort to provide guidance to prospective students before the start of school in the fall.

Number of Projects Per Boy - In Group I, freshmen averaged 2.1 livestock and crop projects. (Table IX); sophomores averaged 2.7 projects; juniors averaged 2.9; and out-of-school youths averaged 2.9. In Group II, the freshmen averaged 1.3 projects; the sophomores averaged 1.4 projects; the juniors 1.5; and the out-of-school youths averaged 1.4 projects. In Group III, freshmen averaged .8 projects; sophomores averaged 1.2 projects; juniors averaged 2.1 projects; and out-of-school youths averaged 1.5 projects. Group I had an average of 1.2 more projects per student than either of the other two groups.

### Table IX. Average Number of Projects Carried Per Boy in Vocational Agriculture in 256 Departments Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
<th>Number of Projects Carried Per Boy</th>
<th>Out-of-School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>Sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average All Groups</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>30 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

Average Number and Length of Project Visitations - In Group I the instructors visited the freshmen students on an average of 4.7 times; sophomores 3.7; juniors 2.9; and out-of-school youths 2.5 times. (Table X).
In Group II instructors visited freshmen for an average of 3.2 times; sophomores 3.3; juniors 2.5; and out-of-school youths 1.8 times as compared to Group III instructors who visited the freshmen for an average of 2.1 times; sophomores 1.5 times; juniors 1.7, and out-of-school youths 1.7 times.

In Group I, the average length of the visit to students was 2.2 hours; Group II, 1.5 hours; and Group III, 1.1 hours in length. (Table X).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
<th>Number and Length of Student Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for All Groups</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools;  b116 schools;  c62 schools

In Group I, two or 2.5 percent of the instructors did not visit any of their students during the summer months. In Group II, thirty-six or 21 percent and in Group III twenty or 32.3 percent of the instructors did not visit any students during the summer months. There were 29.3 percent more instructors in Group III who did not visit any students during the summer months than there were in Group I. It is evident that the instructors in Group I realize more than those in Groups II and III.
the need to continue the teaching process during the summer months by visiting the students on their home farms.

**Physical Facilities**

The time spent by teachers of agriculture in improving the classroom, shop facilities, and equipment was covered by the questionnaire study.

**Working in Shop** - During the summer months the vocational agriculture instructors in Group I spent a total of 8.6 days in taking inventory, learning new shop skills, and putting the shop in order for the new school year. The instructors in Group II spent 5.4 days and those in Group III spent 1.2 days working in the shop. (Table XI).

**TABLE XI. NUMBER OF DAYS SPENT BY INSTRUCTORS WORKING IN THE SHOP AND CLASSROOM IN 256 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Spent Working in Vocational Agriculture Department</th>
<th>Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Days Spent Working in Shop</td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Days Spent Working in Classroom</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. Days Spent on Dept. Facilities</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

**Working in Classroom** - Instructors in Group I spent an average of 6.7 days during the summer months in putting their classroom in order,
in ordering new supplies, and in putting their files in order. (Table XV). Group II instructors spent 4.4 days, and Group III instructors spent 2.7 days in general work in the classroom. Instructors in Group I spend more time than those in Group II and III in getting their classroom and shop in the best of order when the fall term of school starts.

Future Farmers of America

The questionnaire included a study of the following activities carried on by the instructor in connection with their Future Farmers of America activities: (1) Summer trip; (2) Number of meetings held; (3) Future Farmer conventions; (4) School farm; (5) Judging trips; (6) Fairs and exhibits; and (7) Leadership schools.

Summer Trip - 46.2 percent of the instructors in Group I took their Future Farmers on a summer trip. In Group II, 41.3 percent and in Group III, 69.3 percent of the instructors took their Future Farmers on a summer trip. In Group I the trips averaged 3.1 days in length; in Group II and III trips averaged 1.9 and 1.2 days in length respectively.

Number of Meetings Held - During the summer months chapters in Group I held an average of 4.6 meetings; Group II, 4.2 meetings; and Group III, 3.1 meetings. It is important that summer meetings of the Future Farmer Chapter be held so that their activities may continue throughout the year.

Time Spent on other Future Farmer Activities - The instructors in Group I spent 26 percent of their time in Future Farmer of America activities during the summer months. (Table XII). Group II spent 17.5
percent of their time and Group III 16.9 percent of their time on Future Farmer of America activities. These activities are made up of F.F.A. conventions, school or chapter farms, judging trips, fairs, exhibits, and leadership training schools. The instructors in Group I realize more than those in Groups II and III the importance of carrying on a well-rounded program of work with their Future Farmer chapter in order to carry out a complete program of vocational agriculture.

### TABLE XII. PERCENT OF TIME INSTRUCTORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SPENT ON FUTURE FARMER OF AMERICA ACTIVITIES IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Group IA</th>
<th>Group IIB</th>
<th>Group IIC</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on FFA Conventions</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on School Farm</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on Judging Trips</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on Fairs and Exhibits</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent on Leadership Schools</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Time Spent on FFA Activities</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*80 schools; 116 schools; 62 schools

Instructors in Group I, II, and III spent little time in the supervising of a community cannery. The instructors in Group I spent an
average of 2.5; Group II, 2.1; and Group III, 2.4 days in the supervision of a community cannery. Of the instructors in Group I, 18.7 percent of them supervise a community cannery. In Group II, 7.9 percent of the instructors supervise a community cannery and in Group III, 14.2 percent of the instructors supervise a community cannery. There were twenty instructors in Group I that supervised a community cannery, and they averaged 13.3 days supervising it. In Group II there were nine instructors who supervised a community cannery, and they averaged 27 days supervising it. In Group III there were also nine instructors who supervised a community cannery for an average of 17.9 days. Apparently instructors who do supervise a community cannery spend a great deal of time at it.

Professional Improvement

An analysis was made of the amount of time spent in professional improvement by the instructors in the three groups rated as to excellence of the supervised farming programs in their departments.

In Group I, 37.5 percent of the instructors attended summer school during the summer of 1948-1949. In Group II, 31.9 percent and in Group III, 48.4 percent of the instructors attended summer school. A larger percentage of the instructors of Group III attended summer school than of either Group I or II. They may have done so for the following reasons:

1. To renew teaching certificates.
2. To bring up their salary schedule.
3. To get more training.
In Group I, 15.1 percent of the time of the instructors of vocational agriculture was spent in professional improvement. (Table XIII). The instructors in Groups II and III averaged 14.1 and 21 percent of their time respectively during the summer months in professional improvement. Instructors in Group III appear to realize the need to improve their program in vocational agriculture.

**Table XIII. Percent of Time That Instructors of Vocational Agriculture Spent on Professional Improvement During the Summer in 258 Departments Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program 1948-1949**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Professional Improvement</th>
<th>Percent According to Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to Summer School</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Study</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vo-Ag Conferences</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference with State Supervisor, Advisor Council, School Board, or School Superintendent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of Professional Improvement</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

**All-Day Teaching Program**

The questionnaire study was devised so the amount of time that instructors of vocational agriculture spent on their all-day teaching program could be determined. During the summer teachers spent their time
in activities such as: (1) Community surveys; (2) Field trips; (3) Organizing daily teaching plans and a four-year course of study; and (5) Collecting display material and weed samples. Instructors in Group I devote 16.4 percent of their time to these activities as compared to Group II and III respectively who devoted 16 and 15.4 percent of their time. (Table XIX).

TABLE XIX. PERCENT OF TIME SPENT ON PREPARATION OF ALL-DAY TEACHING PROGRAM BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS IN 25% DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activities</th>
<th>Percent according to Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Surveys</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing daily teaching plans and 4-year course of study</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing charts and teaching aids</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting display material</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*80 schools; b116 schools; c62 schools

Out-of-School Program

In the Out-of-school program an attempt was made to find the amount of time spent by the three groups rated as to excellence of supervised farming program under the following headings: (1) veterans on-the-farm
training; (2) young farmers; and (3) adult farmers.

Veterans on-the-farm Training Program - Instructors in Group I spent an average of 28.6 hours during the summer months supervising the veterans on-the-farm training program as compared to 26.4 hours by Group II and 30.9 hours by Group III. Instructors in Group III spent as much as 400 hours on the veterans on-the-farm training program.

Young Farmers Program - The instructors in Group I spent an average of 3.3 hours of classroom instruction with their young farmers. (Table XV). Groups II and III averaged 7.1 and 10.3 hours respectively in classroom instruction of young farmers during the summer months. Instructors in Group I spent an average of 5.2 hours during the months of June, July, and August in on-the-farm visits supervising the work of young farmers. (Table XV). Group II instructors spent an average of 7.3 hours and the instructors in Group III spent an average of 23.1 hours supervising the work of young farmers on their farms.

The survey indicates that the teachers in Group I devoted less time to young farmers. Instructors in Group I spent more of their time with the high school students than do the instructors in Group III and therefore cannot spend as much time with the out-of-school groups.
TABLE XV. NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT INSTRUCTING AND VISITING YOUNG FARMERS ENROLLED IN CLASS BY INSTRUCTORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DURING THE SUMMER IN 252 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours Spent by Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Visits</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>30 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

Adult Farmer Program - The questionnaire divided the adult farmer program into two phases, namely: classroom instruction, and farm visits. The data revealed that the instructors in Group I spent 6.5 hours instructing adult farmer classes during the months of June, July and August, Group II spent 4.1 hours, and Group III spent 5 hours instructing adult farmer classes. (Table XVI).

Instructors in Group I spent an average of 7.2 hours during the summer supervising adult farmer class members. Group II, 4.1 hours, and Group III, 2.6 hours of supervising adult farmers in on-the-farm visits (Table XVI). The data revealed that 16.2 percent of the instructors in Group I had adult farmer programs during the summer as compared to 12.9 percent of Group II, and .8 percent of Group III.
TABLE XVI. NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT BY INSTRUCTORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SUPervising AND INSTRUCTING ADULT FARMER CLASSES IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Hours Spent by Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Supervision</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>50 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

School and Community Relations

The questionnaire was devised so that a study could be made to determine the amount of time that instructors of vocational agriculture spent on school and community relations.

Reports and Correspondence - In Group I, instructors spent an average of 8.6 hours during the summer making out reports and 10.8 hours answering correspondence. (Table XVII). The instructors in Group II spent an average of 11.8 hours making out reports, and 11.2 hours answering correspondence. In Group III, instructors spent an average of 15.8 hours making out reports and 16.2 hours answering correspondence.
TABLE XVII.  NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT MAKING OUT REPORTS AND ANSWERING CORRESPONDENCE BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports and Correspondence</th>
<th>Hours Spent by Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\]30 school; \[b\]116 schools; \[c\]62 schools

News Articles and Radio Broadcasts - The instructors in Group I spent 5.4 hours writing news articles as compared to 4.5, and 3.5 hours spent by Group II and III respectively. (Table XVIII). The instructors in Group I had published an average of 7 news articles during the summer months. (Table XIX). Instructors in Groups II and III had published 5.2 and 4.6 news articles respectively. In Group I, 72.5 percent of the instructors wrote news articles during the summer as compared to 67.2 and 66.1 percent respectively in Groups II and III.
TABLE XVIII. NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT WRITING NEWS ARTICLES AND PREPARING RADIO BROADCAST DURING THE SUMMER MONTHS BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News articles and Radio broadcasts</th>
<th>Hours Spent by Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing News Articles</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing Radio Broadcasts</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 80 schools; <sup>b</sup> 116 schools; <sup>c</sup> 62 schools

Instructors in Group I spent an average of 2.3 hours preparing radio broadcasts as compared to 1.0 and .9 hours spent by Groups II and III respectively. (Table XVIII). Instructors in Group I averaged one radio broadcast; Group II averaged .6; and Group III averaged .1 radio broadcasts during the summer. (Table XIX). In Group I, 41.2 percent of the instructors made radio broadcasts during the summer as compared to 24.1 percent and 19.3 percent respectively by instructors in Groups II and III.
TABLE XIX. NUMBER OF NEWS ARTICLES PUBLISHED AND RADIO BROADCASTS MADE BY INSTRUCTORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles Published and Radio Broadcasts Made</th>
<th>No. of Radio Broadcasts Made and News Articles Published by Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Articles Published</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Broadcasts Made</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

Newsletters - Newsletters were little used by the instructors in this study to keep students and parents informed of activities carried on by the department of vocational agriculture during the summer. The average for Group I was 1.2 newsletters published during the summer months as compared to .6 for Group II, and .8 for Group III.

Farm and Non-Farm Organization Meetings Attended - The instructors in Group I attended an average of 5.9 non-farm civic meetings during the summer months as compared to 5.3 meetings by Group II and 3.6 meetings by Group III. In attending non-farm meetings Group I spent an average of 10.1 hours as compared to 10.3 hours by Group II and 7.3 hours by Group III. (Table XX).

Group I instructors attended an average of 7.1 farm organization meetings and spent an average of 13.2 hours attending them. Group II instructors attended an average of 4.7 farm meetings with an average of 12.3 hours in the attendance and Group III instructors attended an
average of 3.7 meetings during the summer with an average of 9.2 hours spent in their attendance. (Table XX).

**TABLE XX.** FARM AND NON-FARM ORGANIZATION MEETINGS ATTENDED AND HOURS SPENT ATTENDING THEM BY INSTRUCTORS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN 258 DEPARTMENTS RATED AS TO EXCELLENCE OF SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAM 1948-1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Rated as to Excellence of Supervised Farming Program</th>
<th>Meetings Attended</th>
<th>Hours Spent Attending Mtgs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Farm</td>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. All Groups</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>80 schools; <sup>b</sup>116 schools; <sup>c</sup>62 schools

**Data Obtained from State Supervisors**

Questionnaires were sent to state supervisors in forty-eight states, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii. Forty-one questionnaires (82%) were returned. The information gathered is discussed as to whether instructors were required to submit a proposed plan of their summer activities; and whether instructors were required to submit a report of their summer activities.

Forty-one state supervisors of vocational agriculture or 27 percent required instructors to submit to the state office a proposed plan of activities for the summer months.
Twenty-eight of the forty-one state supervisors answering the questionnaire required their vocational agriculture instructors to submit a report of activities carried on during the summer months. Three states required a weekly report; twenty-two a monthly report; and three, a report at the end of the summer. It is the belief of the writer that if vocational agriculture instructors were required to submit a report of their summer activities monthly to the school administrators and the state supervisor of vocational agriculture, there would be less criticism of the pay that the vocational agriculture instructors receive during the summer months and make for better planning of the summer program of work.
Summary of the Questionnaire Study

This summary compares questionnaire data on the high and low groups rated as to excellence of the supervised farming programs of their departments for greater contrast in revealing practices and needs. The contrast between the high and low groups is more marked than that between the high and medium or between the medium and low group. The activities of the instructors in the medium group are similar to the high group in some and to the low group in others.

The findings of the questionnaire study based on variations and similarities between the instructor's activities substantiate the classification by state supervisors of Group I as being superior to Group II and Group II over Group III. Group III instructors show the largest number of deficiencies in their summer program of work.

Similarities Among Instructors and Departments —

1. There is considerable range in the number of years of teaching experience of instructors of vocational agriculture. Little difference exists between the high and low groups in number of years in their present department.

2. In both groups, approximately 65 to 75 percent of the instructors prepare a written plan of the activities they propose to carry on during the summer months.

3. Instructors in both groups devote approximately 20 percent of their time attending summer school.

4. Instructors in both groups supervise the veterans on-the-farm training program.
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5. Instructors in both groups teach young farmer and adult farmer classes during the summer.

Variations Among Instructors and Departments in the High and Low Groups

1. The superior departments are associated with more teachers per department.

2. The superior departments have larger enrollments, but with a smaller enrollment per teacher.

3. Teachers in the high group average more years of teaching experience.

4. Teachers in the high group average $534.61 more annual salary than those in the low group.

5. In the high group 14.6 percent more departments have farm machinery and school farms available for use of the vocational agriculture students than those in the low group.

6. The departments in the high group have more equipment available for their use than those in the low group.

7. Eleven percent more of the instructors in the high group than in the low group keep the general public informed of their summer period activities.

8. Students in the superior group carry a larger number of supervised farming projects than those in the low group.

9. Twenty percent more of the instructors in the high group than in the low group make on-the-farm visits to students during the summer.
10. Fifteen percent more instructors in the high group than in the low group teach adult farmer classes.

11. Teachers in the high group send out more newsletters to keep students and parents informed of activities carried on during the summer than those in the low group.

12. The lower rated departments have less town boys enrolled in agriculture than those in the high group.

13. Forty-five percent more of the instructors in the low group have advisory committees than those in the high group.

14. Instructors in the low group spend more time doing service activities for the community than do the instructors in the high group.

15. More Future Farmer Chapters in the low group than in the high group take summer camping trips.

16. Teachers in the low group spend an average of 17.9 more hours in on-farm visits to young farmers than those in the high group.

17. Teachers in the low group spend more time making out reports and answering correspondence than those in the high group.

18. Instructors in the high group spend five times as much time getting their department in good condition than do those in the low group.

Activities and Practices Emphasized by Instructors in the High Group

1. Instructors in the high group spend very little time on community service activities.
2. Instructors in the high group spend a large percent of their time supervising the on-the-farm activities of students.

3. Superior instructors contact a large percent of prospective students through personal calls to students and parents.

4. Instructors in the high group visit their students for an average of 3.5 visits per boy, with the largest number of visits to the freshmen students.

5. In the high group 97.5 percent of the instructors visit their students during the summer months.

6. The Future Farmer Chapters in the high group held approximately five meetings during the summer vacation.

7. Instructors in the high group make extensive use of newspapers and the radio to keep the public informed of activities carried on in their departments.

Deficiencies — Activities and practices used little or none by either group are as follows:

1. Teachers in both groups show a deficiency in not submitting a report of their summer activities to school administrators, and to the state department of education.

2. Departments in both groups have a high percentage of town boys enrolled who generally lack facilities for farming programs.

3. The instructors in both groups are lax in writing news articles of their summer activities.

4. Both groups are lax in sending out material to keep the boys and parents informed of the summer program.
5. State supervisors and school administrators are lax about requiring instructors to submit a preliminary plan of activities they plan to carry out during the summer and a report of accomplishments.
PART IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE
SUMMER PROGRAM OF WORK OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTORS

The summer program of work in vocational agriculture is an excellent means of improving the present and prospective farmers. An effective program of summer period instruction helps justify the year-round employment of a vocational agriculture teachers. Practically every state plan for the administration of vocational agricultural education provides for the employment of instructors for a twelve month period. Few, if any, state plans permit the vocational agriculture teacher to be absent from the job more than one month during the year.

The employment of teachers for twelve months is an innovation in most public school systems. Because of traditional practices, it is difficult to convince many people of the community that a teacher can be usefully employed during the summer months. Many school administrators and school board members doubt whether the summer accomplishment of the vocational agriculture instructor justifies the cost. Upon investigation one may find that the instructor has no definitely planned summer program. The teacher, rather than the policy of employment of twelve months, may be at fault. In the long run a year-round program must be justified upon its merits. Schools will not indefinitely pay salary and transportation costs of teachers during the summer months unless the accomplishments appear to them commensurate with the cost. The mere fact that such a policy is provided for in state and federal standards is not enough to enforce it. While the summer program of
vocational agriculture instructors in western states is probably not inferior to any other area of the United States, some specific recommendations seem to be warranted in the light of deficiencies revealed in this study.

**Planning A Summer Program of Work**

This study appears to indicate that the best results are, in part, obtained by the instructors' efforts to plan a well-rounded summer program of work. Even the best instructors can improve their effectiveness by giving more attention to their plan of work for the summer months.

The summer accomplishment of the vocational agriculture instructor will be determined largely by his vision of his job. In other words, if the teacher can see and plan for all the jobs he must accomplish during the summer, his work will be more effective.

Unless a fairly definite and reasonably well-thought-through plan for the summer is set up in writing, it is doubtful if the summer activities of the vocational agriculture instructor can function up to their possibilities. This is especially true of teachers with little experience. Unless the summer's work is planned with the thought in mind of putting into practice jobs discussed during the winter months, the value of the instruction is questionable.

Throughout the school year, instructors from time to time should make a note of things they expect to do next summer to improve the physical equipment of their department or to increase the effectiveness of their teaching. Unless written notes of such needs are made, many
of them may be overlooked or forgotten, and as another year gets under way, the teacher finds himself confronted with the same deficiencies largely because he failed to include them in a written summer plan of work.

In order to develop a successful summer program of work the effective instructor of vocational agriculture should include the following:

1. Supervising the farming programs of each student.
2. Follow-up of young and adult farmer instruction and supervision.
3. Visit all parents of students of vocational agriculture.
4. Contact and visit all prospective students of agriculture.
5. Plan projects with new students prior to the opening of school.
6. Follow-up graduates to assist them with their problems.
7. Prepare an annual program of work and a teaching program for each class.
8. Coordinate program of work with County Extension Service and other state and federal agencies.

The following outline suggests a variety of jobs and activities which may be included in the summer program of teachers of vocational agriculture.

A. Activities and Program for the High School Classes.

1. Monthly and special F.F.A. chapter meetings
2. Regular supervisory visits
3. Parent and son meetings
4. F.F.A. subsidiary organizations
   a. Livestock improvement
   b. Crops and soils improvement
   c. Junior cow testing association
   d. Farm record association
   e. Record flock association
5. Educational and recreational trips
6. Practice livestock selection
7. Fair exhibits – livestock, crops, shop, floats
8. Train judging and demonstration teams
9. Train teams for F.F.A. contests and initiations
10. Picnics and athletic events
11. Project tours

B. Young Farmer Class Activities

1. Regular supervisor visits
2. Regular monthly meetings
3. Advisory council meetings
4. Veterans meetings
5. Educational and recreational trips
6. Selection of livestock
7. Purchasing and reconditioning farm machinery

C. Adult Farmer Class Activities

1. Adult farmers evening school follow-up
2. Regular visits to farms
3. Advisory council meetings
4. Special meetings – feed conservation, weed control, DDT
5. Trip to experiment stations and state college
6. Selection of livestock and seed
7. Industrial trips
8. Picnics and social meetings with business groups

D. Possible Test Plots and Demonstrations

1. Crops – corn, oats, potatoes, forage, legume
2. Canning, processing, preserving and storage of food
3. Livestock feeding
4. Seed production
5. Commercial fertilizers
6. Soil conservation
7. Tree planting
8. Landscaping and home improvement
9. Weed killing (2,4-D)
10. Control of flies and insects with DDT
11. Vegetable garden
12. Poultry culling, caponizing, feeding and dipping
13. Sheep shearing and dipping
14. Machinery repair and adjustment
15. Drainage and ditching (use of dynamite)
16. Construction of buildings and equipment
17. Paints and painting of buildings and equipment
18. Clean plowing
E. Cooperative Activities

1. Meetings
   a. Farm organization
   b. Community or county show or fair
   c. Junior organizations
   d. Demonstrations
   e. Service clubs
   f. Committee
   g. Rural day - community celebration
   h. Cooperative - elevator, creamery, marketing, R.E.A.
   i. Garden and flower clubs
   j. Conservation
   k. Dairy day
   l. Breed association
   m. Farm safety

2. Tours and trips
   a. Farm tour
   b. Farm trip to state college
   c. Soil conservation
   d. Irrigation tour

F. Services Activities

1. Assist in locating and securing seed and feed
2. Assist in testing soil and securing fertilizer
3. Assist in locating and securing livestock
4. Pruning and spraying - fruit, weeds, potatoes
5. Testing and treating seed
6. Testing milk and cream separator
7. Identifying and controlling insects, parasites, weeds, diseases
8. Farm records and management problems
9. Community planning
10. Farm surveys
11. Marketing and market information
12. Pest eradication
13. Livestock and poultry management
14. Wildlife conservation
15. Soil erosion control
16. Tree planting
17. Rations
18. Home improvement
19. Farm credit

---

19. Concrete
20. Tool and rope displays

---
20. Selecting paints and painting
21. Plans for buildings and equipment
22. Electrification

G. Pre-enrollment Contacts - High School, Young Farmer and Adult Farmer Classes

1. Personal visits
2. Newspapers, letters, bulletins
3. Rural school demonstrations
4. Entertainment of eighth grade graduates by F.F.A. chapter
5. Invitation to athletic and other school events

H. Program Planning and Department Improvement

1. Annual plans
   a. Preparation of annual program of work
   b. Organize survey information
   c. Make complete records of present and former students
   d. Prepare local and state reports
   e. Correspondence

2. Courses
   a. Revise courses of study and problems
   b. Make detailed plans for young farmer and adult farmer classes

3. Equipment
   a. Inventory and order needed supplies and equipment for shop and ag room
   b. Build or reorganize chart filing case
   c. Recondition tools and equipment
   d. Reorganize filing system

4. Classroom and Shop
   a. Suggest needed improvement in physical facilities
   b. Revise or secure additional seeds samples and plant specimens
   c. Plan remodeling or new buildings

5. Library
   a. Inventory and order reference materials, bulletins, books and charts
   b. Revise and supplement bulletin file

I. Professional Improvement

1. Attend:
a. State conference
b. Called group conferences with instructors
c. Subject matter conference
d. Rural life meetings, organization meetings and conventions
e. Summer school session
2. Read professional books and magazines
3. Read new technical subject matter in agriculture
4. Arrange conferences with leaders on particular subjects
5. Review research studies in agriculture and in Agricultural Education
6. Renew membership in professional organizations, State Vocational Association, A.V.A.
7. Plan vacation

J. Publicity

1. Prepare
   a. Regular and timely articles for local paper
   b. Special articles for state and district papers and professional publications
   c. Radio broadcasts and wire recordings
   d. Department or F.F.A. news bulletins
   e. Exhibits for fairs and celebrations and store windows
   f. Map showing location of students in the community
   g. Booklet explaining the vocational agriculture program
2. Use F.F.A project markers
3. Install appropriate signs on test and demonstration plots
4. Take pictures of projects and activities
5. Make film strip of department activities
6. Write newsletters and personal letters
7. Systematically visit all former vocational agriculture students in the community
8. Schedule days for office calls
9. Develop wide personal acquaintance
10. Contact representatives of other agricultural agencies

K. Other Undertakings

1. Judge at fairs and shows
2. Assist in organizing fairs and shows
3. Assist in organizing other community activities
4. Work cooperatively with other agencies
5. Assist in cooperative service activities

All of these points would not be considered by each instructor of vocational agriculture because he should first consider the needs of
his individual department. A well-planned program will serve as a check on the program and will show up points that need to be strengthened. Furthermore, the instructor can better determine the different groups of people he must work with, and make more efficient use of time and travel. Some instructors report favorably upon the use of a schedule in arranging meetings, farm visits with students, and planning for other activities and undertakings.

The Supervised Farming Program During the Summer

The supervised farming program of the high school, young farmer, and adult farmer class members is the major responsibility of the instructor of vocational agriculture during the summer months. The results secured from the supervised farming program are the best measure of the value of the agriculture department in the school. There is evidence that a high correlation exists between the quality of classroom and supervised farming work, both usually rising or falling together. The superior instructors spend, on the average, about one-third of their time in the supervision of the supervised farming program, but yet are unable to contact all their students during the summer. There is no substitute for visitation of each student individually if the time is used primarily for on-the-farm teaching purposes rather than for a friendly visit or inspection of work done. The number of visits made will not necessarily indicate the work accomplished by either the teacher or student. It will, however, show how closely the student's work is supervised.
Visiting prospective students and their parents before school opens in the fall should result in an excellent selection of farm boys who desire to take vocational agriculture in high school. While superior instructors may visit practically every prospective student before school opens, it should be a goal for all instructors to visit their prospective students during the summer months. This is an excellent time to start good parent-boy-teacher relationships.

What happens during the summer months has much to do with the degree of interest and enthusiasm of boys when they enroll the next September, as well as with the over-all accomplishment achieved during the three or four years of their enrollment in vocational agriculture. It may have much to do with the number of boys carried over from the first year to the second, and from the second to the third, etc. The supervision of farming programs constitutes the chief, if not the only, justification of year-round employment of the vocational agriculture instructor.

Reporting Activities of the Summer Program of Work

The problem of finding a method for reporting of activities carried on by the instructor of vocational agriculture is a big one in all states. The instructors themselves ask "How much and how should I report to the school and community and the state department on the activities that I carry out during the summer and how should it be done?" The state supervisors ask, "Will it be just another form to fill out?" "Will it make for a better summer program?" and "Will the answers be accurate?"
The variations in the types of farming in different areas and states, facilities for teaching, and farming make it difficult to devise a form that will work for departments in all states. State supervisors, school administrators, instructors of vocational agriculture and advisory groups should set up objectives and ways and means for the summer program of work.

The instructor should check monthly to see what progress is being made. This will reveal any weakness in the summer program, and enable him to make corrections.

In order to arrive at a report which will cover the summer activities of the instructor of vocational agriculture, a suggested form is given on pages 70 and 71 of the Appendix.
Need for Additional Research

Vocational agriculture has made great strides in its development since its inception. The progress made in the last decade is illustrated in the increasing number of schools requesting that a vocational agricultural department be established. During World War II a number of departments had to be discontinued because of lack of instructors. Since the war there has been a large request for departments.

The supervisors, teacher trainers, and instructors of vocational agriculture are striving to build up the program. They realize that there is room for improvement in all phases of the vocational agriculture program. This study, as well as others, is but part of the effort to determine what is being accomplished, and what can be done to improve the program.

Suggestions for further studies in areas related to the summer program of work of teachers of agriculture are as follows:

1. Types of activities which should be carried on during on-the-farm visits.

2. In what way can advisory committees be used to plan and carry out the summer program of work?

3. Evaluation of the summer program of work.

4. Studies which might appropriately be made during the summer to determine community needs for agricultural education.
# Appendix

Vocational Agricultural Summer Activity Report

Month ___________________________ 19__

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Daily Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place or Person</th>
<th>Nature of Work</th>
<th>Miles Traveled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number miles traveled ___________________________
II. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

A. Supervised Farm Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Total No. Individ. Visited</th>
<th>Total No. Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Day School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Young Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adult Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Meetings, tours, and trips (Indicate whether conducted, cooperated in, attended, and number; nature and attendance)

C. Test plots, demonstrations

D. Community service work

E. Prospective enrollment (Indicate whether Day, Young Farmer, Adult Farmer, and number)

F. Organization of annual plans, courses, equipment and rooms

G. Professional improvement

H. Publicity, communications and individual conferences

I. F.F.A. activities

J. Other undertakings

III. OUTLINE OF PLANS FOR FOLLOWING MONTH

Signed: Instructor Superintendent or Board Member
### Departments to Which Questionnaires Were Sent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>New Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Carlsbad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge</td>
<td>Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>Portales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbuckle</td>
<td>Tucumcari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>Canty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colusa</td>
<td>Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redding</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcata</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>McMinnville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>Newberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomales</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>Silverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dos Palos</td>
<td>Filer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Haupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Rupert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar City</td>
<td>Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush</td>
<td>Mossyrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Animas</td>
<td>Mountain Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmont</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham City</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Wapato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>White Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Ritzville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurricane</td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum</td>
<td>Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroni</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy RFD 2</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Fork</td>
<td>Snowflake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Geres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worland</td>
<td>Gustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>Hughson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddock</td>
<td>Merced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckeye</td>
<td>Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>Crain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>Grants Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Lakeview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>McMinnville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Newberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Silverton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Filer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Haupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Rupert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Shelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Moses Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Mossyrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Mountain Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Prescott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Rockford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Snohomish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Sunnyside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Toppenish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Wapato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>White Swan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Ritzville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Buckeye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Snowflake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Tolleson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Geres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Gustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Hughson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Los Banos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visalia</td>
<td>Merced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park River, North Dakota
Velva, North Dakota
Big Timber, Montana
Miles City, Montana
Sheridan, Montana
St. Ignatius, Montana
Auburn, Washington
Battle Ground, Washington
Bellingham, Washington
Burlington, Washington
Cheney, Washington
Colton, Washington
Deming, Washington
Edmonds, Washington
Ellensburg, Washington
Goldendale, Washington
Lake Stevens, Washington
Lind, Washington
Longview, Washington
Lynden, Washington
Grady, New Mexico
House, New Mexico
Melrose, New Mexico
Raton, New Mexico
San Jon, New Mexico
Santa Rosa, New Mexico
Arvada, Colorado
Califon, Colorado
Holly, Colorado
Meeker, Colorado
Olathe, Colorado
Rocky Ford, Colorado
Wiggins, Colorado
Adrian, Oregon
Baker, Oregon
Malin, Oregon
Milton, Oregon
Roseburg, Oregon
Salem, Oregon
Sandy, Oregon
Seapoo, Oregon
Wallowa, Oregon
Buhl, Idaho
Emmett, Idaho
Jerome, Idaho
Menan, Idaho
Preston, Idaho
Wilder, Idaho
Modesto, California
Newman, California
Oakdale, California
Rio Vista, California
Ripon, California
Sonora, California
Stockton, California
Calistoga, California
Healdsburg, California
Napa, California
St. Helena, California
Centerville, California
Hayward, California
Auburn, California
Durham, California
Live Oak, California
Marysville, California
Susanville, California
Willows, California
Ft. Sumner, New Mexico
Afton, Wyoming
Douglas, Wyoming
Lusk, Wyoming
Riverott, Wyoming
Sheridan, Wyoming
Thermopolis, Wyoming
Torrington, Wyoming
Langdon, North Dakota
Lisbon, North Dakota
Mayville, North Dakota
Rugby, North Dakota
Wishek, North Dakota
Billings, Montana
Browning, Montana
Fromberg, Montana
Bridger, Montana
Simms, Montana
Chinook, Montana
Arlington, Washington
Asotin, Washington
Bellevue, Washington
Blaine, Washington
Centralia, Washington
Chatteroy, Washington
Clarkston, Washington
Colville, Washington
Davenport, Washington
Endicott, Washington
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Fork, Utah</td>
<td>Fairfield, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalville, Utah</td>
<td>Grandview, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar City, Utah</td>
<td>Greenacres, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim, Utah</td>
<td>Issaquah, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantsville, Utah</td>
<td>Marysville, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum, Utah</td>
<td>Orting, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamas, Utah</td>
<td>Monroe, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyesville, Utah</td>
<td>Pe Ell, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Utah</td>
<td>Pullman, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, Utah</td>
<td>Randle, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephi, Utah</td>
<td>Reardan, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parowan, Utah</td>
<td>Ridgefield, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richfield, Utah</td>
<td>St. John, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Utah</td>
<td>Sedro Woolley, Washingon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt RFD I, Utah</td>
<td>Selah, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>Stanwood, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandy, Utah</td>
<td>Sultan, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springville, Utah</td>
<td>Sumner, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernal, Utah</td>
<td>Tacoma, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, Washington</td>
<td>Toledo, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee, Washington</td>
<td>Tonasaket, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frendale, Washington</td>
<td>Lingle, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenlock, Washington</td>
<td>Glenrock, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima, Washington</td>
<td>Bismarck, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, Arizona</td>
<td>Kenmare, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safford, Arizona</td>
<td>Michigan, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher, Arizona</td>
<td>Tower, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt, California</td>
<td>Williston, North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacaville, California</td>
<td>Belt, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boonville, California</td>
<td>Cascade, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeport, California</td>
<td>Hinsdale, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton, California</td>
<td>Manhattan, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico, California</td>
<td>Polson, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanville, California</td>
<td>Stevensville, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulelake, California</td>
<td>Castle Rock, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City, California</td>
<td>Cathlamet, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td>Chelan, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudcroft, New Mexico</td>
<td>Eatonville, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espanola, New Mexico</td>
<td>Entiat, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland, New Mexico</td>
<td>Enumclaw, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos, New Mexico</td>
<td>Granger, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ault, Colorado</td>
<td>Kennewick, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Norte, Colorado</td>
<td>Kittitas, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton, Colorado</td>
<td>Nooksack, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain, Colorado</td>
<td>Oakville, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeley, Colorado</td>
<td>Omak, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manassa, Colorado</td>
<td>Onalaska, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Orchard, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>Poushbo, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene, Oregon</td>
<td>Renton, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham, Oregon</td>
<td>Waitsburg, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, Oregon</td>
<td>Woodland, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario, Oregon</td>
<td>Yelm, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon City, Oregon</td>
<td>Rainier, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dalles, Oregon</td>
<td>Blackfoot, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Idaho</td>
<td>Oakley, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver, Utah</td>
<td>Circleville, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehi, Utah</td>
<td>Manti, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Utah</td>
<td>Ogden, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panguitch, Utah</td>
<td>Payson, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George, Utah</td>
<td>Hever City, Utah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is to ask for your cooperation in an investigation of some phases of the work of vocational agriculture instructors in the Pacific Region. What we propose will require not more than half an hour of your time. We have under way a study of the various activities in which Vo-Ag instructors engage outside of regular classes, especially their summer programs and personal activities.

We should like to have your help in the following manner:

1. Supply us with a list of the names and addresses of all Vo-Ag instructors in your state who have been on the job in their present location for two years or more.

2. Rate each instructor on the list according to the general excellence of the supervised farming programs developed in his department. Indicate the rating by an H for high third, M for middle third, and L for low third of experienced instructors.

3. Give us your permission to write these instructors and ask them to furnish some data about their activities, requiring not to exceed one-half of their time.

All replies will be kept strictly confidential. No comparisons whatever will be made between the states which cooperate. No individual names will be used in any way.

Can you supply us with this information by August 15?

Very truly yours,

/s/ R. H. Palmer

R. H. Palmer
Professor
Agricultural Education

RHF: jj
Dear Sir:

The undersigned are making an investigation of the Summer Program and Out of School Activities of Vocational Agriculture Instructors. In conducting this investigation we would like your cooperation by checking the questions listed on the attached questionnaire, and returning to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope this questionnaire. Also any forms which your state department requires to be filled out in connection with Vocational Agriculture Instructors Summer Program of work.

We feel that the findings of these investigations will be of value in directing the work of the Vocational Agriculture program. Your time spent in answering these questions, and enclosing the above requested material will be greatly appreciated, and information received will be held in strict confidence. No names will be published or comparison made between states.

A summary of this investigation will be sent to you.

Very truly yours,

Don W. Douglas  
Dick V. Fagan  
(assistants in Agricultural Education)
QUESTIONNAIRE TO STATE SUPERVISORS ON SUMMER PROGRAM AND OUT OF SCHOOL ACTIVITIES OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE INSTRUCTOR

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Do you require a proposed plan of summer activities of the Vo-Ag Instructor be submitted before summer starts? Yes _ No _

2. Do you require Vo-Ag Instructors to submit a report of summer activities carried on? Yes _ No _ (If yes, _ weekly, _ monthly, _ at end of summer _).

3. Do you have any summaries on Summer Activities of Vo-Ag Instructors? Yes _ No _ (If yes will you please send).

4. What is your opinion as to the desirability and appropriateness of the following conditions or factors which the Vo-Ag Instructor might include in his activities. (Check with plus if you favor and minus if you disagree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor or Disfavor</th>
<th>More Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Live on farm</td>
<td>Favor or Disfavor Vo-Ag Longer Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Own a local farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Manage and operate local farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Some local investment in farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Absentee owner of farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Absentee manager of farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Some absentee investment in farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Own town business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Operate town business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Some investment in town business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Collect fees for professional services (Grading potatoes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you desire a summary of the above information? Yes _ No _
In connection with my work in the Department of Agricultural Education, Montana State College, I am conducting an investigation into the summer program of work of the Vocational Agriculture Instructors in the western states. The purpose of this letter is to enlist your cooperation by filling out the enclosed questionnaire which will take approximately 15 minutes of your time.

Your department has been recommended to me by your State Supervisor, and he feels that the investigation is worthwhile. Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire and returning it in the self-addressed envelope will be greatly appreciated.

All information received will be held in strict confidence and no names will be published. I will send you a copy of the results when the study is completed.

Sincerely,

Dick V. Fagan
Assistant in Agricultural Education

Enclosure
A. General Information:
1. Years taught vocational agriculture
2. Years in present department
3. Number of instructors in department
4. Percent of time spent teaching non vo-ag subjects
5. Salary for 1948-49
   a. Does school furnish transportation? Yes No
   b. Amount allowed per mile
   c. Are meals, lodging, telephone calls, etc. paid when you are away from home on business? Yes No
   d. Is expense budget sufficient? Yes No (If NO why)
7. Number of days on vacation 1948
8. Number of days sick or ill
9. Average number of days worked per week
10. Average number of hours worked per day
11. Number of students in department Sept. 1947 May 1948
12. Number of boys who reside in town In the country
13. Do you have available for use by your department?
   a. Film strip machine Yes No Kind
   b. Movie projector Yes No M.M. Sound
   c. Cameras Yes No Size Kind
14. Does your FFA Chapter or school own a tractor and farm machinery Yes No
   a. For use on school or FFA farm only
   b. For use on boys farms
   c. For custom work by FFA
   d. Amount of land owned acres
   e. Amount of land rented acres
15. Do you make a written plan of your summer program of work Yes No
16. Do you make use of your Advisory Committee for your summer program Yes No
17. Do you file a copy of your proposed summer program of work with the Superintendent Sch. Board State Supervisor One
18. Are people in general informed about your being on the job during the summer and what you do? Yes No (If YES how do you do it)
19. Do you submit a final report of activities carried on during the summer to the Superintendent Sch. Board State Supervisor
20. Number of days spent doing service activities for community
B. Supervised Farming Program  

**Summer only 1948**

1. Number of days spent supervising projects
2. Number of days spent contacting prospective Vo-Ag students
3. Average number of visits per Freshman Average number of projects per boy
4. Average no. of visits per Sophomore Average no. of projects per boy
5. Average number of visits per Junior Average no. of projects per boy
6. Average number of visits per out of school FFA member Average number of projects
7. Average number of visits per prospective student
8. Average length of each visit in hours

C. Physical Facilities  

**Summer only 1948** (Indicate no. of days spent)

1. Working in shop (Inventory, shop skills, cleaning and putting shop in order)
2. Working in classroom (Cleaning, putting files in order, and arranging)

D. Future Farmer of America  

**Summer only 1948**

1. Summer trip? Yes No Number of days
2. FFA convention number of days
3. Number of FFA meetings held
4. Days spent on FFA or school farm by instructor
5. Number of days spent on judging and other contest work
6. Number of days spent on fairs and exhibits
7. Number of days spent at FFA Leadership schools
8. Number of days spent supervising community cannery

E. Professional Improvement  

**Summer only 1948** (Indicate no. of days)

1. Summer school
2. Technical study
3. Vo-Ag conferences
4. Conference with state of District Supervisor, Advisor Council, School Board, or School Superintendent
5. Other types of conferences for professional improvement

F. All-day Teaching Program  

**Summer only 1948** (Number of days spent in own department.)

1. Community surveys
2. Field trips
3. Organizing daily teaching plans and four year course of study
4. Preparing charts, teaching aids, etc.
5. Collecting display material and weeds
G. Out of School Program, Veteran, Young Farmers, Adults
   
   **Summer only 1948 (Indicate no. of hours spent)**
   1. Hours spent supervising veterans farming program
   2. Young farmer program
      a. Classroom instruction
      b. Farm visits
   3. Adult farmer program
      a. Classroom instruction
      b. Farm visits

H. School and Community Relations, Publicity, Records and Reports
   
   **Summer only 1948 (Indicate no. of hours spent)**
   1. Making our reports
   2. Writing news articles number published
   3. Radio broadcasts number made
   4. Correspondence
   5. Number of farm organization meetings attended hours spent
   6. Number of town organization meetings attended hours spent
   7. Does department publish a newsletter, booklet, and or etc., to keep boys and parents informed of department activities during the summer? Yes No Number of hours spent
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