

AGRICULTURAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Sacramento CA

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27-28, 1982

Members present September 27:

Laura Tower, Chairperson  
Kenneth Aoyama  
David Austin  
Joe Camarillo  
Jan Eberly  
Mark Linder  
Joe Martinez  
Tracy Schortman

Members absent:

Jack Chappell  
Patrick Emery  
Jack Richardson  
John Thurman  
Robert Trigg  
Marden Wilber

Staff Present:

Jerry Biggs  
Pat Langlin  
Genevieve Marsden  
Don Wilson

Others present for all or part of the meeting:

Steve Arnaudo, Central Region FFA President, Tracy  
Ken Harris, California Agricultural Teachers Association, Sacramento  
James Nielsen, Senator - 4th District, Woodland  
John Peterson, Aide to Senator Nielsen

The September 27th meeting was held in the Board Room, California Farm Bureau Federation, 1601 Exposition Boulevard, Sacramento. It was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Chairperson Laura Tower.

She called the membership roll; then she introduced Senator Nielsen to the group and welcomed Mr. Harris to the meeting. John Peterson and Steve Arnaudo arrived shortly thereafter and were asked to introduce themselves. Mrs. Tower apologized because the full Committee was not present due to inclement weather and harvest problems. She said the Committee decided to go ahead with the meeting anyway because they are trying to remain on schedule. They are looking forward to presenting the report and recommendations to the Legislature and the State Board of Education in time to meet the deadline specified in Senate Bill 187.

## Senator Nielsen's Reaction to the Committee's Work to Date

Mrs. Tower asked Senator Nielsen if he had been able to review the material from the past Committee meetings and if he had any comments to make about it and the direction in which the Committee has been heading.

Senator Nielsen said he was astounded at the amount of time and effort the Committee has devoted to their assignment, and he was pleased to see the group is really dedicated to Agricultural Education.

Mrs. Tower asked him how the Committee should report to the Legislature. The Senator indicated that a letter from the Committee, listing its recommendations, would be all that is required. He commended the group on the thoroughness of its work to date. Mrs. Tower said the Committee's work had been made easier by the good material prepared and presented to it by the Agricultural Education staff.

A discussion followed on the length of time it might take to get the Committee's recommendations reviewed by the Legislature and approved and adopted by the State Board of Education, as required by Senate Bill 187. Senator Nielsen pointed out that it is apparent the recommendations will require additional funding. He said the Legislature and Education currently face financial reductions and in all probability further reductions will be required in the near future. However, he feels the Committee should proceed to design a quality Vocational Agricultural Education program, include estimated costs for the recommended program, and make suggestions on sources of additional funds.

Senator Nielsen indicated he feels the Committee has complied with Senate Bill 187 so far by not recommending new mandates. Pat Langlin stated she believes the imposition of "standards", particularly those that specify numbers is a mandate to school districts, and she said she is very concerned about this. The Senator indicated he does not believe there is a conflict since the districts will not be forced to conduct the Agricultural Education program. It will be designed by the Committee and will be available. If the districts feel they can offer it, within their budget limitations, they may do so. He said if the program is attractive enough, the students, parents, and administrators will WANT the school to participate. If it is attractive enough, people in the districts will see to it that their Education dollars are spent on it.

Senator Nielsen also indicated he believes the Committee should give serious consideration to Adult Agricultural Education. Mrs. Tower told him it had been discussed briefly when the standards were originally considered. The group decided to take it up later when the "Outreach" portion of their assignment is covered. The Senator emphasized the importance of Adult Agricultural Education and said it should not be thrown out. He believes the Committee should make recommendations on who should provide it, where, when, and how.

Mrs. Tower asked about the intent of Senate Bill 187's co-authors when they require that the recommendations of the Committee be made available on or

before January 1, 1983 and the Committee be terminated on June 30, 1983. The Senator replied that the Committee members will be the architects - the designers of the Agricultural Education program; they should formally maintain it; keep an eye on it; and be available to be consulted about it. He said they have a tremendous responsibility, and it is his hope that a statewide advisory committee of some sort could be established permanently for Agricultural Education. Mrs. Langlin said some advisory committees are already operating and asked Don Wilson if this Committee could continue. Mr. Wilson replied that six or eight years ago, the State Superintendent disbanded all advisory committees - the Agricultural Education Advisory Committee among them - and he had not been given permission to re-establish one. He thought the SB-187 Committee might want to consider making such a recommendation when it takes up the "delivery system" later in its deliberations.

Joe Martinez asked if this current Committee will be needed to testify before the Legislature. Senator Nielsen said he was not certain, but if legislative hearings are necessary, he will let the Committee members know and inform them if they should participate.

Joe Camarillo told the Senator the proposed standards have the approval of the Vocational Agriculture Teachers; that they helped to put these together; that they want the best Agricultural Education program for California that can be developed. They want a first rate program, not a second or third rate one, and they are willing to go with these standards. Senator Nielsen asked if local problems will arise about the definite space, square footage, and other recommendations. Jerry Biggs said these are "minimum" criteria. Many districts have even more than indicated in these standards.

There was lengthy discussion about the difference between "General Agriculture" and "Vocational Agriculture" programs. The group indicated to the Senator that they had taken this into consideration and developed two different documents (Attachment 7 to the Minutes of the August 23-24, 1982 meeting, entitled "OPERATIONAL PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE" and Attachment 9 to those Minutes, entitled "OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE."

A discussion was held on Capital Outlay funds, funds for equipment, etc.

Mrs. Tower told Senator Nielsen the Program Standards and Guidelines were developed to assist schools to improve their programs, not to penalize them. Don Wilson distributed copies of a letter sent to Mrs. Tower by Warren Reed, Regional Supervisor for Agricultural Education, South Coast Region, San Luis Obispo, which deals further with the need for standards (Attachment 1). He said the program would not be operational immediately; that it would be phased in over a period of a year or two; and he again emphasized that this is an effort to help schools improve their programs and come up to these standards. Mrs. Langlin said this answered her concerns about "standards".

Mark Linder said this Committee envisions local advisory committees becoming stronger and working toward playing a larger part in helping to get

these programs going in their local communities. Senator Nielsen was impressed and said that by acknowledging these groups in this Committee's work, it will help to encourage them and the local schools. Laura Tower mentioned the booklet "THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE - A GUIDE FOR ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM." She gave the Senator her copy.

Jan Eberly brought up the subject of seven Regional Supervisors for Agricultural Education and asked the Senator if he would support a recommendation by the Committee to retain seven rather than have the Agricultural Education Unit cope with five. The Senator said he had a long discussion with Department representatives and an agreement had been reached. He, personally, did not want to violate that. He realizes it may be possible to grow and expand in the future if the funding situation eases; that it might be possible some day to have nine or even fifteen as a goal, but it is not appropriate at the moment.

Joe Camarillo said the Committee is looking at a program, not only for the high school level, but from K-8, and eventually more Regional Supervisors must be available; that the grades 9-12 already are complaining about not enough assistance.

Senator Nielsen agreed. He said the Committee is creating a "master design" and these questions will have to be addressed; but today everyone is faced with competing for Education dollars, and it is not feasible now. He said the Committee is correct in trying to set high standards and goals and to seek to achieve them. He believes the people of California eventually will set the funding priorities; that the battles and challenges are still before the group; that their "design" will set the stage for what should come.

Pat Langlin said when you talk about additional funding - and that is what the Committee is talking about with their proposed program - now is not the time to separate Agricultural Education and set it up as a separate, categorical fund. Agricultural Education will have to fight other programs and will wind up with nothing because the Legislature is not about to put money into special categories. Senator Nielsen said she may be right in many respects, but reforms are necessary in Education, and if Education comes to the Legislature with reforms, you will see a better attitude about it. He said his priority is Vocational Agriculture, but he certainly must respect other opinions. Mrs. Langlin insisted that Vocational Education must be a total package for funding; it must not be funded in pieces. The Senator replied that he also wanted to be sure that there was funding for Vocational Agriculture. Mr. Wilson pointed out that "togetherness" had been tried, and Vocational Agriculture got nowhere. Mrs. Langlin said she was opposed to shifting funds from one vocational education program to another. Mr. Wilson believes some funds should be shifted from ROP/Cs, VEA, etc. to Agricultural Education. Mrs. Langlin asked if he was challenging the allocation system, and Mr. Wilson said he was. Ken Harris said the other groups do not have their acts together, and the Agricultural Industry is not willing to wait two, three, or four years for something to happen. Mr. Camarillo agreed, saying that people in Vocational Agriculture grab things by the horns; they are willing to stick their necks out and get things done.

He believes the other vocational education groups do not do this. He said Vocational Agriculture takes all of the risks and then, after they succeed, everyone else jumps on the wagon and wants part of what Vocational Agriculture has won. Senator Nielsen said Vocational Agriculture's position was not unique; that this has been the case for many years; and now because of the trying times, everyone is going to have to work together for a total package. Mrs. Langlin agreed and said she was opposed to Agricultural Education going after dollars alone; that Vocational Education should work together. Joe Martinez said if the Committee's recommendations are adopted, that will be a "reform", that the Legislature must look at sources of additional funds; and it also must be certain that Agricultural Education gets its share of Vocational Education funds. He said students must be trained so they can perform, and the Agricultural Industry may want to come up with some money to help. Mr. Linder believes that before the Committee supports that option for funding, it should make certain there is no other way to fund a top-notch vo-ag program. He believes there are other ways of getting adequate funding from Education dollars to take care of Vocational Agricultural Education.

Senator Nielsen mentioned Proposition 13 and the challenge it has presented. He believes that the Agricultural Industry might want to consider a voluntary foundation-type of funding rather than the imposition of additional taxes. He believes it would be a positive influence on the Legislature if the Agricultural Industry would help fund the program and believes the idea should be given more consideration. Mrs. Tower said this was like begging every year; that it was not a long-range solution. The Senator agreed but believes the Legislature would recognize the effort and be more willing to add to these funds. Mr. Linder said the local agricultural education advisory committees could help bring pressure to bear to get funding. He said this Committee is trying to work with the Department of Education and the Legislature; that they wanted to keep on track and be assured they are proceeding in the right direction. Senator Nielsen said the Committee's "design" or "conception" must be for decades; that it will be a precedent that is going to bear weight.

Jan Eberly brought up the matter of a schedule and asked what the timeline might be, assuming the Committee meets the January, 1983 deadline on submitting its recommendations. After discussion, it was decided that probably it might take 1½ years to get Legislative Review, State Board of Education Approval and Adoption, and the start of implementation in local schools. Mr. Wilson said he had been giving this some thought and believes the following might be a workable, realistic schedule:

- January, 1983 - Committee submits written recommendations to the Legislature and State Board of Education.
- \* February-March, 1983 - Committee appears before the State Board of Education.
- July 1, 1983 - State Board of Education studies, approves, and adopts program by this date.

- July 1, 1983 - Phase-in period to explain program to schools and  
June 30, 1984 provide inservice for teachers.
- July 1, 1984 - State program for Vocational Education in California's  
Public Schools could become operational by this date.

\*There will no doubt be recommendations from the Committee on legislation. Such legislation could be introduced in February-March, 1983, hopefully passed by August, 1983, and signed into law by September, 1983.

Mrs. Tower asked if there were any other questions or items the group might like to discuss with Senator Nielsen. Mrs. Langlin brought up a problem with replacement appointments or reappointments to CACVE and asked for the Senator's help.

Mrs. Tower apologized to Senator Nielsen for keeping him past the time he had scheduled for the group. The Senator thanked the Committee for inviting him to appear. He commended the Committee again for the tremendous amount of work it has done to date and indicated he believes they are proceeding in the right direction to develop a quality program for Vocational Agricultural Education in California.

The meeting recessed at 7:50 p.m.

#### Committee Quorum and Future Meetings

Mrs. Tower reconvened the meeting at 8:10 p.m. and polled the group on attendance at the next day's meeting. She asked what the Committee should do if there is not a quorum. Mr. Harris said the Legislature calls itself a sub-committee and keeps working. The Committee decided this might be appropriate. Mr. Martinez suggested that the September 28th meeting adjourn at Noon rather than continue to 5:00 p.m. as originally scheduled. Tracy Schortman agreed and suggested that another evening meeting might possibly be scheduled if the Committee feels it will not be able to finish with the September agenda. Mr. Wilson suggested that this decision wait until the next day. The group then discussed the October and November meeting dates.

ACTION: The group voted to hold the October meeting on the evening of Monday, October 25, from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and all day on Tuesday, October 26, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The group voted to change the November meeting to the evening of Monday, November 29, from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. and all day on Tuesday, November 30, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

#### Reaction of State Director of Vocational Education

Mrs. Tower asked Mrs. Langlin to give the Committee her reaction to the Standards which have been reviewed, revised, and approved by the Committee to date.

Mrs. Langlin reiterated the concerns she expressed earlier in the presence of Senator Nielsen about accepting these standards; the increased funding she believes will be required to implement the program presently being developed by the Committee; a phase-in period; teachers who may not qualify under the standards; out-of-state teachers; funding allocation formulas; student follow-ups; program review and follow-up.

Mr. Wilson told her that it is usual in such circumstances to use a grandfather clause to cover present teachers. New ones would be required to meet the standards. California vo-ag teachers must meet stiffer standards now than those hired by other states. He also stated that the Committee really has not discussed the implementation process (delivery system) yet and that many of Mrs. Langlin's questions would be answered when that process is developed by the Committee. Mrs. Langlin said she believes these things should be spelled out specifically in the beginning to prevent problems later.

Other than the objections already voiced, Mrs. Langlin indicated her reactions are as follows:

No particular concerns about Standard No. 1 - Individual Student Career Plan; Standard No. 2 - Supervised Occupational Experience; and Standard No. 3 - Future Farmers of America.

She objected to Standard No. 4 - Graduate Follow-up. She said sampling is already being done, and this additional requirement of the districts would be objectionable to them. They would be required to duplicate their efforts or do two different samplings. When Mr. Wilson said the past sampling for Agricultural Education was not satisfactory, Mrs. Langlin said he and the other Program Managers should sit down with Administration and Evaluation to restructure the questionnaire. She said the Department already has a program review and follow-up procedure which operates on a four-year cycle. This would be an added review and would not get through the Department and school department committees. Mr. Biggs indicated there appeared to be a break-down in communications. He said this Standard is meant to help gather data by the district to be used only by the district. It is not to gather information to be sent in to the State. He said this would be one of the simplest standards to comply with and is a tool to be used by the district to validate or evaluate its Vocational Agriculture program. Mrs. Langlin said that if the information does not have to be submitted to the State, then she has no problem with the Standard. Joe Martinez told her that as a vo-ag teacher, he would want to validate that what he taught would be applicable, and he would want to do a graduate follow-up. Mrs. Langlin said she wants to make sure this will be done by and retained at the local level.

Mrs. Langlin indicated she does not object to Standard No. 5 - Relevant Instruction.

She said if there is reciprocity with other states and grandfathering, she has no other concerns with Standard No. 6 - Qualified Teachers. Mr. Wilson again pointed out that California has stiffer credentialing requirements for vo-ag teachers than other states, and most California teachers could go to other states with no problem.

Mrs. Langlin feels that Standard No. 7 - Student-Teacher Ratio is not realistic with today's problems involving unions (collective bargaining), funding shortages, etc. She believes the adoption of this Standard would conflict with all of these.

She also objected to Standard No. 8 - Full Year Employment because it depends on additional funding, and there are no more federal or state dollars to be allocated. Joe Martinez cited an instance where a district expects its vo-ag teachers to make a profit on the Ag Farm in order to support its program. Mrs. Langlin said she does not believe that kind of situation is right, but there is just no way now that current state and federal funding can be stretched to cover additional programs or costs.

Mrs. Langlin said she has no particular concerns with Standard No. 9 - Providing for Unique Program Expenses because she believes most of the districts are already doing this. Mr. Biggs did not agree with her. He indicated that a lot of the vo-ag teachers are covering some of these costs out of their own pockets.

Mrs. Langlin did not express any concern about Standard No. 10 - Professional Development. She said some Subpart 3 (Federal) money is already being used for this purpose.

On Standard No. 11 - Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies, Mrs. Langlin asked the same kinds of questions Senator Nielsen had previously asked about problems locally with the specific requirements for space, square footage, lockers, etc. She also mentioned Criteria 5 in this standard and indicated she believes tools and equipment should not be cast-offs, but probably they could be no older than two years. She believes Criteria 5 is relatively workable, and she expressed no other concerns about it. She does object to Criteria 7. She said the wording and meaning are not clear. The Committee explained to her that it merely means the requirements apply only to programs offered by that particular school. If the school does not offer an Agricultural Mechanics program, for example, it does not have to be concerned about Criteria 1.b. If they do not offer an Ornamental Horticulture program, they would not be involved with Criteria 1.c. Mrs. Langlin indicated this portion of the standard should be reworded or perhaps placed elsewhere in the standard if it is to be retained.



She said Standard No. 12 - Advisory Committees was excellent.

On Standard No. 13 - Budget, she believes it is important for teachers to know what kind of a budget they will have, but she does not believe they should insist on being involved in its development or the identification of funding sources.

She did not like Standard No. 14 - Program Management. She believes it is not clear and that, in spite of the Committee's assurance it does not intend to do so, it is dictating to the districts. She does not like Criteria 2. She said that multi-teacher programs could mean even two teachers, and such meetings might not be feasible or practical.

Mrs. Langlin said she had no objections or concerns about Standard No. 15 - Meeting Proficiency Standards.

With respect to General Education, Mrs. Langlin said No. 1 - Qualified Teachers was all right.

On No. 2 - Student-Teacher Ratio, she indicated she has the same objection she voiced about this standard for Vocational Agricultural Education. She does not believe it is workable under collective bargaining. Mr. Harris pointed out that Special Education Teachers, by law, can have no more than 12 students per class; yet a Vo-Ag Teacher is often required to have a full class load of regular students (60) which may include some Special Education students. Mr. Biggs said again there appears to be a misunderstanding. These are OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES for General Education in Agriculture. They are not Standards. Mrs. Langlin then indicated she has no problems with the rest of the guidelines if they are not meant to mandate and if they do not require additional funding.

She also mentioned that as soon as school districts are faced with these, she believes they will do everything they can to seek waivers, ask for extensions, or do whatever they can to get out of complying with them. A discussion followed on the State Board of Education's action on requests for waivers and the time required to process them.

Mrs. Tower asked if the Committee should take another look at the wording of the standards and revise them again to make them the best possible. Several members of the group said they have already done that and believe the standards should remain as is. Mrs. Langlin again told the group they could not have mandates without money; that the Committee must realize this and decide how to handle the problem.

Mrs. Tower asked Mrs. Langlin for her ideas on how to get the Committee's recommendations to the State Board of Education. Mrs. Langlin replied the Committee should prepare a formal report, together with a minority report (if there is one), and a transmittal letter. She hopes the Committee would route this to the State Board of Education through the State Director

of Vocational Education so that she could help to get it on the Board's agenda. There was a discussion about the timing. Mrs. Langlin said anything going on the Board's agenda for their January 13-14, 1983 meeting must be submitted by her (Mrs. Langlin) to the Board by December 9. For the February meeting, the cut-off date is December 30 at 4:00 p.m. Mark Linder believes the Committee should make written AND oral reports to the State Board. Mrs. Langlin said the Committee might contact her following its December meeting, and she could see if the Board would give them some time on the February agenda. It was suggested the written report might be submitted for the December Board meeting and the oral report might be presented at the January Board meeting.

Mr. Linder asked at what point in the process the Committee should go to the Agriculture Industry to get their reactions and input. Mrs. Langlin believes this should be done before the Committee contacts the Legislature and the State Board of Education. She believes such industry input should be made a part of the report; that it would give added strength to the recommendations the Committee will make to the Legislature and State Board.

A discussion followed on whether it would be necessary to hold public hearings on the recommendations. Mrs. Langlin believes the State Board would not approve or adopt them without such hearings. Mr. Wilson pointed out that Senate Bill 187 says the Committee must report to the Legislature and the State Board. What the Legislature and the State Board decide to do with the Committee recommendations is another matter. He said if the Committee wants to get industry support beforehand, that would be up to the members and the agencies they represent.

Mrs. Tower indicated she has given some informal information to a few people. Mr. David Austin requested permission from the Committee to present the material developed to date to State Grange members for review and a possible statement from them in support of the concept.

Considerable discussion followed on obtaining State Board of Education approval and adoption. Mrs. Langlin does not believe the Board will give approval because the recommendations could be considered as mandates. The group discussed what could properly be done to sell the program. It was brought out that eventually it must be sold to the Agricultural Industry, the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, local school boards, and local districts. Mrs. Langlin said the Committee must be honest and tell these groups that the program is going to be costly.

Joe Martinez said that for the Committee to complete its assignment, it must come up with the best possible program for Vocational Agricultural Education. The Committee then has to present its recommendations to the Legislature and the State Board of Education, not to anyone else until those groups have had a chance to act upon the Committee's recommendations. Mrs. Langlin and Mr. Wilson agreed. Mr. Wilson pointed out that the Committee still must consider recommendations on a total program, the delivery system, funding, outreach, and curriculum. So far, all they have developed

are recommended standards. Mr. Harris agreed and indicated they should also consider recommending a permanent statewide advisory committee for Agricultural Education.

Mr. Martinez again cautioned against releasing any of the material until it has been presented in a package to the Legislature and the State Board. The members of the Committee agreed, and Mr. Austin stated, for the record, he would not release anything without the full cooperation and consent of the Committee. The Committee did decide that the "concept" could be discussed with people outside of the Committee and suggestions and input could be solicited.

Mrs. Langlin brought up funding from outside sources, discussed previously, and again mentioned the GM-UAW training project with which the Vocational Education Unit is currently working.

Mrs. Tower and the Committee members thanked Mark Linder and the California Farm Bureau Federation for permitting the group to use their meeting room for the evening meeting. Mr. Linder said his organization was happy to be of assistance and would welcome the Committee again if it chooses to meet there.

Mrs. Tower reminded the members the meeting would start on Tuesday, September 28, at 8:00 a.m.

The meeting recessed at 10:05 p.m.

Reconvene - Tuesday, September 28

The meeting reconvened at 8:20 a.m. in the Fourth Floor Conference Room, State Education Building, 721 Capitol Mall. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Laura Tower. She introduced Ron Lawton, Aide to Assemblyman Norman Waters, to the group.

Members present:

Laura Tower, Chairperson  
Kenneth Aoyama  
David Austin  
Joe Camarillo  
Jan Eberly  
Mark Linder

Members absent:

Jack Chappell  
Patrick Emery  
Joe Martinez  
Jack Richardson  
Tracy Schortman  
John Thurman  
Robert Trigg  
Marden Wilber

Staff present:

Jerry Biggs  
Pat Langlin  
Genevieve Marsden  
Don Wilson

Others present for all or part of the meeting:

Ken Harris, California Agricultural Teachers Association, Sacramento  
Marsha Johnson, Sr. Consultant, Assembly Committee on Ag., Sacramento  
Ron Lawton, Aide to Assemblyman Norman Waters

Minutes - August 23-24, 1982

Laura Tower asked for comments and corrections on these minutes. Dr. Trigg submitted a written request that his comments on Page 8 be corrected to read:

Page 8 - Consideration of Operational Program Standards Numbers 5-15

..... "Robert Trigg again emphasized his belief that the adoption of these standards will *significantly* increase the

cost of the vo-ag program. *He thought the standards were fine but maintained the cost of implementing the recommendations would have to be considered in relation to total program requests. Discussing the program without specific knowledge of the cost does not appear to be realistic.*" Several committee...

No other changes were requested.

ACTION: It was moved and seconded that Dr. Trigg's corrections be made to the August 23-24 Minutes.

The motion passed.

Mrs. Tower asked if there were any additions to the Agenda for the current meeting. None was requested.

#### Development of Committee Statement of Purpose

This item was discussed briefly. No action was taken.

#### Continuation of the Discussion on Funding

Mrs. Tower asked Don Wilson to proceed with the discussion. He replied by stating that at the last meeting of the Committee, staff had indicated they would select some schools which are close to meeting the Committee's recommended standards and some that were not. Jerry Biggs visited four of these schools and was present to give the Committee a report on what he had found.

Mr. Biggs said he met with the Superintendent or Business Manager, Principal, and Vocational Agriculture Teachers at the four schools. He requested information on money spent on Agriculture for the 1981-82 school year. He reviewed the recommended Standards with these schools to get an indication of what additional costs might be involved to implement these standards fully. He did not get into their income figures. The four schools visited were Fowler High School in Fresno County, in the San Joaquin Region; Sierra High School at Tollhouse, Fresno County, in the San Joaquin Region; San Benito High School at Hollister, San Benito County, in the South Coast Region; and Bret Harte High School, Calaveras County, in the Central Region.

Jerry Biggs distributed VEA-4 forms (Attachments 2, 3, 4, 5), which he said were used by most school districts to report expenditures and to obtain VEA funds.

FOWLER HIGH SCHOOL did not report any VEA expenditures. The school did report non-federal funds expended, including money put into the program from its Agriculture Farm. None of the income from this farm may be used for anything other than the Agriculture program. If the Farm were not available, the school would have to make an attempt to cover, by some other means, the \$14,961 contributed by the Farm. The program at Fowler comes closest to meeting the standards recommended by the Committee. It has one vo-ag teacher and 58 students, of which 55 are actively involved in the

Vocational Agriculture program. Fowler does not have accurate records (as is the case with most of the other schools) on student transportation costs, depreciation schedules, power costs, etc. Fowler and the three other schools visited have very, very high levels of support for strong Vocational Agriculture programs from the District Board right on down to the Vo-Ag Teachers, and they all do a great deal for the Vo-Ag program. The Vo-Ag Teacher has a great deal to say about the Agriculture program budget.

A discussion followed on ways to figure ADA, actual costs of running the program, Farm expenses, etc. Mr. Biggs said that program expenses are not included as Farm expenses. Mrs. Langlin reported that Fowler's Revenue Limit is 1847.95. Mr. Biggs said Fowler's is primarily an Agriculture Production program, basically Crops, Livestock Production, and an Agricultural Mechanics component.

BRET HARTE HIGH SCHOOL is also Production (Livestock, Crops) and Ag Mechanics. It is funded from District and VEA funds (little chunks of money - not large). In 1981-82, there were 84 students in the Vo-Ag program; this year they have 80. Approximately 40 students are really involved in Supervised Occupational Experience programs. If they have to go to 60 students, a lot of travel dollars will be required to conduct the SOE program. The Vo-Ag Teacher is on an 11-months contract and additional salary and shop facilities will be required. Also approximately \$2,000 per year would be needed for equipment replacement. Presently no charge is listed for the vehicle or depreciation. The Superintendent said they try to keep Agriculture expenses out of the budget. The Vo-Ag Teacher teaches five periods. This is a six-period (with seven periods optional) school. The Revenue Limit is 2852.29.

Mrs. Tower asked if funds from Boosters or other Ag Clubs enter into these pictures. Mr. Biggs said they did not at Bret Harte and Fowler. Such funds at these schools are used to promote FFA activities and Fair exhibitors.

A discussion followed on length of contracts and ADA.

SAN BENITO HIGH SCHOOL's Revenue Limit is 2043.86. The VEA 4 for this school shows some VEA expenditures, district funds expended, funds contributed by the FFA and ROP. The ROP courses (Farm Management and an Advanced Class in Ag Mechanics) are a part of the Agriculture program here. They are not separate from the regular school program. There are two teachers (full-time but not quite on a 12-months contract). Here again, the actual Agriculture expenditures are not listed. The school farm has a tractor, but the fuel is charged to maintenance. One pickup was purchased by the district and one by FFA. No depreciation has been listed. The FFA Chapter pays for buses for all FFA activities. Last year there were 220 students, with 120 in SOE. Real Supervised Occupational Experience with 60 students would be very difficult because the district is very large, and the travel costs would be huge. There is a school farm, but no income is generated. It involves about ten acres with a few apricot and walnut trees, plus a small project facility for

a few of the "town" students. Most of the students have projects at home. The program at San Benito is primarily Production and Ag Mechanics.

SIERRA HIGH SCHOOL is a four-teacher department. Here again, there is a large transportation expense because of the miles to be traveled for SOE. It sometimes requires three hours just to visit one student's project. Sierra has Production, Agricultural Mechanics, Ornamental Horticulture, Forestry, and Meats programs. The Revenue Limit is 2365. There are ROP and district students, totaling 330 different students, with 120 in SOE. The school operates a bus, three times a day, to go from the school to the school farm. This cost is not included on the records for the Ag Department. District cars or vans are used for Ag teacher meetings or FFA activities. All of the water, power, utilities, and maintenance of equipment costs are paid by the district. The district does not get any income from the Farm. No vehicles were purchased in 1981-82 and no dollars were spent on equipment. There are four Vo-Ag Teachers - three full-time and one on 11 months. Three teachers have paid supervision periods. The Farm has 1,000 acres, but it is not very productive. Some thought has been given to starting a Christmas Tree farm. The district bought this land many years ago when the school was almost a boarding school. The district once had the highest income level in the state. The district size needs to be considered. Supervised occupational experience with 60 students would be extremely difficult. Another teacher would have to be added, as would approximately \$6,000 for transportation, plus \$20,000 for supplies and equipment. The school has a good Heavy Equipment class. The equipment has been donated, but they have to maintain it and buy fuel, which is a tremendous cost not indicated on this VEA-4.

The discussion turned again to the standards. Mr. Wilson mentioned a recent award program established for FFA leadership and quality programs. He said 33 programs out of 320 received awards, which indicates that quality FFA and Vocational Agriculture programs are diminishing. Mr. Linder asked if the Committee could take the Sierra program and work to develop a perfect program and if they could estimate how much it would cost. Mr. Wilson replied the committee could take these four programs, estimate the ADA, and estimate the cost of running programs that would comply with the standards. They would have to come up with answers to the following:

1. Do these programs meet the recommended standards?
2. If not, what would it take for them to comply?
3. How much would it cost?
4. How much is currently being put into the program?

Upon a direct question, Mr. Biggs replied that his short-cut for figuring ADA is as follows:

The average class size times the number of Agriculture periods over the number of periods in the student day.

Example:	Period 1 - 20 students	Period 4 - 15 students
	Period 2 - 20 students	Period 5 - -----
	Period 3 - 25 students	Period 6 - -----

Total class count 80 ÷ number of periods of Ag (4) = 20 average class size.

Av. class size  $20 \times \frac{4 \text{ number of Ag periods}}{6 \text{ periods in student day}} = 13.3$  ADA attributed to the Agriculture program.

Mr. Camarillo asked if there was a possibility of losing Ag Farm acreage. Mr. Biggs replied there might be some possibility of this, but he does not believe it would be widespread. It was mentioned that many schools call their programs "Vocational Agriculture", but in reality they are "General Agriculture" programs because of their class sizes and funding. Mrs. Tower asked Mr. Biggs if there had been any comments made at these four schools about the suggested standards. Mr. Biggs replied the schools are in favor of them if there is a way to get sufficient money to fund them. They feel the Agriculture programs are the most expensive a school can offer. They really want to support them, but all of them agreed that more funds are needed. Most of them liked the graduate follow-up recommendation rather than a proficiency test to validate programs. Mr. Biggs said Fowler is the closest to meeting the recommended standards. Bret Harte does not know how long they can continue putting money into the program. Sierra spent the most and feel they would need the most to continue. Here they are really doing "hands-on" activities and accomplishing what a good vo-ag program should.

Mr. Linder again brought up the matter of obtaining information on how much ROP money is going into Vocational Agriculture. Mrs. Langlin again said this was difficult to obtain because they are not required by law to report this information. Mr. Wilson believes that two ROPs with Agriculture programs in each region could be selected, and with their cooperation, it could be determined how much it costs ROPs; then an estimate could be made. Mr. Harris said that with 12-13 ADA, 2000 Revenue Limit, 1 Vo-Ag Teacher, 80 students, the cost would be somewhere between \$48,000 and \$50,000. Fowler comes closest to this. Mr. Biggs agreed and believes double ADA is the way to go on the cost of a quality program. A discussion followed on the reactions of others and if double ADA is supported for Agriculture programs. Mr. Harris replied that ROP did it; he believes those interested in Agricultural Education programs must attempt it if they expect the programs to grow. Mrs. Langlin said she can't see any possibility of this happening because there is no extra money; that Education must face further cuts. Mr. Harris believes this Committee should come up with recommendations and programs the districts will want; then the districts will find ways to fund the programs.

Mr. Wilson said the Committee must decide what a quality program is, define the delivery system in order to get public help and support, and stop worrying about what one group or another will do or say. Mr. Camarillo and Mr. Linder agreed and again asked why they could not go to the ROPs and get the same kinds of information Mr. Biggs got from the four schools.

The meeting recessed at 10:15 a.m.



The meeting reconvened at 10:45 a.m., and the discussion continued on funding.

Mr. Linder said sampling may not provide the information the Committee wants. He again asked if it could be determined how much a top-quality Vocational Agriculture program would cost; how much is currently available from all funds for Vocational Agriculture; will more money be needed for Vocational or General Agriculture-based on what districts can afford? Mr. Austin asked if the Regional Supervisors could go to the Ag Teachers to get information from the ROPs. Mrs. Langlin said no; that any survey would have to be done through her office; that it was not possible to zero in on just one instructional program; it would have to be across-the-board. Mr. Austin said he was amazed that there is no accountability for such programs. Mrs. Langlin said there is accountability but not what the Committee is requesting. Mr. Austin said the group keeps talking about this but hasn't gotten off "square one." He asked if the Committee could get a decision on this. Mrs. Langlin replied that ROPs would have to be willing to cooperate, and the information probably would not be available until November 15. Mr. Austin again pointed out that Mr. Biggs got information from four schools, and Mrs. Langlin replied that he had, but her office got phone calls about it. She again said ROPs are not required to supply this information. Mr. Linder said there must be accountability or Jim Nielsen, or some other Legislator, is going to pick up on this, and somebody will have to supply the information. Mrs. Langlin said there is accountability, but the material does not come to Vocational Education. She said every time there is a mandate for a local district to do something, money has to be supplied for them to do it, or there could be law suits. At present, she said there is no staff or funds to do this sampling, and there is no way for her to make massive commitments of time and money to get the information the Committee wants. Mr. Lawton asked why they couldn't be told to supply the facts or not get any more money? Mrs. Langlin reiterated there is no reporting requirement, and such information can be obtained only if they are willing to volunteer it. She also mentioned a new policy of deregulation to lessen pressures on districts. Mrs. Tower said that Mr. Austin was correct. The Committee has spent a lot of time on this question, and it appears they will have to spend a lot more.

Mr. Lawton said he believes the recommended standards are excellent but expensive. The Committee should suggest how they could be funded. He believes the districts will have to account for what they get now before any more is allocated. They should be required to state why they need additional funding, where they will spend it, and whether there will be matching funds.

Mrs. Tower asked if Jerry Biggs should proceed further with the funding question. After much more discussion, Mr. Harris said the Biggs Committee had already come up with the rough estimate of between \$48,000 and \$50,000 per full-time teacher times existing Ag Teachers (630) or 450 full-time equivalents (FTEs) = \$21,600,000. Half of this is already contributed in regular ADA, which would mean about \$10,800,000 in additional funds. Perhaps one and a half million dollars are already there from VEA, and possibly three and a half million more could be diverted from ROPs; so something in the area of six million dollars actually would be needed for quality Vocational Agricultural Education programs in California.

There was more discussion on whether current programs already meet the standards, and again it was pointed out that staff has indicated there are 45,000 students in Agriculture programs now. About 30,000 might be considered true Vo-Ag Students, with the other 15,000 definitely falling into the General Agriculture category.

**ACTION:** It was moved and seconded that the Agricultural Education staff come up with definite projections concerning the number of full-time equivalent teachers there are, the number of students which definitely fall into the classification of true Vo-Ag Students, and the costs associated with a Vo-Ag program, based on double ADA.

The motion passed.

Mrs. Tower asked Don Wilson if the Committee could have this information for the November meeting, and Mr. Wilson replied in the affirmative.

#### Observers' Comments

Ron Lawton asked if there were going to be any proposals for input to the budget by January, once the Committee determined the cost of a quality vo-ag program. Mr. Wilson replied it probably would not be possible to get Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) through the Department without legislation - probably late in 1983 or 1984. Marsha Johnson said as soon as recommendations come from the Committee, bills could be started through the legislative process.

Ken Harris said the Committee had already been kind enough to accept his input, and he had nothing more to add.

#### Staff Reports

Mr. Wilson said he had not been involved in further discussion with Mrs. Langlin regarding the 5/2 regional supervisor issue. She had indicated previously that she would meet with Don Wilson, the two regional supervisors to be reassigned, the three regional coordinators, and the Field Operations administrator. To date, he said he was not aware that these meetings had been held or that Mrs. Langlin had talked with Mr. Reed or Mr. Beck. Mr. Wilson said he had heard the change is to take effect October 1, but he has not received anything verbally or in writing on this. He said until the two supervisors involved have been told otherwise, they will continue their current assignments.

#### Committee Mailing List

A discussion followed on who is currently receiving copies of the Committee Meeting Minutes. Mr. Lawton requested that his name be added to the list. Mr. Austin asked about the co-authors of Senate Bill 187. It was decided that Mr. Lawton would receive copies but the co-authors would not be included unless they specifically request it.

## Committee Business

Mrs. Tower indicated that earlier the Committee members suggested the Operational Program Standards for Vocational Education may not be in final order. She asked them to give further consideration to this and be prepared to discuss it at the October meeting. She distributed a list she had prepared and indicated whether the particular standard involved (S) students; (T) teachers; (P) programs. (Attachment 6.)

## Delivery System

Mr. Wilson said a proposed Delivery System had been made a part of the Biggs Committee materials submitted to the Committee earlier, but he had prepared copies and distributed them again (Attachment 7.) He asked Jerry Biggs to discuss this with the Committee. Mr. Biggs said there were two components - General Agriculture and Vocational Agriculture, and the staff had tried to devise a system for delivering both - with emphasis on Vocational Agriculture. He indicated that page 27 pretty well summarized the system. He said that a statewide, permanent advisory committee had not been completely spelled out, and after the comments from Senator Nielsen and others at this meeting, the Committee might want to explore the possibility more fully. Mr. Wilson suggested that Committee members review this and come to the next meeting with suggestions for revisions, similar to the way they handled the material on Standards. Some of the members asked about staff recommendations, and it was pointed out that staff members were the ones who had worked on this and developed it for the Committee's information. However, if the Committee felt the staff should review and revise it again, Mr. Wilson said he would see that this was done. Several members objected to the words "delivery system", and Mr. Wilson and Mr. Biggs assured them those words did not have to be used. What they mean is a method of implementing the program that will be developed by the Committee. It could be called a "Plan for Implementation" rather than a "Delivery System."

## Consumer Outreach

Mrs. Tower asked Mr. Linder if the Farm Bureau would share its Consumer Outreach program with the Committee at the evening meeting on October 25. Mr. Linder replied in the affirmative, and Ms. Johnson said she had seen it, and it is excellent.

Mrs. Tower asked Mr. Wilson to read Senate Bill 187 to the Committee again so they would be aware of their assignment on this item. Mr. Wilson replied that the bill contains the following language:

*"Recommendations shall include, but not be limited to, the development of a curriculum and a strategy for the purpose of establishing a source of trained and qualified individuals in agriculture, a strategy for articulating the state program in agricultural vocational education throughout the state school system, and a consumer education outreach strategy regarding the importance of agriculture in California."*

## Agenda Suggestions for October Meeting

The group decided it wishes to discuss the following items at its October meeting:

- Consumer Outreach Program and Definition
- Revisions of the Delivery System/Plan for Implementation
- Review of the Order of the Operational Standards
- Adult Education Standards
- Staff Projection on FTE, Vo-Ag Students, Costs - based on double ADA

## Final Recommendations

There was further discussion on the form of the Committee's report or recommendations. It was felt that a formal report should be prepared rather than the letter containing recommendations suggested by Senator Nielsen. Marsha Johnson asked who would actually write the report, and it was decided this should be an assignment to one or more of the Committee members. Mr. Wilson suggested the report would be a Statewide Program for Vocational Education in California and would cover the Committee's recommendations on (1) Standards, (2) Curriculum, (3) the Plan for Implementation, and (4) Legislation that might be necessary. This should be submitted to the Legislature and the State Board of Education, and the Committee could then await action from these two agencies. Marsha Johnson and David Austin asked if the Department could stall it and not submit it to the Board. Further discussion followed on this possibility.

## Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on October 25 and 26, 1982, with the evening session again being held in the California Farm Bureau Federation Board Room, 1601 Exposition Boulevard, Sacramento, starting at 6:30 p.m., and the meeting on October 26 scheduled to begin at 8:00 a.m., in Room 166-A, State Education Building, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento.

## Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.