

A HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS

AN INCLUSIVE COMPILATION OF VOLUMES

I THE PERIOD 1901 – 1940

II THE PERIOD 1940 – 1969

III THE PERIOD 1969 – 1974

IV THE PERIOD 1974 – 1981

By:

Sidney S. Sutherland, Professor Emeritus
Department of Agricultural Education
University of California
Davis, California
Covering the Periods of 1901-1969

And

Herbert H. Burlingham, Professor Emeritus
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, California
Covering the Periods of 1969-1981

PREFACE

This Preface to the inclusion compilation of Volumes I, II, III and IV is prepared for the purpose of identifying and clarifying the status and form of the preceding texts and publications covering the years of the HISTORY from 1901 to 1974.

The first published HISTORY covered the period from 1901 to 1940. It was simply so identified and not marked as "Volume I." It was compiled and edited by Sidney S. Sutherland, at the time on the faculty at the University of California, Davis and the Staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education as Agriculture Teacher Trainer under an agreement between the Bureau and the University. The 1901-1940 publication was published in mimeograph form by the Bureau of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education.

The second HISTORY, also published in mimeographed form by the Bureau of Agricultural Education, carried the complete story from 1901 to 1969. Again, this publication was not identified as "Volume II" but that is what it was, to all intents and purposes. The update for the Period 1940-69 was written by Mr. Sutherland, now Professor Emeritus, Department of Agricultural Education, University of California, Davis. Professor Sutherland retired from active professional service at the University in 1965. At that time and for some time previous, he had been Head of the Department.

Volume III included an update for the Period 1969-1974. It also included the texts of the Period 1901-1940 and 1940-1969. Published in duplicated form by the Bureau of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education, it was compiled and authored by Herbert H. Burlingham, Professor Emeritus, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. Professor Burlingham retired as Head of the Agricultural Education Department at Cal Poly on July 1, 1972.

So, thus we identify the VOLUMES of HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS as:

Volume I – The Period 1901 – 1940

Volume II – The Period 1940 – 1969

Volume III – The Period 1969 – 1974

Volume IV – The Period 1974 – 1981

Herbert H. Burlingham
January, 1982

FOREWORD to Volumes I and II

This history of agricultural education in California is primarily a history of vocational education in high schools and junior colleges of the state. It includes the complete text of A History of Agricultural Education in the Secondary Schools of California published as a mimeograph by the Bureau of Agricultural Education in 1940 and draws heavily upon the annual reports made by the Bureau to the U. S. Office of Education for data concerning development from 1940 to date.

The manuscript was read by Byron J. McMahon, Howard F. Chappell, Donald E. Wilson and E. David Graf all of whom were leaders in administering and supervising vocational education in agriculture in California during much of its development. My sincere thanks are hereby expressed to them for their suggestions and advice

FORWARD to Volumes III and IV

In preparing the earlier "Forward", author S. S. Sutherland wrote, "This history of agricultural education in California is primarily a history of vocational education in the high schools and junior colleges of the state". He made references to the first mimeographed pamphlet produced by the Bureau of Agricultural Education in 1940 and expressed appreciation to those who read the text which carried the story forward to 1969 – Byron J. McMahon, Howard F. Chappell, Donald E. Wilson, and E. David Graf.

There has been some change in the structure of public education in California in recent years but this issue of the HISTORY is still concerned primarily with vocational education in agriculture in California Secondary Schools.

The additional text covering the period 1969 to 1974, encompasses a time-span in which literally scores of major, and sometimes critical, happenings occurred.

The information, much of which has been necessarily briefed, has been drawn from many sources which have been, I believe, included in the List of References. Suggestions were solicited from present and former staff members of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, and some of the information is from first-hand knowledge of the present author. Various persons have read various parts of the manuscript and their suggestions are appreciated. Helpful (and critical) grammatical and literary suggestions have been volunteered by the writer's loving and competent wife and by his equally well qualified daughter.

The ultimate responsibility for content, commentary, and any expressed but undocumented, or personal professional opinions, however, is fully assumed by Herbert H. Burlingham.

VOLUME I – 1901 to 1940

Agricultural Education In California Secondary Schools

The entire development of agricultural education in the elementary and secondary schools of California is recent. Prior to 1900 only two institutions in the offered regular instruction in agriculture - - the College of Agriculture of the University of California, and the Chaffey College of Agriculture, the latter a private institution established in 1883 and continuing instruction in this subject through 1895. At the turn of the century, only one institution, the State University, was giving instruction in this subject, while forty years later, agricultural education existed, to some extent, in at least five other different types of public schools - - the public elementary schools, the public junior and senior high schools, junior colleges, special state schools and state teachers colleges.

Early efforts to establish agricultural education in the public schools in California coincide roughly with the areas of greatest agricultural development in the state. The period of 1900-1910 not only saw the bringing of California's fertile valleys under irrigation and cultivation, but also the introduction of education in agriculture to its public schools; 1917-24 was not only a period of rapid expansion for the horticultural enterprises of the state, but also brought with it the introduction of vocational education to the secondary school system.

The diversity of California agriculture and the complexity of its agricultural problems has made the establishment of education in this subject peculiarly difficult. A report by Wilson Flint in 1859 to the State Agricultural Society makes the following statement, "Possessed of a climate with every grade of heat and cold of all the zones, it is believed that all the fruits and plants indigenous to all climes could be acclimated with great facility for general culture in California."

The extent to which his prediction has come true may be determined by the fact that today, California derives its farm income from over 200 crops and livestock enterprises, and in many communities in which agriculture is taught in secondary schools farmers produce more than fifty separate and distinct farm commodities. In the "roaring twenties" one county boasted that "every known crop which is useful to mankind will not only grow but thrive in Yolo County", and the boast was not without foundation.

Lacking the unifying influence of one or two major crop or livestock enterprises common to the entire state, it is not surprising that the period of experimentation and of "trial and error" in agriculture courses in high school of the state was more extended than in states where agriculture was less diversified.

Not to be overlooked in the development of agriculture in the public schools is the influence of the University of California, where academic traditions have always been paramount, and academic standards high; where, to quote from E. J. Wickson, one-time director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, "The June of vocational training was wedded to the December of classical culture, and they could not immediately learn and love each other's ways." In passing, it might be noted that June has never proved a match for December in the entire history of the College of Agriculture, with the result that agriculture courses in high schools taught by graduates of the University, tended in the beginning, and until recently still tended to be academic and scientific rather than practical.

Early Developments 1900-1905

This period is characterized by the development of agriculture in state schools. Not yet had this subject found its way into the curriculum of the secondary school, and not until 1907 when the State Legislature through Section 1665 of the Political Code required all elementary schools to give "instruction in nature study with special reference to agriculture", did it receive more than passing attention in the lower grades.

In 1901 the Legislature passed the act establishing the California Polytechnic School at San Luis Obispo, and two years later, in October 1903, the school opened for instruction, as a vocational school, to teach agriculture, mechanics, commercial and household arts. Of the total number enrolled (176) about on-third were in the Agriculture course. Dr. Leroy Anderson, who was closely identified in this and other institutions with the early development of agricultural education, was in charge of the San Luis Obispo institution. Thus, this school became the first public institution in the state outside the University of California to offer instruction in Agriculture, and the first to teach this subject on the secondary level. It is of interest to note that this school, which later became so closely identified with the development of vocational education in agriculture in California, should have been the first in the field.

The 1905 Legislation passed a proposition providing \$150,000 for the purchase and equipment of a University Farm to be selected by a commission created for that purpose by the law. The University Farm was to be under the management, direction and control of the Board of Regents of the University of California. The commission inspected several tracts of land, and finally decided unanimously to purchase, at a cost of \$103,290, the 779 acres adjoining the townsite of Davis, Yolo County. Later this acreage was increased by leasing 300 acres of adjoining property, and has borne the title of "University Farm" since the institution established thereon opened its doors for instruction in agriculture of high school grade in January 1909.

Thus, in this period, roughly 1900-1905, two state schools of agriculture were established, both for the purpose of providing instruction in agriculture on the high school level.

The Beginnings of Agriculture in the High Schools

In the year 1905-06, the Kern County Union High School, of Bakersfield, became the first district high school in California to make a beginning in agricultural instruction. A. G. Grant, the instructor, taught general science, soils and crops, physics, and chemistry. Three years later the Kern County High School engaged H. F. Tout, a graduate of the class of 1906 of the California Polytechnic School, to teach agriculture and manual training. Today, some thirty-four years later, Mr. Tout is still a teacher of agriculture in the vocational agriculture department of the Willows High School, Glenn County, California.

The Gardena High School of Los Angeles became the second high school in the state to offer instruction in agriculture, when in 1908 courses in "Botany and general science with special reference to agriculture" were established, with F. H. Bolster as instructor.

These two schools are unique, not only in the fact that they were pioneers in the field of agricultural instruction, but both experimented with school farms as instructional devices. IN 1909 the Gardena school purchased a 14-acre farm for \$14,000, built a lathhouse, mushroom house, and greenhouse; and installed an irrigation system for use by the agricultural classes. In July, 1909, the Bakersfield school purchased 27 acres of land at a price of \$16,000, cleared, graded and planted the land to alfalfa and cereals, and planned the purchase of a dairy herd. This tract of land was used as a school farm for a period of about 10 years.

During this time barns and stock sheds were built, an orchard planted and a large greenhouse built for horticulture work. In the summer of 1919 this property was sold to the city of Bakersfield, and the school farm discontinued. It might be noted, in passing, that the Bakersfield school now has a department of vocational agriculture, employing nine full time teachers, owns a school farm of 102 acres, fully equipped with buildings, barns, corrals and sheds, which is operated as a school farm laboratory.

Notable also among the pioneer agricultural high schools were Oxnard in Ventura County, starting in 1909 with W. G. Hummel as the instructor; Imperial, starting the same year with school gardens, botany and dairy laboratories, under the direction of D. N. Morgan, instructor. To the list of the early day instructors, Hummel, Bolster, Grant, Tout and Morgan should be added the names of E. B. Babcock, Herbert Lee, principal of the Oxnard School; C. J. Booth, T. J. Penfield, and H. G. Boll, all of whom were identified with the development of high school agriculture as teachers or administrators in this period.

The Development of Academic Agriculture and Agriculture Science Courses 1910-16

At the end of the five year period 1905-1910 only six of the 215 high schools offered agriculture courses, representing less than 3% of the total schools in the state. In 1911, this number jumped to 25; in 1912 to 47; and by 1916-17 almost exactly one-third of the 281 high schools in the state - - 93 - - included this subject in their programs.

It is difficult to characterize these early departments, but two features seem to stand out. One was the individualism displayed in developing curricula in the various schools; the other, the extremely short tenure of teachers, and the rapidity with which they changed positions.

Commenting on the former in 1911, E. B. Babcock wrote, "Self-directed high school development is surely in evidence so far as agriculture is concerned. Indeed we find agriculture being handled in nearly as many ways as there are high schools including it in their course of study.

Nevertheless, three types of courses could be distinguished. The first was the "applied-science" type, in which the instruction in subjects as physical geography, general science, and botany were carried on by experiments, with discussion following. A textbook was used only as a reference. In these type courses, the science teacher, because of his training, was selected to do the agriculture teaching. The apparent purpose of these courses was to impart as many of the fundamental principles as possible. The Oxnard school was a good example of this type.

The second was the "one-course" type, usually found in a small high school. In these schools, one course in science, designed as "general agriculture" was offered to the student. The instruction was made "practical" in some of the schools having home projects.

The third was the "full-curriculum" type, in which was offered an agricultural subject or an applied science subject in each of the four years. Field and garden work were required of each student taking agriculture, and naturally these courses were found in the large schools - - Stockton, Fresno, etc.

It is evident, from the description of the types of Agriculture courses taught during this period, that they were, in effect, "science courses with an agriculture flavor". Commenting on this fact, Edwin R. Snyder, in 1916 writes:

The agricultural courses in our high schools have too largely resolved themselves into courses in science taught agriculturally. What we need in these schools are courses in farming taught scientifically. The product of the high school course in farming should bear the same relation to the technically-trained agriculturalist as the trained nurse bears to the physician. It is the function of the agriculturalist to diagnose and prescribe; it is the business of the farmer to administer his farm and to nurse plant and animal life."

Only a casual study of the teaching personnel of these schools from 1909 to 1912 is necessary to impress one with the rapid turnover of agriculture teachers. To find the name of an agriculture teacher listed among the faculties of four different schools in four consecutive years was the rule rather than the exception. Naturally this tendency had its effect also on the number of different types of organization experimented with by various schools and the failure of these early departments, generally, to undertake constructive long-term programs of development.

One marvels at the patience and the tolerance with which farmers, school patrons and school administrators viewed these early efforts to teach agriculture in the high schools. Snyder also brings out this fact in his Biennial Report of 1916, saying:

"The rapid growth of agricultural courses in California high schools since their first introduction in 1909 is conclusive evidence that the people of the State desire this type of education. In many instances the work where introduced has not proved entirely satisfactory even to those most interested, and yet, with few exceptions, the people of various communities have clung to the subject with a determination to solve the problem and thus to place it upon a more satisfactory basis."

That not all communities were so tolerant is clearly shown by the following table which summarizes not only the growth and development of agriculture classes during the period 1905-1917, but also the number of schools which dropped the work in different years, later to resume it; and the number who tried it for a single year and found the results not entirely to their liking.

TABLE I
Summary of Growth of Agricultural Instruction in the California Day Public High Schools

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Schools Offering Agriculture</u>	<u>State Total High Schools</u>	<u>Percent of Schools Teaching Agriculture</u>	<u>Schools Discontinuing Agriculture</u>	<u>Schools Resuming Agriculture</u>	<u>Schools Teaching Ag. Single Year</u>
1905-06	1	177	0.56	0	0	0
1906-07	1	179	0.55	0	0	0
1907-08	1	184	0.54	0	0	0
1908-09	2	199	1.00	0	0	0
1909-10	6	215	2.79	0	0	0
1910-11	25	208	12.01	1	0	4
1911-12	47	231	20.34	6	1	4
1912-13	45	249	18.07	15	0	1

1913-14	60	259	23.17	8	5	1
1914-15	70	258	27.13	12	8	5
1915-16	80	266	30.07	19	8	6
1916-17	93	281	33.09	15	11	17

It is not unlikely that the unhappy experiences of some of these communities with agriculture courses were reflected in the relatively slow growth of the vocational program in the years immediately following the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act.

The developments of the entire era of academic agriculture in the public schools of California may well be summed up in the following statement made by the members of the Special Legislative Commission on Agricultural Education in 1922, to the effect that:

“The movement to introduce agricultural courses into the secondary school curricula met with indifferent success during this period 1909-1917. Perhaps the chief weaknesses displayed in these early attempts were the highly theoretical nature of the courses offered and the general confusion of the purpose of agricultural instruction in the secondary schools with the purpose of collegiate instruction in the same subject. It was not until the Vocational Education Act became effective in 1917 that a policy for the development of agricultural course in the high schools was adopted which combined the project idea of training in the art and business of farming with instruction in the science of farming.”

The Introduction of Vocational Agriculture into the High Schools of California – 1917-

20

Less than three months after President Wilson signed the Smith-Hughes Act on February 23, 1917, the Legislature of California accepted the provisions of the Act in a bill passed and approved in May of that year, and agreed to appropriate one dollar of state funds for every dollar received from federal sources for the aid of agricultural education. Emulating this prompt action on the part of the legislature, the State Department of Education on July 19, 1917 had ready for distribution general regulations for the establishment and maintenance of federal and state-aided vocational education in the state in the form of Bulletin No. 23, “Vocational Education”, giving instructions to local boards of education regarding the procedure to be followed in applying for authority to establish vocational courses. Thus in a few short months, the ground-work was laid for the new program.

Space does not permit including herein a complete statement of these early plans and provisions, but some of them of more passing interests are as follows:

The classes in vocational agriculture for which provision was made were “part-time day vocational courses in agriculture”. As to the classes themselves, not less than three hours per day of the pupils’ time was to be devoted to “farm project work and the instruction appertaining thereto”, and to farm mechanics, “and not less than three hours per day to academic work in class or in school”. Provision was made for related subjects as follows, “farm mathematics, science and English must each constitute a one-unit course and must all be given on each day assigned for academic work”, and the subject matter to be covered in these courses was definitely specified.

A minimum salary for the agriculture teacher was set at \$1500 per year and a maximum reimbursement to the district of \$1000 per annum. Other provisions of this earliest plan deal

with project work, recommend individual instruction, employing of teachers on a twelve months' basis, transportation facilities for teachers, minimum ages of pupils, with remarkable clarity and detail.

Much credit is due to the individuals charged with the responsibility of inaugurating the new program and of guiding its course during the early years of its development. Members of the State Board of Vocational Education at this time were: E.P. Clarke, President; Mrs. O. Shepard Barnum of Alhambra; Marshall DeMott of Corning; T.S. Montgomery, San Jose; Mrs. Agnes Ray, Oakland; George W. Stone, Santa Cruz; Charles A. Whitmore, Visalia. Other important figures were Edward Hyatt, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Secretary of the board; Margaret E. S. McNaught, Commissioner of Elementary Schools; Will C. Wood, Commissioner of Secondary Schools; Edwin R. Snyder, Commissioner of Vocational Education; C.S. Pixley, Chief Clerk. J.B. Lillard was appointed State Supervisor in 1917 and served until 1923; W.G. Hummel was teacher trainer at the University of California.

Progress from 1917-1920 was slow. The attitude of school authorities and the people of the local communities toward the work was frankly skeptical. In spite of this fact, the number of departments in 1917 had more than trebled by 1919-1920 and included 32 schools. The original ten departments offering vocational agriculture were: (1) Clovis, (2) Fresno, (3) Holtville, (4) Gardena, (5) Jefferson (Los Angeles), (6) Ontario, (7) Pasadena, (8) Pomona, (9) Roseville, and (10) Visalia. Of interest is the fact that while six of these departments are in existence today (1940) only one, Ontario, retained its identity as a vocational department continuously from 1917.

Naturally the keynote of this period was one of promotion and of winning the respect and cooperation of school administrators. It is doubtful whether a happier choice could have been made for a State Supervisor during this period than the man chosen. J.B. Lillard, who has just announced (1940) resignation and retirement as President of the Sacramento Junior College after a lifetime of service in vocational education in the secondary schools of the state, builded well in these early years. In a personal interview with the author, he made this statement, "I made it my first job to educate high school principals to the fact that the vocational agriculture department was their own, and that no one was going to tell them how it should be run. Never did I visit a school without first going straight to the principal's office, asking how the department was getting along, and what the State Department of Education could do to help him. Never did I leave a school without again calling upon him and reporting the results of my visit."

That he succeeded, at least in the promotional phase, is shown by the fact that during his six years as supervisor, the number of departments grew from 10 in 1917 to 57 in 1922-23 when he left the work, and that the enrollment in these classes increased from 337 to 1475. Scientist, philosopher, leader and educator, kindly "Jerry" Lillard left with us many guiding principles so clearly and tersely stated that they have survived to remain as guide posts even today. Best and most widely known is his "Royal Road to the Jumping-Off Place," an ironic statement in true Lillard style:

"Lean hard and with a full faith on a single text book. Follow it in regular order, and disregard the local types of farming and other local demands and needs. Insist that you are teaching subjects and not boys. The more quickly and consistently you do this, the easier will be your task. The more effectively and persistently you do it, the more magnificent will be your failure and the briefer your stay in the field of agricultural education."

Further Developments – 1920-24

The period 1920-24 brought with it no particularly striking developments. The promotional phase of the work still predominated, but there was a leveling off in the number of new departments established, as might be expected. In 1924, 63 departments were listed, about double the number in 1920 (32).

On July 13, 1920, was formed the first organization of vocational agriculture teachers in the state; the California Agricultural Teachers' Association. Its original purpose according to the minutes of the organizational meeting and the first circular letter to its members was to "organize and improve the agricultural work from the teachers' point of view; to complete the cooperative measures between the Extension Department and the Smith-Hughes teachers; and to provide for regional conferences of teachers for professional improvement."

O.P. Palestine of Modesto called the meeting, which was held during the Annual Conference at the University Farm, Davis, and acted as temporary chairman. The first officers were C.J. Booth, President; R.E. Burton, Vice-President; and R.J. Werner, Secretary. The later growth and development of this organization and the part it played in shaping the policies and philosophies of the vocational program in later years will be discussed more fully in a subsequent chapter.

The year 1922 saw the first judging contests for vocational agriculture pupils at the University Farm, Davis, in connection with its annual "Picnic Day", and the first small beginnings of an activity that was to grow to large proportions and exert a powerful influence on the development of vocational agriculture in the state.

This era, too, saw the beginnings of another extra-curricular activity that was later to demand much of the attention of teachers and supervisors, for in September, 1923, arrangements were made with officials of the California State Fair at Sacramento for a "camp" and a program of judging and other activities on the fair grounds for vocational agriculture pupils. Active in its establishment was Richard J. Werner, who assumed his duties as State Supervisor in that year, superseding J.B. Lillard who resigned to become President of the Sacramento Junior College. Named for the first state supervisor, Camp Lillard has been an annual feature of the California State Fair since that date.

Teacher training during this era was largely the function of the University of California, and changes in personnel, policy, and location characterized its activities during these years. With headquarters at Berkeley one year, at the University Farm at Davis the next; and dividing activities between the two centers the remainder of the time; with four men shifting in and out of the picture in a four-year period, little accomplishment in the nature of a constructive program was possible. F.L. Griffin acted as head teacher trainer during most of this time and much of what was done of a constructive nature maybe traced to his guidance. Acting in various capacities during this time were W.G. Hummell, S.H. Dadisman, and B.R. Crandall.

The development of vocational agriculture thus far might well be summed up in the conclusions of the Special Legislative Commission in 1923 which stated:

"The basis for a sound and practical system of agricultural education in the...secondary schools of California has been provided by the Federal and State Vocational Acts of 1917."

“In the high schools, the Smith-Hughes work has made a successful beginning, and its extension is recommended. The project feature of this type of agricultural instruction has proved particularly valuable. Constant improvement of the high school teaching personnel is distinctly desirable and is rapidly taking place.”

Vocational Agriculture Accepted and Its Position Consolidate – 1924-29

Not until six years after the passage of the organic act did the number of high schools with vocational agriculture department equal the number of non-vocational agriculture departments in the state, indicating a definite division of opinion among the administrators of secondary schools. In 1922-23 there were 57 vocational departments and 58 non-vocational. In 1923-24 the count stood 63 and 59; the next year 71 and 66; but thereafter the number of vocational departments steadily increased and the others diminished until 1929-30 saw the reimbursed schools pass the one hundred mark with 105 departments, as against 43 still non-vocational.

In 1924 H.M. Skidmore replaced F.L. Griffin as teacher trainer, remaining in that capacity until 1929. The teacher training was still shifted periodically between the campuses at Berkeley and Davis, but with an increasing demand for teachers and an awakening realization of the importance of well-trained teachers, rapid strides were made in t his phase of the work during this period.

1925 – The year 1925-26 was a pivotal year in many respects in the history of the vocational agriculture program. It say, among other things, the peak of the enrollment of girls in vocational agriculture classes. There had been a steady increase in the number of girls in vocational agriculture until this year when 115 were enrolled; followed by a diminishing enrollment each succeeding year for the next six-year period.

In this year, also, or approximately at this time, the practice which prevailed in many areas, of agriculture teachers assisting in the organizing and supervising of 4-H club work and being paid with extension funds for so doing, ceased to exist. This arrangement which was in effect in many schools prior to 1917 continued with varying degrees of success until the expanding program of vocational education made its discontinuance advisable.

Whether this year marked the peak of high salaries for vocational agriculture teachers is difficult to determine, since data of this kind is difficult to obtain. The directory of this year, however, did include information on salaries paid, and comparisons with salary schedules of later years gives some credence to the inference that 1925-26 was at least a “good year” financially for workers in this field. Of the 177 teachers listed in the directory of that year 82 received salaries of \$2500 per year or more; 20 were in the \$3000-\$4000 bracket; and one each in the \$4000-\$5000 and \$5000-\$6000 division. No teacher of vocational agriculture listed this year received less than \$2000 in salary exclusive of mileage. Not all of these teachers, however, were in vocational departments.

Occurring this year, too, was a most important change in personnel. R.J. Werner, State Supervisor since 1923 resigned in October, 1926, to become Commissioner of Secondary Education. Julian A. McPhee, who has been Assistant State Supervisor since August, 1925, was appointed to succeed him. Prior to his appointment as Assistant Supervisor, Mr. McPhee had served as a teacher of vocational agriculture in the Gilroy High School and for a time as a farm advisor in Merced County. Under the direction and guidance of Mr. McPhee, the present

State Supervisor and Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, the program of vocational education in agriculture was to make its most striking and rapid development and progress.

1926 – By this time some 75 departments of vocational agriculture were in existence, scattered from Fortuna in Humboldt County in the north over the 1100 miles to Holtville in Imperial Valley down near the Mexican border.

A year's experience in attempting to supervise these widely-scattered schools and care for the other details involved in the direction of the rapidly growing program led Mr. McPhee early in 1926 to take advantage of a ruling passed in the spring of that year by the Federal Board for Vocational Education providing for local supervisors. On July 1 of that year E.W. Everett was appointed as the first local or regional supervisor of agricultural education in California. With headquarters at the Fresno State Teachers' College at Fresno, Mr. Everett was employed to devote half time to supervision of agriculture departments in schools in the San Joaquin Valley, some twelve in number; and half time at the college where he taught classes in agriculture. With his appointment the groundwork was laid for a system of regional supervision and supervisors, which was to prove so effective as the program and its various activities grew and expanded. Mr. Everett, prior to his appointment, was director of the vocational agriculture department in the Santa Rosa High School, one of the largest departments of the state, where he had been an outstanding teacher and particularly active in the development of extra-curricular activities for pupils, not only locally, but through the California Agricultural Teachers' Association.

At this time, also, another start was made in an activity which was for some time to be peculiar to this state, and which later was to be recognized as a pattern for other states. Prior to 1926 the training of teachers had been largely an institutional responsibility, and practice teaching conducted during intersession in various departments throughout the state. Starting in 1926, practice teaching was conducted on a semester basis under the direction of the Teacher-Training Department of the University of California. Cadet teachers were placed in agriculture departments of high schools in certain sections of the state, where they remained during the entire semester; attending classes once a week for the purpose of receiving instruction in professional methods. Thus was a start made in the so-called "cadet" training program which later was to become a joint function of the State Department of Education and the University, and to set a new standard in providing participating training for prospective teachers.

Evening and part-time class instruction began, for the first time, to play an important part in the state program, during this year, and the Biennial Report of the Bureau of Agricultural Education for this period reports twenty adult classes taught with an enrollment of 687 farmers. Several classes for out-of-school farm boys were also organized, but no statement is available as to the number or enrollment.

1927 – While the program of regional supervision really had its first beginnings a year earlier with the appointment of Mr. Everett, this type of organization had proved so effective in its first year, that in 1927 four additional regional supervisors were added, each devoting half time to supervision and half time to resident instruction in one of the state teachers' colleges or junior colleges. Prior to this time, in 1923, partly through the California Agriculture Teachers Association, and partly for the purpose of more effective supervisory work, the state had been divided into five districts or regions, each a natural geographic unit with common agricultural problems, and in 1927 a sixth region was added. Thus in 1927 the following supervisory organization obtained:

1. The San Joaquin Region extending from Modesto on the north to the Tehachapi Mountains on the south, embracing the whole of the fertile valley of the San Joaquin River, under the supervision of E.W. Everett, and having in its borders twenty-one vocational agriculture departments.
2. The North Coast Region, extending from San Francisco on the south to the Oregon line on the north and embracing the area between the Coast Range and the ocean. Sixteen schools were included in this region, under the supervision of H.F. Chappell, located at and teaching half time at the San Jose State Teachers College.
3. The South Coast Region, under the supervision of R.J. Werner, formerly state supervisor from 1923-25, also located at the San Jose State Teachers College as a half time instructor. This region extended from San Francisco on the north to Santa Maria on the south and included Santa Clara and Salinas Valleys west of the Coast Range. In this area were eleven schools at this time.
4. The Sacramento Valley Region, under the supervision of A.G. Rinn at the Chico State Teachers' College, including the entire valley of the Sacramento River with the exception of Sacramento and Yolo Counties, and embracing the entire northeast section of the state. Nineteen departments were located in this region.
5. The Central Region, under the supervision of Mr. McPhee, including the lower Sacramento Valley and the counties of Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, Contra Costa and San Joaquin, with nine agriculture departments.
6. The Southern Region, under the supervision of Charles Perrin, located at Ontario, teaching half time in the Chaffey Junior College, including all the area south of the Tehachapi Range, and with ten departments.

All of the newly-appointed regional supervisors brought to their new positions extensive and successful experience as teachers of vocational agriculture. Mr. Chappell was formerly director of the department at Modesto, Mr. Rinn director of Watsonville, and Mr. Perrin from the Chaffey Union High School in Ontario.

Within these six regions were organized smaller districts or "sectional" groups of which there were a total of 12 in the state. These sections held monthly meetings during the year; twice a year regional meetings were held; and annually the teachers were brought together for a statewide meeting.

Thus we see the beginning of the regional organization which has persisted from that time to the present, and which has proved its merit from the point of view of both teachers and supervisory staff.

In 1927 also we find the first mention of a statewide organization of high school vocational agriculture pupils which was organized the previous year, the California Junior Aggies. The Biennial Report of that year describes this organization as follows:

"In every high school where agriculture is taught there is formed an organization made up of high school agriculture students. The names given these groups vary, but for the most part

they are called Junior Farm Centers or Junior Aggies. Each organization sets up its own program of work at the beginning of each year. There are certain standards for admittance to these groups, based on scholarship records and the number of courses taken in agriculture. The programs of work invariably include participation in judging contests, Father and Son banquets, agricultural product exhibits of their projects at various fairs, etc.”

“A statewide organization, made up of agricultural students, called the Federation of California Junior Aggies has been developed. It is necessary for agricultural students to be members of this organization before they can participate in judging contests, fair exhibits, and agricultural student camps held in connection with fairs.”

Growing out of the agricultural clubs which were organized in local departments, the development of the California Junior Aggies represents a transition step from purely local organizations to the state and national organization of the Future Farmers of America which was to come into existence one year later.

In addition to the establishment of the program of regional supervision and the organization of the first statewide student organization in agriculture, the year of 1927 brought with it the first bona fide attempt to train agriculture teachers on a cadet or apprentice basis. During the preceding year trainees had been placed in high school centers for a semester of practice teaching, but no payment was made for their services, and they still were, in effect, “practice teachers”. Starting in the fall of 1927 a new arrangement was made. Cadet teachers were hired by school districts where there was a successful agriculture teacher. They were hired for a full year and acted as assistants in the departments hiring them. They were supervised and instructed by the regional supervisors under the guidance and direction of the teacher trainer. Nine trainees were so placed during this year, and were paid \$100 per month for a ten months’ period.

That this method of training teachers was an important advance is shown by a statement made in the Biennial Report of that year by Mr. McPhee:

“This plan has worked so successfully that it is far superior to any so far used, since it assured real training on the job without seriously handicapping the trainees financially.”

Much credit must be given Mr. McPhee for his courage, initiative and originality in venturing into an entirely new field in teacher training and in devising a training program, which in principle and practice was far ahead of its time. Not until more than a decade later did other states begin generally to develop training programs which provided for long-term, organized participation of trainees.

1928 – From the standpoint of the program of instruction and activities carried on by local departments, 1928 is chiefly notable as the year when judging and judging contests, as an activity of high school agriculture pupils, reached its zenith; and the National Future Farmers of America organization was formed. For several years, the supervisory staff, in an effort to overcome the handicaps imposed by widely scattered schools, teachers trained under varying methods (many of who received their training in other states) and widely varying conditions in local communities, had been sponsoring judging contests as a local, regional and statewide activity. This had been done advisedly, the feeling being that here was one common bond of interest, and that if teachers could be brought together in district, regional and state meetings to discuss problems arising from conducting contests, that other, and perhaps more basic

problems would also come in for their share of consideration. Judging, then, was first promoted as a means of building morale, of obtaining desirable publicity for the program, and finally as a means of welding the teachers of vocational agriculture into a more closely-knit group. Much of the development of the California Agricultural Teachers Association and the California Junior Aggies may be traced to the unifying influence of interest in this activity. The proportions to which this activity had grown may be judged from the following quotation from the Annual Descriptive Report made by Mr. McPhee in that year, which states:

“There are now seven recognized State Championship Judging Contests, namely: Livestock, Tree, Citrus, Poultry, Dairy Cattle, Dairy Products, and Farm Mechanics. There are five semi-final contests held in the state sometime during the spring of the year, and under the direction of the local supervisors of their respective regions. Final contests are arranged by the State Supervisor during the month of May. California each year sends at least three teams for out-of-state competition.”

The Annual Descriptive Report for the year following makes this statement, “More than 100 schools participated in these contests in one branch or another of agriculture.” When it is considered that, in addition to the contests sponsored by the supervisory staff, there were large invitational contests held annually at the University Farm at Davis each year in connection with Picnic Day; at the California State Fair in the fall, and at the Pacific Slope Dairy Show in Oakland during December, to say nothing of local and practice contests, it might well be inferred that participating in and preparing for these affairs constituted the major activity of many departments. Recognizing this fact, members of the supervisory staff began, shortly thereafter, slowly to de-emphasize this activity, and, while it remained for several years, and still is a major activity in the departments of the state, it never again reached the heights attained during this year, in terms of interest displayed, number of participants, and the time devoted to it in local departments.

A part of the diminishing interest in judging and judging contests evident during the next few years may probably be traced to the fact that another activity was making its bow and its bid for attention. Following contacts with the San Francisco Union Stock Yards made by Mr. McPhee, arrangements were made for the first fat stock show and auction at South San Francisco where vocational agriculture pupils were enabled to exhibit and sell fat animals developed through their project activities. The first show was held in November of 1928 with fifteen high schools exhibiting 67 entries and receiving in premiums and from sales of stock some \$4000. From this small beginning was to develop the largest junior fat show in the country, to reach its peak with the Golden Gate International Exposition in 1939 and eventually to lay the foundation for a non-competitive marketing day for project livestock.

Basing their action on the same philosophy, the Los Angeles Union Stock Yards organized a similar show that same year, with ten schools exhibiting. With the advent of these shows we see the beginning of a gradual shift from the more clearly-defined “extracurricular” type of competition, to one involving the supervised farming activities of pupils; a shift which was further emphasized by the fact that this same year saw the establishment, in four regions of the state, of “project competition, in which individual projects in various enterprises were visited and judged, and prizes awarded.

At the same time changes were in progress in the organization and administration of vocational education in the State Department of Education, and in the attitude of high school administrators toward this subject.

Starting in August, 1927 and completed during the following year, was a reorganization of the California State Department of Education. Prior to this time, the Department of Agricultural Education was a part of the Division of Vocational Education, under the Commissioner of Vocational Education. After the reorganization it became the Bureau of Agricultural Education in the division of Rural Education, and the title of the Supervisor of Agricultural Education changed to "Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education". A commission was created, called the "Commission for Federal and State-Aided Classes", made up primarily of the chiefs of the bureaus of agriculture, trade and industrial, and homemaking education and the chief of the bureau of vocational rehabilitation, with the Chief of the Division of Secondary Schools as executive officer. With minor changes, and omission of the dual of the Division of Secondary Education, this organization was to continue for several years, and is still in effect today (1940).

As further evidence of the growing importance of vocational education in agriculture in the minds of local and state school administrators, 1928 brought with it a great increase in the number of requests for the establishment of agriculture departments from high school principals; and a change in the requirements for high school graduation by the State Board of Education recognizing vocational subjects as majors counting toward graduation. This put a definite stamp of approval on vocational subjects, and placed them on an equal plane with academic work.

Partly as a result of the expansion in the number of departments and of the general activities of the state program, and partly due to the resignation of Regional Supervisor Charles Perrin, it became necessary in this year to create the first full-time position as regional supervisor, and H.F. Chappell was given this assignment, supervising the North Coast, Southern and Central Regions.

Briefly summarized, the close of 1928 saw improved agricultural conditions in the state, optimism prevailing among farmers with the fading of the post-war depression, a fast-growing program of vocational education in agriculture and its acceptance by school administrators and agricultural interests generally. Everything was on the upgrade; enrollments in high school and evening classes; projects and project activities; the number of departments; all were enjoying a typical California boom. The Future Farmer program was launched in Kansas City, Mo., near the year's end.

1929 – In contrast to the new developments of the previous year and the steady progress which generally characterized the program in the state, 1929 brought some measure of confusion and uncertainty.

The one bright spot in an otherwise dark picture was the birth in the previous year of the Future Farmers of America, and even this contributed its bit to the general uncertainty. Naturally the new organization was not accepted overnight. Some teachers questioned whether a national organization had inherent advantages over one which primarily confined to state and to local departments. By the end of the year thirty agriculture departments had formed chapters with a total membership of more than 1000, but the majority of schools still retained the old California Junior Aggie affiliation. The department of the Lodi Union High School was the first to file application for a charter and won the honor of being Chapter No. 1 in the State.

The first regular state convention of the new organization was held on September 5, 1929 at Camp Lillard during the California State Fair in Sacramento. It was in the nature of a permanent

organization meeting. State officers were elected and fifty-five State Farmer degrees were awarded. While the state charter had been issued November 20, 1928 after preliminary state and national organization meetings, the following year brought with it the first chapters and the first real state-wide organization.

During those years when expansion and growth were the order of the day; when extracurricular activities and the winning or making a good showing in judging contests seemed an end in itself rather than merely a means of accomplishing a broader objective, it is only natural that project work and especially sound supervised farming should suffer. It is questionable whether the project profits and yields reported by teachers during this period were entirely accurate, and doubtful whether all teachers spent as much time as necessary or were as much concerned as they should have been over whether project accounts were accurately kept, or kept at all.

With the realization that there were other things of importance in vocational agriculture besides contests and activities, a start was made in devising a project record book which would serve to focus the attention of teachers and pupils on the business side and the practical side of supervised farming, and in this year Mr. Chappell and Mr. McPhee compiled and published a record book which would enable pupils to keep accounts which would have some value and meaning when summarized. With teachers themselves unfamiliar with even simple accounting systems; with some unsympathetic toward the idea that pupils should be required to keep accurate records, the introduction of project records which would enable pupils to determine labor income and costs of production certainly did not aid in clearing up the general confusion of objectives.

For several years there had been developing mutual misunderstandings between the Bureau of Agricultural Education in the State Department of Education and the University of California. It is difficult to trace the many factors which contributed to the difficulties which arose, for personalities, differences in viewpoints, and honest differences of opinion all played their parts. As a result, the position of teacher trainer in the University was abolished, and the duties of teacher training taken over by the supervisory staff of the Bureau in this year, practically severing for a time all relations between the two agencies.

Among the primary reasons for the break were these: (1) The College of Agriculture of the University at this time was developing a curriculum in agriculture which was highly technical in nature and organized in terms of specialized majors. Hence it was difficult for students who wished to qualify for teaching to obtain the general training in agriculture which was necessary; (2) Relationships between the Bureau of Agricultural Education and the Agricultural Extension Service were strained as a result of the abrogation of the memorandum of understanding agreed upon in 1928 between the two federal services; (3) the Director of the Division of Vocational Education of the University, Dr. Edwin A. Lee, had built up a very strong department in the School of Education and naturally wished to include Agricultural Education in his field. Teacher training of an institutional type was not consistent with the cadet system established by the Bureau of Agricultural Education; (4) The feeling existed within the Supervisory Staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Education (probably magnified by the difficulties mentioned above) that the University wished to control and dominate the program of agricultural education in the state.

This is not an attempt to fix the blame for the break which occurred on the University. Probably an impartial analysis of the situation as it existed would place the blame on the fact that the three or four individuals directly involved were competent, ambitious men; each with a huge

job to accomplish; each equally determined that they would let nothing stand in the way of successfully accomplishing that job; with the natural result that they found it impossible to arrive at a mutually agreeable procedure.

In spite of the difficulties encountered in this year, however, the program in general continued its healthy growth and expansion, and the close of 1929 saw 105 high school departments in the state; an enrollment of all-day pupils approaching 4000, an increase in adult evening schools, and a generally optimistic outlook for the future.

1930 – The teacher training situation continued to be a sore spot during 1930. The situation is summed up in the Biennial Report of that year, which stated:

“Teachers of agriculture may be obtained from other states, but in view of the variety of crops and farm conditions in California, few of the out-of-state men can cope with the agricultural conditions without further training. At the present time 71 percent of all the vocational agriculture teachers in California have been trained in other states.”

As a result of this situation, and particularly because of the necessity of providing more in-service training for teachers brought in from other states, Mr. McPhee had been searching for a solution to this problem for several years. Some two years prior to this time he had conceived the idea of adding to his staff specialists in various agricultural fields, and of utilizing one of the special schools operating under direction of the State Department of Education (The California Polytechnic School) as a service institution which would do for vocational agriculture what the land grant colleges were doing for the Extension Service, and announced that these plans were in final form to be put into effect as soon as possible.

At this time California was rather belatedly beginning to feel the results of the depression. Agricultural overproduction and the attendant low prices brought to farmers and the agriculture in general, a rather gloomy outlook. In spite of this fact, however, 11 new departments were added during the year, bringing the total to 115, enrollment jumped to over the 4500 mark, and the demand for teachers far exceeded the supply.

The year 1930 brought to a close the period characterized herein as the era of the acceptance of the principle of federal- and state-aided vocational education by the educational agencies of the state. This acceptance was evidenced by two facts: (1) the phenomenal growth of federally- and state-aided classes as compared to the growth of non-reimbursed classes and of the high school program in general; and (2) the changed attitude of administrators.

Commenting on this, Nicholas Ricciardi, Executive Officer of the Commission for Federal and State Aided Classes, wrote in 1930:

“During that period (1918-1930) the growth in the federal- and state-aided vocational education program has been practically 12 times greater than the growth in the regular high school program, and nearly twice as great as the growth of the non-federal and state aided special adult program.”

“The most encouraging and gratifying index of growth in vocational education is the changed attitude towards secondary education by high school principals, of the superintendents of schools, of the junior college heads, of higher institutions of learning, and of the state university.”

“In 1917 practically every high school principal sincerely doubted that vocational education classes could be successfully maintained in high schools. Today it is the exceptional principal who does not definitely recognize that the major responsibility of the high schools is to make available an effective program of vocational education to those boys and girls who are planning to fit themselves for specific occupations which require training of a character different from the collegiate preparation which fits young people for advantageous entrance to higher institutions of learning.”

“This important change in attitude toward secondary education is the most significant contribution of vocational education to secondary education.”

The development and the acceptance of vocational education in agriculture was equally as noteworthy as that of the other vocational programs, and it is fortunate that this was true, for the next decade was to bring the worst depression in the history of the country, and to require vocational education in agriculture to fight for and to justify its existence.

The Depression Era – 1931-34

In spite of the fact that 1931 brought with it the trough of the worst depression in history, the plans for the correlation of the vocational agriculture program in high schools with that at that California Polytechnic were put into effect with an attendant expansion in the personnel of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, and Mr. McPhee's dream of making the institution at San Luis Obispo a centralizing agency for the entire program made its first significant stride toward realization.

Three men were added to the staff to work in a dual capacity with the institution and the high school program. J.I. Thompson, formerly head of the Animal Husbandry Department of the College of Agriculture at Davis, and later manager of the Straloch Farm of the same place; and one of the best-known livestock men in the state as well as nationally recognized, was employed to act in an advisory capacity to the Animal Husbandry Department at California Polytechnic and as Livestock Specialist to assist agriculture teachers in high schools throughout the state with their livestock instruction and problems. George P. Couper, a journalism major from Oregon State College and a newspaper employee from The Dalles, Oregon, was employed to develop an information service for the Bureau, prepare bulletins and visual aids, and to supervise education by radio. S.S. Sutherland, Professor of Agricultural Education at Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana, was employed to serve part time as cadet supervisor and part time as specialist in Farm Mechanics throughout the state. All three were located with headquarters at the Polytechnic.

Changes and expansion were also the order of the day in the supervisory staff. Mr. Everett, who had been employed on a half-time basis as regional supervisor for the San Joaquin was placed on a full time basis, and transferred to the Southern Region with offices at Los Angeles. B.R. Denbigh, formerly head of the agriculture department of the Modesto High School succeeded Mr. Everett at Fresno. This gave the staff two full time regional supervisors in Mr. Chappell, in charge of the Central and North Coast regions, and Mr. Everett; and three half-time supervisors - - Mr. Rinn in the Sacramento Valley region, Mr. Werner supervising the South Coast region, and Mr. Denbigh at Fresno, supervising the schools in the San Joaquin.

This year marks another step in the development of the teacher-training program, in which cadets for the first time were employed directly by the State Department of Education, and were assigned for one semester to high school centers over the state for apprentice teaching, spending the other at the Polytechnic obtaining technical instruction and experience in agriculture as well as additional teaching experience and instruction in methods. Cadet salaries were reduced to \$75.00 per month for a ten-months' period in contrast to the \$100 per month received when employed directly by school districts.

Marking another step in the correlation of programs which characterizes this year, the annual summer conference of agriculture teachers returned to San Luis Obispo, being held at the California Polytechnic in July, where it has been held each year since that date.

1932 – With the morale of teachers at a low ebb as a result of salary cuts and attempts to reduce teaching staffs; with more than half the eighteen teachers trained the previous year unable to find jobs; with attacks on vocational education the order of the day in Sacramento and in Washington; this seemed hardly the time for optimism.

In spite of these conditions the "correlation" program, started the previous year, received another impetus by the adding of a man to the staff to devote half time to building up the Future Farmer organization throughout the state as Executive Secretary; the remainder of his time to be devoted to administrative duties at the Polytechnic. C.O. McCorkle, who was selected for this position, was head of the agriculture department of the Red Bluff High School, a former president of the C.A.T.A., and one of the outstanding teachers in the state. With his appointment was begun an era of emphasis on Future Farmer activities, and an attempt to identify the program of this organization with the work of the agricultural department to the end that in the eyes of the instructor they became one and the same. Quoting from the Annual Descriptive Report of the following year. "A very definite program was launched throughout the state to interest all the Future Farmer Chapters in a program of work that would have for its major premise the improvement of agriculture, with the idea that the entire educational program within the agricultural departments of the local high schools would be centered around the activities of the Future Farmers of America."

To this end an attempt was made to replace the regular monthly reports of teachers of vocational agriculture to the state office by reports made monthly by secretaries of local chapters covering the activities of local chapters, which (again quoting from the Annual Descriptive Report) "naturally included the work of the entire department." This practice was continued for a few years, but eventually discontinued.

As part of the general program to establish the Future Farmer movement within the state, the "California Future Farmer" began publication in this year, under the editorship of George Couper; functioning as the official organ of the State Association, and published by the Association in the California Polytechnic School. Originally made up largely of news items reported by local chapters and of state-wide activities and events, it rapidly developed to include monthly columns by various staff specialists and members of the Polytechnic Staff, and to prove a powerful factor in building a statewide moral and consciousness. Regular broadcasts on the National Broadcasting Company and other networks started in March 1932, and have continued without interruption since that time.

In teacher training, 1932 brought another major change, but ushered in an era in which it became more or less stabilized. At the joint request of President Sproul of the University of

California and Vierling Kersey, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, an agreement was reached wherein the University was to assist and cooperate with the Bureau of Agricultural Education in the training of agriculture teachers. A Committee on Agricultural Teacher-Training relationships was appointed, made up of Julian A. McPhee, representing the Bureau, Dr. W.W. Kemp, Dean of the School of Education and Thomas F. Tavernetti, Assistant Dean of the College of Agriculture, both of the University of California. A full-time teacher trainer was employed by the Bureau to spend half time in residence at the Davis campus of the University teaching professional methods courses, and recruiting cadets, and half time supervising cadets at the Polytechnic School and high school centers. S.S. Sutherland was appointed to this position and took up his duties at Davis in August of this year. Cadets were to be selected and employed by the State Department of Education through the Bureau and enrolled as graduate students in the University, receiving credit toward the necessary teaching credentials.

In spite of it being a depression year, eight new departments were established in high schools, all-day enrollment passed the 5500 mark, no curtailments were necessitate either in personnel or activities, although no attempt was made to replace one half-time regional supervisor, R.J. Werner who resigned to accept a commercial position.

1933 – The most significant development of the year was the removal of the offices of the Bureau of Agricultural Education from Sacramento to the California Polytechnic School at San Luis Obispo. The school, dedicated to vocational training in agriculture and trades and industries, was placed under the direction of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, and Mr. McPhee was made Director. This change placed the entire resources of the school, as a service and educational institution, at the disposal of the Bureau, and brought the goal of utilizing facilities of this institution to the fullest one step nearer realization.

Two service programs involving the institution were immediately started: (1) that of furnishing high quality foundation livestock and poultry to the vocational agriculture pupils throughout the state from the natural increase of the school's flocks and herds, and (2) the establishing of a weekly 15 minute radio program with the cooperation of the National Broadcasting Company to go out over a three-station network to all the high school departments in the state. In this program, instructors at the Polytechnic and Bureau specialists prepared timely lessons on various phases of agricultural production, which were broadcast by Jennings Pierce in charge of NBC's agricultural broadcasts.

Little in the way of development characterized the vocational program in the high schools during this year. Agriculture in the state reached a still lower ebb than in 1931-32. Many banks closed their doors. There was a general movement on the part of the public to curtail all government functions, including education. Much of the efforts of teachers and staff were to the end of protecting the program against cuts in financial support which would have crippled it at least temporarily.

Although characterized by the continued emphasis on the program of the Future Farmer organization, the most significant change in the program of agricultural education in this year was the revision of the State Plans to include vocational agriculture courses in junior colleges throughout the state. The requests for this change originated with the junior college administrators who wished to offer terminal courses in agriculture on a vocational basis. The plans were approved by the Federal Board for Vocational Education on the basis that terminal courses in junior colleges were essentially and actually of less than college grade, since they did not carry transfer credit toward graduation from a four-year institution, and that junior

colleges were secondary schools. Although approved in this year, it was not until two years later that the first reimbursed vocational courses on the junior college level were actually established, with Reedley and Ventura Junior Colleges establishing courses at about the same time.

1934 – This year saw California emerging from the depths of the depression, with certain types of farming bringing in satisfactory income; others still at a low ebb. Attention was centered on the various federal programs for the assistance of agriculture, and while a few of the crop control programs affected the state's major farm enterprises, some 70 of the 126 departments in the state cooperated with the AAA committees in the surveys and sign-ups conducted.

During much of the period of 1931-34, evening and part-time classes throughout the state were subjected to severe criticism. Due to the fact that the state subsidizes all special classes through a special fund for this purpose, evening and part-time classes organized and taught by vocational agriculture departments have never been reimbursed from Smith-Hughes funds. The attacks which occurred were directed mainly at classes in general subjects, but the effect was felt in vocational classes as well.

Many counties passed regulations prohibiting all evening class work in the schools as an economy measure, with the result that 1934 represents an all-time low in the number of evening and part-time classes in agriculture, with a total of only 14 each.

Naturally development of the all-day program was also slow, and only four new departments were added - - representing another all-time low for annual expansion in the program. Total all-day enrollment for the year was only some 550 greater than the previous year - - less than a 10 percent increase.

Summarizing the programs carried on in local departments during this period, one finds several conflicting tendencies. In the more progressive departments the Future Farmer program was accepted immediately; teachers set about identifying the work of the department with that of the organization, and much was accomplished in the way of real improvement of agriculture in the local communities. More apparent, however, was the accomplishment in developing leadership in boys who participated actively in the program of the local chapter. Vocational agriculture pupils of this period were found more and more often occupying positions of leadership in farmers' organizations and in colleges. Many fine cooperative enterprises characterized the programs of these chapters. A typical example was the certified seed potato program at Fortuna, where members of that chapter produced and marketed cooperatively from 10 to 20 percent of the certified seed potatoes produced in the state.

In less progressive departments teachers found difficulty in visualizing the possibilities of identifying Future Farmer activities with the teaching program, and the typical department of this period still adhered to a "box" system of subject organization; with a freshman year of Crops and Soils, a sophomore year of Animal Husbandry, a junior year devoted to Horticulture and Poultry; and with management and marketing problems occupying the time of the seniors. In these departments the project programs was a unit unto itself, little related to the instructional program of the department; the F. F. A. chapter was another unrelated unit; and the farm mechanics instruction, generally taught by a special teacher of that subject, was still another.

In all departments extracurricular activities, generally sponsored by the Future Farmer organization, demanded much of the time and effort of instructors. Judging contests, while

only wrecks of the sturdy youngsters of the late twenties, still came in for their share of attention. Participation in junior livestock shows had made an enormous growth, and with the Great Western Livestock Show in Los Angeles in November, the Interstate Junior Livestock Show at South San Francisco at Easter, the Los Angeles and San Joaquin County Fairs in late summer and early fall, and the California State Fair in September, life for many teachers and youngsters was spent preparing for, going to and recovering from, stock shows. In spite of the efforts of J.I. Thompson, Livestock Specialist, and the regional supervisors, many projects were developed primarily for show purposes, so that these shows, while they gave a much-needed impetus to the improvement of the quality of livestock produced by Future Farmers and in local communities, were not an unmixed blessing.

Added to these major activities were local fairs, Father and Son banquets, local and regional project competition, public speaking contests, to mention a few; and the cumulative demands of these affairs loomed large in the work of the departments during this period.

Farm mechanics instruction during this and earlier in the history of agricultural departments was not closely integrated with the agriculture phase of instruction. The early teachers of farm mechanics were mainly industrial arts-trained men with farm experience, graduates of the State Teachers' Colleges, and employed by local departments to devote part time to teaching farm mechanics and part to industrial arts or manual training classes. This persisted through this period, primarily as a result of the desires of school administrators and of tradition. However, the last special farm mechanics teacher was trained by the agricultural teacher training program in 1931, and the number of special shop teachers showed a gradual decrease thereafter. The typical organization of a two man department during most of this time, however, consisted of one man directing the department, and devoting full time to teaching agriculture, supervising project work, and advising the Future Farmer chapter, and on a shop teacher doing little or no supervisory work, unfamiliar with the chapter activities, and making little or no attempt to correlate the shop work with the agricultural instruction or the supervised farming programs of pupils. Overcoming this lack of correlation was a major supervisory problem of this and later periods.

This was an era of good projects, and the word "project" is used advisedly. Supervised farming programs, as such were the exception. Many pupils and many departments developed outstanding one-enterprise projects, but minor, contributory, farm improvement and farm experience projects were only terms used by teacher trainers and supervisors. The fact that the one project idea clung so tenaciously in this state, is due in large measure to the fact that much of California agriculture during this period was a one-enterprise or a specialty farm business. Diversification, as such, made little progress, until depression, repression and post-depression conditions forced its adoption by farmers.

The Post Depression Era – 1935-1940

With federal crop reduction programs functioning, and droughts in the middle west, 1935 found California agriculture emerging from the depression era. With this improvement in both conditions and moral, came the biggest demand for new vocational agriculture departments since 1917, when the work was established. Thirty schools were listed as desiring to establish departments, but due to the lack of teachers, and the fact that other agencies were attempting to raid the existing supply, only ten were admitted.

This increased interest in agricultural education was reflected in the attitude of the State Legislature during the 1935 session. Measures including matching George-Ellzey funds, permitting expenses for travel outside school districts, and bills providing for more effective service from the California Polytechnic were passed almost without a dissenting vote.

In the programs of local departments, and of the state as a whole, the improvement of supervised farming programs began to come in for increased attention. There was a noticeable increase of projects which were growing into full-time farming enterprises and in contributory projects necessary to round out the farming programs. Approximately one fourth of the projects in the state were entered in project competition, with eliminations bringing the finalists in the various regions down to some 200 boys. Weekly radio programs, giving timely suggestions regarding project operations, disease control, marketing, feeding, were prepared and broadcast by specialists and faculty of the Polytechnic, further centering the attention of teachers and pupils on this phase of the program. The project record book used throughout the state was revised and a practice record book for teaching pupils how to keep records was published. J.I. Thompson, Livestock Specialist for the Bureau of Agricultural Education, published a bulletin on sheep projects, and project analysis programs in various enterprises were begun by various members of the supervisory staff.

The trend away from a "glamour" program was making its start. Problems dealing with placement of pupils trained began to replace discussions dealing with rules for local judging contests. There was good reason for this. In June of this year it was estimated that California had within its borders 40 percent of the nation's drifting population, and by the end of the fiscal year about 4,000 persons a day, twenty-five percent of the them without any means of support, were drifting into the state, laying the foundation for "Grapes of Wrath", creating a future placement problem that was of utmost concern.

1936 – The increased interest and emphasis placed upon developing sound supervised farming programs which became evident the preceding year continued to gain in momentum during 1936. A much better understanding was evident on the part of both teachers and pupils as to the function of supervised farming and the place it should play in vocational instruction. The principal objective of the annual conference of teachers was the development of sounder farming programs, based upon analyses of results of completed project enterprises.

The program of instruction in farm mechanics also evidenced a similar improvement. Instead of "rural industrial arts", many departments were changing their instruction to that of the mechanics of farming, and increasing emphasis given to studies in the costs of tractor operation or efficiency of irrigation pumps, at the expense of building kitchen stools and making leather halters.

As a result of the continued efficient functioning of vocational agriculture departments throughout the state, the year 1936 set a new high in the demand for new departments. At least 40 schools requested either teachers to establish new departments or information to present to boards of education. Again the limiting factor was the supply of teachers.

The fact that the various "New Deal" agencies, the extension service, and commercial concerns were bidding for the services of the more successful agriculture teachers and trainees, and offering higher salaries than obtained in the teaching field was responsible for the most significant administrative or policy change of the year. This was the change in the reimbursement system to schools.

Ever since 1917, with minor changes, reimbursement to local departments had been made on the basis of a flat sum per teaching unit or full-time teacher. For several years, departments had received \$900.00 reimbursement for the first full-time teacher or teaching unit; \$600 for the second; \$300 for the third; and no reimbursement for more than three teachers.

Seeking for a plan which would provide additional reimbursement to departments which were rendering more efficient service, and at the same time serve to encourage the payment of higher salaries when merited, Mr. McPhee developed with his staff a system which would accomplish this, and at the same time encourage more thorough supervision on the part of the staff.

The system, as finally put into effect gave each school an option between the former system of basic reimbursement (\$99, \$600, \$300) and one in which schools which could pay the head of the department a minimum salary of \$2200 per year, and would receive this basic reimbursement plus a certain percentage of the difference between \$1800 and the salary paid - - this percentage to be determined by the rating made by the department on a score card devised by the bureau. These two plans were designated as "Plan I" and "Plan II", and local boards of education were requested, at the beginning of the school year to indicate the plan under which they wished to operate. Since the higher the department scored, and the higher the teacher's salary, the greater the reimbursement it received, it not only gave teachers an incentive to improve, but made salary increases easier to obtain. In certain cases it was actually less expensive for a board of education to pay a teacher \$2200 per year or more than to keep his salary at \$2000.

Peculiarly, the other major development of the year, in terms of its effect on the program of vocational agriculture in the state, seemed, at first to bear no relationship to the work of the schools. In November, 1934, the people of the state voted to legalize pari-mutual wagering on horse racing. A certain percentage of the "take" accrued to the state to be used for support of the State Fair and certain county fairs, and the remainder to be used for agricultural education in colleges and state schools. The immediate effect was the organizing in practically every county of the state, small "county fairs", each with attractive premium lists for junior exhibitors. As a result Future Farmer participation in showing project products at fairs experienced an immediate boom, to the extent that restrictions had to be devised to prevent students from developing into junior "show tramps" and making a show circuit up and down the state.

This year also the recognition of a state association of alumni chapters of the Future Farmers of American and the first state convention in connection with the annual meeting of the active chapters at the Polytechnic, and the first separate department of vocational agriculture in a junior college, Modesto Junior College being the first to appear in the directory of vocational departments, although courses had been established prior to this in both the Reedley and Ventura departments where the College was administered through the high school and not as a separate institution.

1937 – It has been said that California would never have "felt the depression" had it not been for the financial burden imposed upon it by the influx of impoverished families from the so-called "dust bowl". Commodity prices in many major products were good throughout the depression, and incomes relatively large. The social, economic, and placement problems brought about by the necessity of supporting and absorbing the hundreds of farm families who

flocked to various parts of the state was the negative force which may have overcome such gains as resulted from the state's otherwise favorable position.

The effect of this situation was to turn the attention of workers in vocational agricultural education more specifically to the problem of placement, and one of the major developments of the year was the initiation of courses of study based upon placement opportunities in local communities. As a basis for this move, each member of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Education made a study in a local high school district to determine placement opportunities therein, and to develop, with the teacher in that district, a course of instruction and a program in vocational agriculture which would prepare and train pupils for these opportunities. The professional instruction in annual summer school and conference for agriculture teachers was devoted to this end. Naturally the new program was not adopted at once by teachers generally, but a good start was made.

This immediately pointed to the necessity for a guidance program as a part of instruction in vocational agriculture to center the attention of pupils upon the necessity of choosing an agricultural occupation and of training for that occupation, and many departments began to center their attention upon this problem in connection with a study of placement opportunities.

The course of instruction thus developed marked the first major attempt to set up a procedure for developing standard courses of study for vocational departments, with the "cross-section" method of organizing subject matter replacing the time worn "box System". Much of the credit for starting this movement should accrue to E.W. Everett, Supervisor in the Southern Region, who made the first survey and laid the groundwork for its eventual adoption on a statewide basis.

Other major developments of the year included (1) the beginning of a long time study of efficiency factors in swine production started by Livestock Specialist J.I. Thompson with the cooperation of the agriculture teachers of the state. This study involved the analysis of completed swine projects to determine efficiency standards, and has been continued since that date with great benefit to teachers, pupils and the swine industry as a whole. (2) The changing of "project competition" in several regions of the state to "farm program competition" in which the entire farming program of the pupil was considered instead of an individual project enterprise in judging the supervised practice work done. (3) The establishing of an undergraduate curriculum in the College of Agriculture of the University of California to prepare teachers of vocational agriculture. (4) The raising of salaries of agriculture teachers as a result of the reimbursement plan developed the preceding year. According to the Annual Descriptive Report of this year, some 60 teachers received increases in salary as a result of this plan, and trainees placed received an average salary of more than \$2000.

1938 – The trends noted in 1936 and 1937 toward courses of study based on placement opportunities, toward a closer integration of farm mechanics instruction with that of programs of instruction as a whole, toward replacing individual project enterprises with complete farming programs, toward an increased emphasis on guidance during the first year of high school instruction, and salary increases for teachers generally, continued to show healthy developments during this period.

The major developments of the year, however, were in the field of teacher training. In the in-service training of teacher, a growing need was evident for more technical and practical training in agriculture in comparison to the need for training professional methods. Teachers, in guiding

pupils into specific farming occupations, supervising complete farming programs and attempting to get pupils established in programs and attempting to get pupils established in farming, began to feel the need for sounder and more extensive knowledge and skill in agriculture.

As a result, the entire program of the annual summer school and much of the summer conference was devoted to skills training in agriculture given by members of the faculty of the California Polytechnic and the various specialists. To further meet this need a man was employed half time to supervise the preparation and to compile and distribute subject matter information to the teachers of the state. C.O. McCorkle, a member of the staff of the Polytechnic, was given this assignment, and began the publication of a monthly release including abstracts of worthwhile articles, bibliographies, charts, and other teaching materials.

In the pre-employment training of teachers, 1938 saw the establishment of a curriculum in Agricultural Education in the College of Agriculture of the University set up in terms of the provisions for the new State Plan which was to go into effect at the beginning of the new fiscal year, and which would provide the general training in agriculture specified by the Plan and needed by prospective teachers. The response on the part of students was immediate, and this curriculum became overnight the fastest-growing major in the college.

It also brought a major change in provisions for participating experience of trainees, in the establishment of the first permanent high school training centers with critic teachers selected by the bureau and cooperating in the training program. Contracts were made with the local boards at the San Luis Obispo and Santa Maria High Schools providing for special reimbursement to these schools in return for their cooperation in the training of vocational agriculture teachers, and two outstanding teachers employed in these schools as critics. George K. Jenner, formerly head of the agriculture department at the Fortuna High School, was elected at the Santa Maria center, and Wesley P. Smith, formerly at Ferndale High School, at the San Luis Obispo center. The active supervision of these schools was given to W.E. Court who had been brought to the Polytechnic the year previous from the Wasco High School to act as half-time Assistant Teacher Trainer and as half-time instructor on the Polytechnic Staff.

In 1938, also, came the most valuable acquisition and the most rapid expansion in the history of the California Polytechnic. In August of this year, Charles B. Voorhis and his son, Congressman Jerry Voorhis of Pasadena, who, ten years before, had established a beautiful school and home for deserving, underprivileged youngsters near San Dimas in Los Angeles County, made an outright give of his school to the Polytechnic to be used as a horticultural branch of the institution. Completely equipped with classrooms, dormitory facilities, and orchards, and including 150 acres of land, the gift was conservatively valued at close to a million dollars. Almost immediately, instruction in agricultural inspection, citriculture, and deciduous fruit production was transferred to the southern school, which became known as the Voorhis Unit of the California Polytechnic.

The extensive development of county fairs noted previously began in this year to bring additional problems in the form of friction with the Extension Service due to competition in the junior divisions developed in most of these fairs. To cover all the ramifications of this particular problem would require a volume in itself, but the major difficulties arose from two sources: (1) The fact that fair secretaries insisted that the amount of premium money for the two divisions be the same, although the number of participants in one group might far outnumber those in

the other; and (2) that the Extension Service insisted that boys be allowed to be members of both the Future Farmer and 4-H organizations at the same time and to show in both divisions at the same fair. These demands, workers in vocational agriculture protested as being contrary to all previous agreements, and unethical, since they permitted undesirable duplications in premium awards at fairs. (The State Department of Finance has since ruled against such duplications.)

1939 – With the Golden Gate International Exposition and the Annual Pacific Regional Conference for Vocational Education scheduled for California, this year gave early promise of looming large in major happenings and developments - - a promise which was amply fulfilled.

The Interstate Junior Livestock Show, started in South San Francisco in cooperation with the Union Stock Yards some ten years previously, had grown in the intervening years to become the largest show of its kind in existence. It is fitting that its climax should have been reached in 1939 with the greatest show of all time held on Treasure Island with some 1000 Future Farmers from seven states exhibiting and selling some 2,700 head of beef cattle, sheep and swine; with the announcement being made during the closing days of the show that it marked the last show of its kind in the Bay City. While the development of this show on a competitive basis contributed markedly to the improvement of livestock in the state, the high prices received for grand champions, and the encouragement given to exhibitors to use practices in feeding and selection which were not in conformity to good commercial practice, led in a large measure to the abandonment of this activity and its replacement the following year with a marketing day. Thus fell another remnant of the “glamour program” which characterized the earlier development of vocational agriculture in the state.

Other than the livestock show, Future Farmer participation in the exposition was limited. Two 1000-foot motion picture films in sound and color were shown at Treasure Island throughout the Exposition; one depicting the activities of the Future Farmer program, the other the development of the Polytechnic School. Both films were produced under the supervision of George Couper, at the request of the state commission for the Exposition, and served to acquaint thousands of fair visitors with vocational education in agriculture in the state.

For several years, with Mr. McPhee acting in the dual capacity as Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education and President and Director of the California Polytechnic School, and regional supervisors located at various centers over the state, there had been evidence of a growing trend toward regional programs and a regional consciousness in contrast to the development of a unified state program. To counteract this tendency, Mr. McPhee, early in the year, effected a reorganization of the bureau, brought E.W. Everett from Los Angeles where he had been regional supervisor of that area to San Luis Obispo as Assistant State Supervisor; moving Mr. Denbigh from the San Joaquin Region to Los Angeles; bringing Mr. Rinn from Chico to San Luis Obispo to supervise the San Joaquin Valley from that office; and appointing two new regional supervisors on a half-time basis. Weir Fetters, formerly of the California Polytechnic Staff in the new Voorhis Unit at San Dimas, California, was appointed half-time supervisor in charge of the North Coast Region with offices at San Luis Obispo, devoting the remainder of his time to developing teaching aids in field and fruit crops. B.J. McMahan, who for the past year had been head of the Meat Animals Department of the California Polytechnic, was appointed supervisor of the South Coast Region and Assistant Teacher Trainer, also with offices at the Polytechnic, replacing W.E. Court in the teacher training work. Thus all of the supervisory staff with the exception of H.F. Chappell, whose office was at Sacramento, who assumed the supervision of Mr. Rinn’s former region, the Sacramento Valley, and B.R. Denbigh

at Los Angeles, were brought to the Polytechnic School in an effort to form a state, rather than a regionalized system of supervision.

In the Los Angeles city schools, an increased interest in agriculture courses was becoming evident, and, with the establishment of several vocational departments in the system, E.B. Angier was named to supervise the agricultural instruction offered there.

In teacher training, two more training centers were established near San Luis Obispo on the same basis as the two organized the previous year, with H.H. Burlingham, formerly head of the Madera department, assuming his duties as critic teacher in the newly established department at Paso Robles; and C.P. Winner from the Elk Grove Department accepting a similar role in the Arroyo Grande High School.

Significant, also in the teacher-training program this year was the provision made for trainees to obtain participating experience in part-time and evening school work. While, for several years, the majority of the trainees had received experience in one or both of these activities, with all of them participating in evening school instruction in 1938; this year saw every trainee teaching evening school classes and participating either in the organization or teaching of part-time classes of young farmers.

In the programs of local departments, the Alumni Future Farmer Chapters were being replaced by Young Farmer groups organized around part-time classes; many new buildings were being built for vocational departments, and built according to plans developed by the bureau; communities which had no vocational agriculture in their schools were becoming increasingly insistent that the program be established and they be given the benefit of a training program which was rapidly gaining recognition from all. Only the lack of federal and state funds prevented the establishment of a record number of new departments this year, but, facing a 16 percent prorate in reimbursement to the schools, the number was definitely limited.

Changes in methods of instruction were reflected in two publications of the Bureau. The first was a Farm Account Book to replace the old Project Record Book. Made necessary by the general change from single-enterprise projects to a supervised practice program made up of major, minor and contributory enterprises, the new account book was a natural step in the trend toward a program of instruction in which pupils were "growing into" farming and in which records, agreements, and analyses of a complete farming program were an essential part. The other publication, the California Life Plan Book, was designed for use in fourth-year agriculture classes in centering the attention of students who were completing their all-day instruction on the problems of placement and continued growth in the years immediately following high school.

The twenty-two years since the establishment of vocational education in agriculture in California were characterized by a healthy development and expansion. This development, in terms of the numbers of departments, enrollment in all-day classes and membership in the Future Farmer of America is summarized in the following table.

GROWTH OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN CALIFORNIA 1917-1939

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Departments</u>	<u>Enrollment All-Day Pupils</u>	<u>Membership in Future Farmers of America</u>
1917-18	10	(not available)	

1918-19	22	337	
1919-20	32	640	
1920-21	39	1097	
1921-22	50	1281	
1922-23	57	1475	
1923-24	63	1838	
1924-25	71	2163	
1925-26	75	2537	
1926-27	81	2880	
1927-28	85	3279	
1928-29	95	3975	1572
1929-30	105	4531	2055
1930-31	115	5096	3064
1931-32	119	5450	3087
1932-33	123	6260	4021
1933-34	126	6816	4903
1934-35	127	7021	5215
1935-36	137	7174	6077
1936-37	155	8211	7106
1937-38	163	8915	7630
1938-39	175	9263	8427
1939-40	187	9648	8868

1940 – The growth as indicated by the foregoing table continued in 1940 and problems and trends were little affected by events in Europe which presaged World War II.

Four major trends characterize the developments of the year.

First among these was the increased interest in Young Farmer organizations and attendant class instruction. The Annual Descriptive Report for 1939 listed 94 evening and part-time classes in agriculture conducted in the state during that year. The number of such classes for 1940 was well over the hundred mark with the increase coming largely in Young Farmer classes but with more departments maintaining a complete program of all-day, part-time, and evening class instruction. Plans were made during the year for a state convention of Young Farmer groups for the coming fall and there was every evidence of a glowing future for this type of instruction.

The second trend was increased attention to the placement and selection of pupils for high school classes. A state-wide study was initiated to determine the factors which should govern selection and an enrollment data form was developed for recording and analyzing the home conditions of beginning pupils. As a result, there appeared to be a greater selection of pupils than ever before and evidence that principals and guidance counselors were more willing to cooperate in the selection process. Teachers also were giving more attention to placement and finding placement opportunities for graduating pupils. More farming programs were being planned and initiated which would enable pupils to accumulate capital, stock, and machinery needed for placement in farming and farm to farm studies were being conducted in some departments to determine exactly what the placement opportunities were for their pupils.

The third major development was the replacing of competitive livestock shows with marketing days. The first marketing day for livestock was held in South San Francisco during Easter

week with encouraging results. Other, and perhaps smaller marketing days were being planned for other sections of the state.

The fourth major development was the awakening to the need for and importance of terminal vocational courses in agriculture. While there had been a limited number of such courses offered in prior years by junior colleges, there was an increased interest and more courses established than ever before. Such courses were being taught in junior colleges at Modesto, Salinas, Reedley, Ventura, Auburn, Oceanside and Hollister and plans were apparently under way for other schools to begin the work next year. As this expansion occurred, it promised to bring even more conflict between college preparatory and vocational courses in these institutions than it had in the high schools, but the trend to the vocational curricula was becoming quite pronounced. It is of interest to note that a decade ago school administrators were just beginning to accept the high school vocational programs. In 1940, their status was unquestioned and we find acceptance of instruction for out-of-school young farmers and vocational instruction on the junior college level at about the same place as the high school instruction had been ten years before.

Perhaps the most striking development of the year in agricultural education was the changing status of the California Polytechnic. As the California Polytechnic School at San Luis Obispo, this institution played a significant role in the development of vocational education in agriculture, first as one of the earliest secondary vocational schools, next as an institution offering terminal and degree transfer courses of a vocational nature on the college level, then as a centralizing service agency in the state program of vocational agriculture in the high schools and as the headquarters for the Bureau of Agricultural Education and the Future Farmers of American organization. In this year, the institution was given authority by the State Board of Education to grant to its graduates the Bachelor of Science Degree in Agriculture in recognition of the superior program of instruction it had maintained.

VOLUME II - 1940 to 1969

1941 – In spite of the fact that our entry into World War II did not occur until late in the year, dramatic changes were already under way as the nation made defense preparations for possible involvement. Such preparations also had their impact on agriculture and on education in agriculture. For the first time in many years, there were labor shortages in agriculture as persons ordinarily engaged in farm work thronged to the cities for the higher wages in defense industries. The draft also began to make its inroads into the labor force and with overall increased employment and higher wages came an increased demand for farm products of all kinds.

While all of these changes had a certain disruptive effect upon the state's program of vocational education in agriculture, it was due to the uncertainty and the emotional unrest rather than actual changes in the work of teachers or state staff. While national defense courses were well under way earlier in the year, the offering of courses in agriculture lagged somewhat behind and due to delays in obtaining federal approval of state plans for such courses the first class under program 4-A for the training of out-of-school rural youth was not inaugurated until March 1, pretty well toward the close of the school year. In spite of this late beginning, 98 courses were in operation prior to the end of the fiscal year, mostly in the care, repair, and operation of trucks, tractors, and autos. These and other courses were designed primarily to train farm youth for employment in defense industries and such courses were catalogued under the brand

classification of OSY instructions. Since the real impact of the war was yet to come, there were few changes in either personnel or duties of state staff. George Weir Fetters was added as a Regional Supervisor.

Among developments occurring in the regular program, as contrasted with defense activities, was a major change in instruction for out-of-school youth. These classes were officially called "part-time" classes since the inception of the National Vocational Education Acts, but with the coming of an organization in addition to class instruction, the term which was adopted for this type of work in California, was "Young Farmer" instruction. The success of the Future Farmer organization and the contributions which it had made to the instruction for high school students led to the development of similar organizations for out-of-school youth and these groups were encouraged to elect officers, hold social gatherings, plan community service programs, and aid in the selection of topics for class instruction. Therefore, this instruction developed into a combination of organizational activities and formalized and organized instruction, either by the teacher who acted also as advisor for the organization or by outside experts called in to provide instruction in special topics. To aid teachers in developing this new type of program, an 85-page handbook for young farmer instruction was developed by the state staff, published and made available to teachers.

While the number of agriculture departments in schools continued to grow, the shortage of teachers, especially teacher candidates, was becoming acute. To meet this decreasing supply of qualified candidates, some radical changes were made in the fifth year so-called cadet program. Instead of starting the training program September 1, new trainees were appointed and assigned to schools July 1st and were truly apprentice teachers, involved almost immediately in the activities of the departments to which they were assigned. Many of these also were placed in full-time teaching positions at mid-year to fill vacancies created by the draft. Recruiting activities on the part of the state staff were stepped up and every potential source of teacher candidates explored and exploited.

In summary, 1941 was somewhat of a transition year between the normal rather routine program and the emphasis on defense activities and special courses brought about by World War II. More disruptive during this year was the fact that the regional supervisors were expected not only to handle their supervisory tasks in connection with the so-called regular program but to devote up to one-half time to the organizing and establishing of defense classes. The fact that many young men were being drafted, not only those in farming but employed teachers and teacher candidates, presented new problems for all to face.

1942 – Few states felt the impact of the nation's entry into World War II as did California. With only about 5% of the nation's population, and still primarily an agriculture state, it now had 10% of the war contracts. In 1941 a half million new persons entered the state and the influx continued. Large numbers of training camps for the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard were established with many of the Army camps in agricultural areas. More than 110,000 aliens including those of Japanese ancestry, many of the latter American born and not speaking Japanese, were removed to reception centers. Many of these were farmers, but the group also included doctors, dentists, and persons from all walks of life. Japanese farmers had been cultivating an estimated 235,000 acres of the best farm land in the state, mostly highly productive and intensely cultivated, producing strawberries, cantaloupes, squash, onions, tomatoes, and other vegetable crops, and arrangements had to be made for these lands to be taken over in an orderly fashion and operated by other farmers. Restrictions on border travel, clogging of rail transportation - - both passenger and freight - - lack of housing for all, changes

in civilian life, threats of invasion and air raids, evacuation, the setting up of disaster service areas, all contributed to the general unrest. The availability of farm machinery decreased some 50%, and California agriculture, dependent as it was on farm machinery, suffered accordingly. In education, the school year was disrupted, the normal 170 day requirement shortened, and many students excused in the spring to harvest, thin, and cultivate crops. Collegiate enrollment, both four year and junior college, dropped rapidly and instruction at the College of Agriculture at Davis ceased entirely with the campus being turned over to the Signal Corps for the duration and students transferred to other campuses. In the high schools, enrollments dropped, and teachers were drafted or left to work in defense industries. Interscholastic activities of all kinds, including athletics, were drastically curtailed due to the lack of transportation.

Effect Upon Vocational Agriculture

In spite of disruptions, most departments of vocational agriculture were still maintained, but total enrollment began to drop. Concurrently, came a drastic change in the responsibility of agricultural teachers, taking attention away from regular classes and the supervision of farming programs, to training school age labor, heading various drives among rural people, serving on agricultural war committees, finding acceptable operators for Japanese farms, and organizing and supervising OSY classes. Teacher training activities, too, were radically changed with candidates being placed immediately in full-time teaching positions without the usual half year of formal instruction in methods and subject matter and with little or no formalized instruction involved in the fifth year. The teacher trainer from the University of California at Davis was reassigned to spend three-fourths of his time as a regional supervisor and only the remaining one-fourth time to teacher training duties. Other major changes taking place in responsibilities of state staff and personnel included the appointment of Eugene Boone as half-time specialist in national defense, C.O. McCorkle as half-time subject matter specialist, and Harold O. Wilson as an assistant state supervisor in charge of the activities in one of the southern regions. As changes occurred in programs of instruction, responsibilities of the state staff changed accordingly with fairs, shows and contests virtually eliminated for the duration, F.F.A. participation curtailed, Young Farmer programs virtually dropped. Each supervisor devoted an increasing share of his time and effort to organize OSY-ND courses to train workers for war industry and for agriculture. In-service training activities for teachers changed accordingly. The OSY classes to train workers for war industry and for increased agricultural production were taught mainly by local skilled mechanics, carpenters, electricians, farm machinery repairmen, and others with considerable experience but with perhaps less formal education and little or no training in teaching methods. The results that these teachers achieved, however, were generally excellent. Local teachers aided by organizing these classes, assisting in securing enrollment, and supplying teaching aids prepared and distributed by state staff. It is known that hundreds of young men completing these courses received employment in war industries but complete records are not available since placement was handled by the U.S. Employment Service. Other classes in farm machinery aided local farmers in the repair and maintenance of equipment which they already owned and enabled them to meet the demands for increased production. Many teachers aided local citizens in the growing of "victory gardens" and in many towns community canneries were developed and instruction provided so that housewives could preserve the fruit and vegetables produced by nearby farms. In summary, 1942 was the first year in which the real impact of this nations' entry into World War II was felt.

1943 – This year saw the country fully committed to the war effort. The hysteria of 1942, invasion jitters, bombing scares, fear of sabotage by Japanese residents, the consequent air

raid alarms, evacuation and disaster plans subsided and were replaced by a more sober realization of the war status of the state and the nation.

Unrest was the order of the day and the seeds were being sown for the subsequent social and racial antagonisms, juvenile delinquency, and other disorders which were so evident in the immediate post-war years. To add to the uncertainty, local selective service boards apparently followed no fixed pattern in granting deferments. One board would get the reputation of being rather liberal and granting deferments to certain groups such as farmers and teachers; others would draft these persons regardless of occupation. Even within a single selective service board, there were major inconsistencies in these matters. Wages increased. Population in the state continued to burgeon, with an additional estimated one-quarter million people arriving during the year. Training camps were in full swing in almost every community. Many of these camps were located in areas distant from population centers and the small towns adjacent to the camps were overrun with soldiers on leave and all kinds of pleasure establishments sprang up to cater to servicemen on weekend leave. In many homes, both parents were working, and youngsters received little parental supervision. Gangs of hoodlums were organized in Los Angeles and larger cities, zoot riots occurred with local toughs clashing with servicemen. Government regulation of production and prices caused widespread dissatisfaction. Black markets for meat and other scarce commodities sprang up overnight. Many hasty, ill-advised projects were undertaken by government agencies. For example, a considerable acreage of some of the best farming land in the Salinas Valley was preempted for the growing of guayule, a desert plant which was purported to produce rubber from which the government hoped to supplement the decreasing supply from usual sources. Long before any rubber was produced from these plantings, synthetic rubber was developed and little need was found for more production from natural sources.

Impact of Agriculture

Acute shortages of certain products caused changes in farming enterprises conducted in the state, and there was a general trend away from crops which required heavy peak loads of labor for thinning, cultivating and harvesting. In fact, the shortage of farm labor was perhaps the most crucial problem that farmers faced at this particular time. Normally, some 225,000 seasonal workers were employed on California farms. Most of them worked only four or five months per year starting the harvest season in the Imperial Valley and migrating northward as crops produced in cooler parts of the state matured and became ready for harvest. Some of these men were drafted; others left their usual pursuits for employment in higher paying jobs in war industries and, as a result, the usual supply of such workers was considerably lessened. The seasonal employment of this large group of farm laborers in California due to the type of crops produced contributed to this shortage. Selective service boards which could readily see the reason for granting deferments to year-round farm workers could hardly justify this same action for these part-time workers. As a result, there were major changes in farm enterprises from crops such as sugar beets, tomatoes, etc. with high labor demands for those better adapted to mechanical planting, cultivating and harvesting. In spite of all of these handicaps, however, the total farm income of the state was up 31.3% from 1941 to the figure \$1,147,895,000, the greatest in the state's history.

To alleviate the labor situation, about 30,000 Mexican nationals were brought to the state by the Farm Security Administration this year. These, plus some 400 men from Arkansas and Louisiana moved from marginal farm land, were brought into the state to harvest crops. Training was provided for these workers to familiarize them with the specialty crops of the state

through Rural War Production Training classes, some of which were held in the camps set up for such workers as they were brought into the state.

Impact on Vocational Agriculture

The attention of teachers of vocational agriculture in this period turned increasingly from high school youth in regular day classes to adult training through Rural War Production Training programs. A total of 1,576 adult courses were approved, enrolling an estimated 50,000 students. Eight hundred of these were courses in the production, conservation and processing of food, including many community canneries which were set up and for which modern equipment was provided. Thirty thousand students, mostly housewives, were enrolled in the courses this year. Courses for the training of farm labor totaled 214 with some 4,500 enrolled. Other courses in the repair and construction of farm machinery numbered 233 enrolling 5,000 farmers. The remaining courses were mostly in the production of crops and livestock. There continued to be inconsistency on the part of local selective service boards in deferment of teachers of vocational agriculture, even within a given local board. As a result, a number of teachers were drafted during the year and 19 departments had to be closed for lack of teachers and perhaps other causes, with the total number of departments at the end of the year standing at 176, a drop from the 195 of the year before. Of teachers lost, 23 entered the armed services, 15 turned to farming, and 27 other employment. Supervised practice programs carried on by high school youngsters changed from long-time multi-enterprise programs to short-term enterprises promising quick returns. Still further reductions occurred in all outside activities in connection with Future Farmer organizations such as field days, marketing days, judging contests, etc.

Teacher training plans were again revised to meet changing conditions. Candidates were enrolled at any time during the year and training centers concentrated insofar as possible into an area which made supervision easier. The bringing of teacher candidates together for formal group instruction was entirely abandoned and replaced by more individual instruction and supervision of those full-time employed and those retained as apprentices.

In an attempt to offset teacher losses, a new reimbursement plan was instituted which would provide schools increased support from federal and state funds on the condition that the salaries of the agricultural teachers they employed were increased and that the salary of the department head reached a minimum of at least \$2500 per year.

Changes in Personnel and Responsibilities of State Staff

During the year, Mr. H. H. Burlingham was appointed as a Regional Supervisor, Wesley P. Smith to devote on-half time to duties as Regional Supervisor and the other half as Assistant Teacher Trainer, S. S. Sutherland was relieved of his three-fourths time appointment as Regional Supervisor to devote full time to teacher training, Weir Fetters' assignment was changed to that of full-time coordinator of the Rural War Production Training Program. C. O. McCorkle and Eugene Boone left the Bureau staff to join the faculty of the California Polytechnic. Each Regional Supervisor was assigned to devote one-half time to the supervision of Rural War Production Training courses. Regional offices were re-established and the supervisors who had been located at California Polytechnic at San Luis Obispo were again located in regional offices throughout the state. The major reason for this move was to enable supervisors to do their work with less travel.

Two notable trends can be identified during this year with respect to federally supported war training programs. The OSY program established early during the war years for the training of youth for war industries was changed to become the OSYA program (out of school youth and adults) for the training not only for war industries but for agriculture and both of these were supplanted in 1943, so far as vocational agriculture was concerned by the Rural War Production Training program designed to provide the training necessary for increasing food production as food became recognized more and more as a vital element in the war effort. The second trend was the growing emphasis on the training of farm labor.

In the courses set up for training farm labor under the Rural War Production Training Program, a thrust was made toward the training of supervisors and foremen. Therefore, in cooperation with the Training Within Industry Section of the War Manpower Commission the so-called "job instruction training" of J.I.T. courses were established. Five institutes were held to train teachers for these courses and, as a result, more than 100 courses were taught to foremen and supervisors throughout the state. Not as a part of the Rural War Production Training Program, but carried on by regular Bureau staff, materials were prepared for use in urban schools for training students for farm work and records show about 100 schools provided some organized training for this purpose.

1944 – The war hysteria which was characteristic of the two preceding years began to subside but this was a year of confusion to farmers as a result of conflicting directives and changing conditions affecting manpower and farm labor. They were faced with almost day to day changes in policies in draft deferment, price ceilings, rationing, support process, subsidies, and other mandates which directly affected their work. In spite of these hurdles, agricultural production again reached a new high. In contrast, war industries leveled off, with a few new plants being established and the number of war contracts in the state reduced.

Attention was being given to the Central Valley Water Project to conserve water and to provide supplies to lands already under cultivation. The bitter controversy on the 160 acre limitation for water users already was in full swing. The farming situation this year was marked more than usual by great gambles by growers with resulting huge profits on some ventures and equally tragic losses on others. There was an easing of the labor situation, especially for larger operators due to the efficient use of Mexican nationals and the manner in which they were able to be moved to areas of greatest need, plus an unexpected influx of migrant workers, who aided materially plentiful supplies of farm equipment and other items which farmers needed became available. Higher prices prevailed for their products but with attendant higher wages for farm labor.

Among the estimated 6,000,000 men passing through the state en route to war theatres or who were trained in various military camps, many liked what they saw of California and stated publicly that they would return someday to make this their home. This gave rise to the predictions of a tremendous population growth in the state after the war but doubtless no one at this time foresaw the magnitude of the population explosion and the migration which did occur.

Impact on Education

The quality of teaching in public schools continued to deteriorate. Many of the younger, better, more ambitious, were in service of war industries and teachers found themselves in a squeeze between rising living costs and fixed salaries. As a result, many during this period left the

profession. In high schools, older boys facing induction simply marked time without much interest in school work. In colleges enrollment was mostly made up of girls, 4-F's, and a few returning servicemen. College enrollments generally were greatly reduced.

Effect on Agricultural Education

The general unrest naturally was transmitted to farm youth. Enrollment dropped from over 10,000 in 1941-42 to 7,208 during the current year and the number of departments from the high of 195 to 162 in this period, an all time low since the depression years. There was some indication of a revival of interest in the Young Farmer program as young men began returning from military service, and certainly a growing recognition of the high school as a community center, brought about largely by the war training programs which brought many adults back to school.

There were no changes during the year in state staff personnel, duties, or general organization. The Rural War Training Production courses claimed much of the attention of staff members and the total courses approved for the year numbered 1,308, some 200 less than the previous year. This reduction was due to fewer food production (Victory Garden) courses as many home gardeners felt they had learned during the previous year how to grow vegetables. However, sixty community canneries were established with attendant instruction. There was an increased interest in courses for the training of farm labor with 96 J.I.T. courses held for farm foremen, 313 to train Mexican nationals. Others of various kinds totaled 58, mostly in pruning, thinning, and other specialized farm work.

Much staff time was spent working with U.S.D.A. War Boards, state and county boards, selective service, war savings drives, and staff of the California Farm Production Council, and other agencies.

With the many extra duties saddled upon teachers of agriculture at this time, there was some lowering of teacher morale and to counteract this another adjustment was made in the reimbursement system making it possible for schools to receive almost 100% reimbursement from federal and state funds for increasing agricultural teachers' salaries. As a result, the average salary in the state rose to \$2850 per year, a ridiculously low figure compared to the salaries paid today but the highest to date.

Already, attention was turning to postwar plans for educating returning servicemen and establishing and re-establishing departments lost during the war. State Supervisor McPhee was requested by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to take leadership in framing legislation and planning for the education of returning veterans. A study was launched to determine the postwar training desired by teachers of vocational agriculture now in military service and a study completed to determine criteria for the establishment and re-establishment of departments of vocational agriculture in the postwar period.

Publications completed and distributed included a supplement to OSYA Bulletin No. 3 under the title of "Suggestions to Teachers and Supervisors of Mexican National Classes" and OSYA Bulletin No. 5, "School Community Canning Centers". A printed bulletin, "Handbook for Special Teachers of Food Production War Training Classes", was also distributed for the purpose of aiding lay teachers of these adult classes. To aid Future Farmer officers, two handbooks, one entitled, "Your Job as Chapter President", the other "Your Job as Chapter Reporter", were completed and distributed.

A summary of adult courses in agriculture conducted during the year under the Food Production War Training Program showed 333 classes in increasing production of food, estimated enrollment 6,351; 321, mechanical courses, estimated enrollment 7,203; 228 classes in food conservation and preservation, estimated enrollment 9,933; 473 courses in training farm workers, estimated enrollment 14,254; making a total of 1,355 courses offered with over 37,000 enrolled.

In this year, Julian A. McPhee who had been State Supervisor and Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education for some 30 years was made State Director of Vocational Education and his place as Bureau Chief taken by Byron J. McMahan. The part that Mr. McPhee played in the development of the statewide and national program in agricultural education during these years can hardly be over emphasized. He worked unceasingly and used every possible avenue to promote and strengthen the program of vocational education for farm youth during the entire three decades in which he was guiding the program in the state.

1945 – In many respects, this was a sort of transition year so far as education and the program in vocational agriculture was concerned. Instruction in high school classes, the work of the Future Farmers of America, continued much as it had during the preceding war years. Food Production War Training courses were continued at a high level but thought was beginning to turn to plans for the training of returning veterans. An important educational development marking the year was the completion of the so-called “Strayer Report” taking its name from Dr. George D. Strayer, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, who made a study of the state’s educational institutions under the Reemployment Commission appointed by Governor Earl Warren. The highlights of the report were recommendation for a change in the base of state support for general education, the appointment of a state commission to study district boundaries and possible consolidations, and the reorganization of the State Department of Education.

During the year, California moved into first place in the nation in the value of farm products produced, supplanting the state of Iowa with a value of \$1,744,425,000 worth of farm products. The year was characterized by a continued labor shortage throughout the state, housing an equally critical shortage, a continued immigration to California with state border stations reporting 150,000 persons checking into the state in private cars. With V.E. Day lessening the activities in the European sector, the war effort began centering in the Pacific and with California being the trans-shipping point for much of the war material and personnel, San Francisco was selected as the meeting place of the United Nations Conference for International Organization and the setting for what the world hoped would be a most significant move toward peace.

During this year, farmers began developing the hitherto undeveloped lands on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, sinking deep wells, putting in expensive pumping plants, and developing huge acreages many in blocks of several thousand acres. California’s need for seasonal labor and for farm labor generally was shown by the fact that while some 20,000 farm workers were trained in Food Production War Training courses during the year in this state enrollment in such courses in the state of Iowa totaled only 35. Farmers during the year continued to develop labor-saving farm equipment and specialized machines for use in utilizing labor more efficiently in planting, cultivating, and harvesting California’s specialty crops.

The Post-War Period – 1946-1950

1946 – This year introduced a period of confusion, indecision, and frustration as the state and the nation endeavored to return to normalcy after the war years. To the continuing problems of immigration, rapid population growth, shortages of housing in the state, was added meat rationing, price controls, the impact of the state becoming highly industrialized, the introduction of fast freezing of vegetables and fruits, government regulations, inflated land values, booming demands for specialty products, and this increasing demand counteracted by a diminishing need for potatoes with thousands of tons being dried for stock feed or simply dumped.

In this period, the moral of teachers of vocational agriculture badly needed stimulation. They were faced with much larger classes; they felt they were overworked and underpaid in comparison with men of similar training and experience in other occupations. They faced the problem of phasing out remnants of war programs and planning for the establishment of training courses for returning veterans and a continued shortage of qualified teachers to assist in these tasks. Continuing this general theme, the Bureau staff, too, struggled with problems of trying to turn to a greater semblance of normalcy. Their efforts were centered on informing school administrators regarding the objectives of vocational education in general and vocational agriculture in particular, to unify the objectives of the several services, to improve the selection and counseling of students, to stimulate a return to long time and complete farming programs, the reestablishment of Young Farmer classes, to carry on the usual adult classes where needed and to plan for new adult programs. Teacher training still continued on an emergency basis with new appointees given three months of intensive professional and skills training at California State Polytechnic and then employed as a second and third teachers supervised by teacher training and Bureau staff members. Plans were under way at the California State Polytechnic to train teachers and to give credit for the fifth year training involved.

Planning programs for returning veterans began in 1945 and the preliminary program established involving two hours of systematic organized instruction per week and one hour of individual supervision per week per trainee was presented to and approved by the Veterans Administration.

Under this plan, the schools were to be reimbursed \$15 per month per veteran for their efforts. This plan was approved and inaugurated in February, 1946, and within the month 25 schools had started classes. In May, the Veterans Administration received a directive from Washington, D.C. increasing time requirements which involved increasing class instruction from 96 to 200 hours per year and supervision from 48 hours to 100 per year. In light of this increase, the Veterans Administration was requested to increase the reimbursement to schools from \$15 to \$25 per month but by the year's end, June 30, no official approval had been received. In this new program, the primary limiting factor was a shortage of qualified teachers. It was expected that at least 60 could be used by July 1st if available. Another complicating factor was the action of the Department of Industrial Relations in beginning to develop programs of on-the-job training in a few areas of the state, a program which was primarily adapted to industry and which they proposed to extend to agriculture. This resulted in some strained relationships.

In the regular programs, the Future Farmers of America organization was strengthened, state contests were revived, plans were made for a large delegation to the national victory convention. The Young Farmers organization held its first state convention since 1941 with representatives from 20 schools present. Many members were returning veterans and reports showed 25 schools were holding classes. In adult education classes in the production and conservation of food centered around school community canneries continued to thrive.

During the year, a study was completed by Sutherland and published under the title, "Why Did they Leave?". In this, successful teachers were asked by personal letter to indicate the primary reasons why they had left the teaching profession. The replies indicated that unsatisfactory school conditions, unsympathetic administrators, lack of opportunity for advancement, were primary factors. It was of interest that small or inadequate salaries, while mentioned by some, was not in the primary group of reasons given.

A study was started on time requirements for high school classes to determine if there might be any advantage in changing from the present time requirement of 450 minutes of instruction per week in each of four years to a lesser time requirement in either the Freshman or Senior year. Twelve schools were involved in this experimental program and preliminary results showed the school administrators to be favorable, that there were larger enrollments of perhaps more desirable students, but that less material was covered in class and fewer field trips could be held. The study was to be continued for another year.

During the year, the number of departments offering vocational agriculture dropped from 167 to 165 but enrollments increased. In addition, 54 schools applied for state and federal aid but could not be approved because of lack of teachers. Many of these were former departments wishing to reinstate the work; 33 schools were in this category.

1947 – Primary emphasis for the year in the Bureau program of work was given to developing Young Farmers and veterans training, making this instruction more effective, revitalizing and strengthening the high school program with more planned farming programs, limiting participation in fairs and shows, selecting F.F.A. activities most appropriate for individual chapters, reducing teacher loss and recruiting and supplying well trained teachers.

This year saw agricultural education really launched into post-war activities. Considerable progress was made in veterans' training. Ninety-seven schools offered such training enrolling 1640 students, about 10% under Public Law 16, the remainder under P. L. 346. A staff member, E. W. Everett, was assigned to devote full time to coordinating this program and a number of publications were prepared under his direction and issued to facilitate the organizing of classes and improving instruction. This program now became officially known as the Institutional On-Farm Veterans Training Program and popularly known as the "I on F" Program. Two major divisions as outlined by the Veterans Administration were as follows: (a) For self proprietors (farmers) 200 hours of class instruction and 50 hours of individual instruction; (b) for "farmer trainees" (not operators) 200 hours of in-class instruction and 50 hours of individual field instruction per year. Reimbursement to schools from the Veterans Administration was increased to \$25 per month per veteran but no support provided for state supervision. Great growth was anticipated to a potential 20,000 students in the state. A major difficulty in carrying on this program was the many changes in policy by the Veterans Administration to dampen confidence in its stability. There remained also the continuing difficulty of obtaining qualified teachers.

While Young Farmers instruction was begun in 1936, it emerged now as a national movement. Within the state, the number of chapters grew to 60, state membership to 1000, the seventh annual state convention was held with 100 in attendance from 20 chapters. A beginning was made toward regional organizations and two or three became active. An official Young Farmer manual was prepared and distributed setting forth the aims and purposes of the organization and to assist local officers in developing stronger programs.

High School and Junior College Instruction

With so much attention being centered on the I on F program, little progress was made during the year toward accomplishing the goals set up by the staff for 1947, especially with respect to the improvement of farming programs. Some progress was made in limiting fair activities and in increasing the supply of teachers and an excellent state Future Farmer convention was held.

Army and Navy surplus became available at unbelievably low prices and schools were quick to take advantage purchasing quantities of shop equipment and supplies, tractors, welders, etc.

Salaries of agriculture teachers rose during the year to the four and five thousand dollar level which was more than double the salaries of the early 1930's. During the year, the state set a \$2400 minimum for all teachers, both elementary and secondary, a considerable increase from the former \$1800 minimum for elementary teachers.

Students thronged to colleges and junior colleges and these schools began to covet four-year college status. Fresno State College started establishing a complete agricultural major and acquiring and developing a large college farm. The California Agriculture Teachers Association began to gain status and prestige, especially among other vocational teacher groups. The Farm Bureau started to expand programs for young people, a "20-30" organization. However, in counties where Young Farmers organizations were doing well, they decided not to attempt to establish their own organizations.

1948 – This was a consolidation year bringing little in the way of new programs but fairly steady expansion in practically all areas of activity. Growth was especially notable in the I on F program and the decision was made to increase the number of regional supervisors in 1949 each with responsibility for both the veteran training program and regular supervisory duties in their areas rather than employing special I on F personnel. As a step in this direction, J. E. Walker was employed to replace H. H. Burlingham as supervisor of the Sacramento Valley Region. M. K. Luther was also added to the staff, replacing E. W. Everett as supervisor of North and Central Coast area. H. H. Burlingham became teacher trainer at California State Polytechnic College and Everett devoted full time to administering the I on F program. To give added attention to the growing Young Farmer program, J. D. Lawson was added to the staff as a special supervisor of these activities, joining special supervisor George P. Couper and J. I. Thompson, two long time staff members, with all of them located at California State Polytechnic College. An assistant teacher trainer was added to the staff at the University of California at Davis – E. M. Juergenson. Major emphasis during the year was placed primarily on improving existing programs rather than venturing into new fields. The adding and shifting of staff members was just one means to that end. Among the plans for the year which were included in the Bureau program of work, were the following objectives:

- (1) To emphasize and re-emphasize the importance of supervised farming programs, to attempt to offset the time which staff and teachers had been devoting to extracurricular activities.
- (2) To center the attention of the entire staff on recruiting and improving the training of new teachers to meet the growing demand. As a means to this end, a special effort was to

be made to encourage outstanding F.F.A. and other farm youths to enroll in agricultural colleges and to prepare for teaching.

- (3) To improve the veterans training program by reducing the load of teachers to a realistic figure as some districts were enrolling large numbers of veterans to get greater financial returns.
- (4) To extend the third and fourth year training emphasizing managerial and economic skills, and
- (5) To act upon the request of the California Association of Nurserymen and the approval of the State Veterans Agricultural Training Committee to include training of returning veterans for occupations in ornamental horticulture. (It is notable that this is the first official recognition of ornamental horticulture as an agricultural occupation and an estimated 1,000 enrollees were anticipated in the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas.

During this year, the number of agriculture departments increased from 170 to 178 and high school enrollment topped the 10,000 mark, a significant increase from the low of 7,208 in 1944. Young Farmer classes increased to 39 enrolling 1,440 students. Adult classes numbered 88 including 36 community canneries. I on F classes were held in 106 schools with 223 teachers enrolling 2,848 returning veterans.

1949 – Although four years had elapsed since the close of World War II, it was evident that the state was still in a post-war period of adjustment and that vocational agriculture in the state had not yet returned to the level of effectiveness it had achieved prior to the conflict. While high school class enrollment had returned to the pre-war level, the number of departments was still below the maximum reached in 1940 when the first impact of the war was beginning to be felt. Supervised farming programs still were not as good as they were in the pre-war period. Teacher and staff morale was at a low ebb perhaps as an after effect of steppe-up programs during the war years and the added burden of organizing and supervising courses for training returning veterans. This overload was heightened by the fact that there was still an acute shortage of qualified teachers.

It was true, too, that since the war many activities had been added to take the time of local teachers and staff. The number of county and district fairs had about doubled and had increased demands on teacher time proportionately. Many new contests and F.F.A. activities had been added through the state association and the national foundation.

At the annual convention in June of that year, 130 teachers received 15 year service awards and 30 teachers and 7 staff members 25 year service certificates. In a word, vocational agriculture in California was in the hands of a middle-aged group, needing inspiration and guidance rather than new challenges.

During the conference, a special task force of representative teachers was appointed to meet in July to evaluate the current program and activities of teachers and staff as a basis for determining those activities which contribute most to better farming and rural living for students and those of least value and which perhaps consumed time out of proportion to the contribution which they make.

Several changes in responsibilities and additions to staff personnel occurred during the year. G. A. Hutchings was added as supervisor of the South Coast area, W. J. Maynard was appointed to work full time with veterans training with his offices at San Jose, R. H. Pederson was employed as regional supervisor of the northern half of the San Joaquin Valley Region, formerly supervised by A. G. Rinn who retained supervision of the southern half of that region. These, in addition to the appointments of M. K. Luther and J. E. Walker who began work at the beginning of the fiscal year, represented a significant increase in the supervisory staff of the Bureau.

As of July 1st, the end of the fiscal year, the I on F program had been in operation for three and one-half years and was offered in 122 centers enrolling 3,911 veterans, 2680 of whom were operating their own farms. The peak enrollment in this program was expected during the coming year. Negotiating contracts with the Veterans Administration continued to grow more difficult as more and more decisions were being made by the central office in Washington and fewer by state offices.

First Junior College Programs Reimbursed from Federal and State Vocational Funds

Probably the most significant development for the year was the extension of reimbursable vocational agriculture to junior colleges. Prior to this time, high school instruction only was held to be eligible for reimbursement. The basis for the change was the establishment of the fact that junior colleges in California were a part of the secondary school system by law; that one of their basic purposes was to provide terminal occupational education, and that in fact only about 25% of the students enrolled in these institutions at the end of their two years of training. Added to this was the fact that the war had given further impetus to vocational-technical training in many of these two year institutions.

The annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949 states that eight junior colleges were reimbursed that year from federal and state vocational funds, but did not identify them.

The Bureau issued two directories during that year, listing reimbursed schools. One of these lists eleven junior colleges and the other ten. However, they do agree on the following eight: Orange Coast at Costa Mesa, Yuba College at Marysville, Modesto, Hartnell A & M at Salinas, Santa Ana, Mt. San Antonio at Pomona, Stockton, and Ventura. It is probable that these are the eight to which the annual report referred.

Three other junior colleges, all operated in conjunction with high schools, were listed by one or the other of these two directories: Napa, Antelope Valley at Lancaster, Chaffey at Ontario.

Serious questions were raised at this time as to how rapidly these programs might be expected to develop as there was a lack of teachers, especially those with a vocational philosophy and with the advanced training necessary to obtain a credential and to provide technical instruction. Administrators of these institutions were generally academically prepared and oriented and most of the emphasis had been given to transfer courses. Furthermore vocational training was considerably more costly than providing the basic courses required for transfer. The major factor, however, was the difficulty that these schools anticipated since federal time requirements were set up for high school classes and did not easily fit into junior college schedules.

This year saw a return to the pre-war program of teacher training after a lapse of seven years. Provision was made for more and improved undergraduate instruction in farm mechanics at the University of California at Davis and collegiate F.F.A. chapters were revived both at Davis and at the California State Polytechnic College.

1950 – This year was marked by the following significant developments:

- (1) A continued increase in the I on F program;
- (2) A similar increase in general (as contrasted with vocational) agriculture courses in high school;
- (3) A continued increase in the number of junior colleges offering reimbursed courses in agriculture;
- (4) Closer cooperation with the Agricultural Extension Service; and
- (5) Steady growth in Young Farmer instruction.

While one of the major emphases of the staff for the year was to help teachers devote more time and attention to supervised farming programs, actual accomplishment fell far short of the goal. The statewide conference of leading agriculture teachers held early in the fiscal year brought out worthwhile recommendations as to how outside or extracurricular activities might be reduced but many factors conspired against their being fully accepted by teachers. Many agricultural organizations were promoting extracurricular activities carrying substantial rewards for Future Farmers and departments were still understaffed. Organizing and supervising I on F courses took much teacher time so little progress was actually discernible.

The I on F program continued to expand with an increase of 17 new centers and 2,246 new trainees to a total of 7,770 students reached during the year in 139 centers. Since the deadline for closing the program was July 25, 1951, plans were being formulated at this time to accommodate and accept all those desiring to enroll. Administrators continued to have difficulty with changing policies of the Veterans Administration, especially as new rulings were so frequently made. One such new ruling defined a farm as follows: "The term 'farm or other agricultural establishment' shall mean any place on which the basic activity is the cultivation of the ground and the raising and harvesting of crops, including fruits, vegetables, pastures, etc. and which may included as an activity of greater or lesser economic importance the feeding, breeding and management of livestock including poultry."

This interpretation seemed to rule out training already started in ornamental horticulture and certainly poultry farming as conducted in California.

Courses in general agriculture not reimbursed from vocational funds had been offered in Los Angeles junior and senior high schools for years with considerable success. During this year, a number of rural and suburban schools which were having problems with an increasing number of non-farm students wishing to enroll in vocational agriculture began the establishment of courses in general agriculture for such students who had indicated an interest in agricultural instruction.

A new director of Agriculture Extension was appointed in the person of J. Earl Coke, a man who had for a number of years been familiar with vocational agriculture instruction and who understood and appreciated it. During the year, meetings were held between supervisory staffs of both services, a memorandum drawn up for consideration by working members of both services outlining in some detail the responsibilities and relationships particularly between 4-H Club and Future Farmers activities.

Continued fine relationships existed with the agricultural cooperatives, the California Dairy Council, the California Bankers Association, and the Bank of America, all of whom expanded awards and scholarships for Future Farmers.

At the close of this year, June 1950, Pacific naval stations were working on a 24-hour basis reactivating vessels for service in the Korean War, Marine combat divisions had received sailing orders, thousands of commissioned officers had received or were about to receive orders to return to active duty, and the draft had been put into effect. It appeared probable, therefore, that vocational agriculture faced additional years of operating on a wartime basis.

Prelude to Change – 1951-1961

There are a number of phrases which might have been substituted for the title which was chosen to designate this era. It could well have been called the “Frustrating Fifties”, “Back to Normal”, or the “Lull Before the Storm”. It was an era which saw little major change in vocational education in agriculture, an era in which there was little reaction to the many developments within the state, the nation, and in the world, one in which education in general came under intense scrutiny by the public, and much criticism.

It was an era, also, which saw tremendous developments in agriculture, which saw the state change from a primarily agricultural economy to a highly industrialized one, which saw major breakthroughs in science, booms and recessions, a burgeoning population in the state which was to bring California to its present status as the most populous state in the nation. It saw changes which brought the state face to face with critical problems both economic and social. It started in anticipation of another war in Korea with intense preparation on the west coast for involvement in that war but which in reality had only a minor impact on the state.

Scientific, Economic, and General Development

The year, 1951, brought California to its second billion dollar state budget, its first two billion dollar budget in 1958, and a budget just short of three billion dollars as the decade closed. It was an era which saw population in the state growing at a rate of 2,000 per day during most of the period. It saw in 1955 the devastating Christmas floods which inundated Yuba City, caused major damage in its twin, Marysville, and saw the northwest area of the state suffering losses of millions of dollars from unprecedented flood waters, a holocaust which brought the state face to face with the necessity not only of caring for or preventing similar happenings in the future but also brought them a realization of the necessity for better management of its water supplies. It saw in 1957 the launching of Sputnik I by Soviet Russia which triggered angry attacks at the entire American school system for not giving sufficient attention to the training given its students in science and mathematics and ushered in the missile race which was to concern the entire world. It saw the establishment of missile launching sites such as Vandenberg Air Base in addition to the already large number of military establishments within the state. In the nation

as a whole and in California, this was an era of tremendous change and tremendous pressures on education.

Agricultural Developments

The beginning of this period saw mechanization really starting to burgeon. As it continued, it saw the development of numerous sophisticated harvesting machines – machines to process and to transport farm products, the mechanical cotton picker, the tractor operated tree shakers to harvest and collect fruits and nuts, a machine with an electric eye selecting ripe fruit and rejecting the unripe, and many others. It saw an increased movement of youth away from farms, the number of farms decreasing, and an attendant increase in the size of those which continued to operate. Not a small part of this decrease in farm numbers was traceable to the numerous subdivisions which sprang into being around each major city and the highways and freeways which increasingly crisscrossed the state. Also taking place were extreme shifts in agricultural production. At the beginning of the decade or early in the decade, it saw shifting of cotton acreage to barley and alfalfa and later a shift back into cotton production. It saw movement of fruit trees, especially citrus, from the south toward the north. The production of walnuts and deciduous fruits moved northward as well. It saw the development of sprinkler irrigation, the introduction of field corn and many acres planted to it; a tremendous decline in the poultry industry with most of the nation's broilers being produced in the southern states where cheap labor and the so-called "vertical integration" made it possible for California poultrymen to compete. It saw the small time dairy almost disappear from the farm scene and milk production produced in tremendously large dairies which might almost be termed "milk factories" located on the outskirts of metropolitan population centers. As this era drew to a close it brought with it a recognition of the relationship between the farm and the agricultural business which produced and distributed the supplies and equipment which farmers used as well as the firms which purchased, processed and distributed the products of the soil. It brought into being toward the close of this era a farm production valued at over three billion dollars and well ahead of any other state in the nation.

Along with these tremendous developments came problems. Perhaps the greatest of these was the water problem which stemmed from the fact that most of the state's water supply was in its northern half and the greatest need, both agriculturally and industrially, in the south. Along with this came the renewed controversy over the so-called 160 acre limitation which was placed by federal authority on the number of acres of land which could be irrigated from U. S. Bureau of Reclamation projects or other projects with federal support. It was eventually realized that a more equitable distribution of water was essential to the development of the state, which culminated in the Governor's appointment of a Water Resources Board in 1956 to deal with this problem.

As the era drew to a close, farm labor became an increasing problem. This had long been stabilized and was still stabilized to some extent by the use of some 100,000 Mexican nationals handled in an orderly manner by labor contractors. Now, however, came attempts to unionize farm labor and the emergence of some of the first real labor problems in agriculture.

Educational Developments

The beginning of this era saw enrollment in both junior and four year colleges begin to drop, primarily as a result of the Korean War and the drafting of many students. Immediately thereafter, however, enrollments began to increase dramatically. Many new state colleges

were established, three new branches of the University were under consideration, junior colleges were being established in many new districts. High school enrollment was experiencing a dramatic increase and to cope with this many schools were forced to a five period day with double and triple sessions as this era came to a close. It saw, too, the establishment of second and third high schools in existing districts and the close of an era when we were accustomed to having just one school per district. It saw tremendous increases in salaries with the minimum salary increased from \$2400 to \$3000 in 1951 and a few years thereafter to \$4200. With the advent of Sputnik, there came an increased interest in education for the gifted and experimental programs were established to give this group specific attention.

Naturally, these changes resulted in many problems. They brought public rebellion against so-called "progressive education" and a demand for a return to the three R's, without knowing what each of these two terms really meant or involved. With education becoming so costly and with a general trend toward public criticism of what the schools were doing, the defeat of bond issues and tax overrides became more and more common.

The outcome of these problem situations resulted in a number of educational milestones, one of the more important of which was the creation of a new credential structure which reduced the forty some credentials formerly in force to just five and placing primary attention upon the preparation of teachers in the hard core subject fields such as science, social studies, humanities, and mathematics, and relegating subjects such as physical education and vocational education to a second-class status. This new credential structure, which as the "Fisher Bill" was finally passed by the legislature in 1961 to become effective in 1963, if strictly interpreted seemed to make it virtually impossible for teachers of vocational subjects to obtain the "standard teaching credential" which replaced the old general secondary and general elementary credentials. It also made an "academic major" an essential requirement for any administrative credential and since many vocational teachers and physical education teachers normally progressed to administrative positions this was quite a shock. Later interpretations, however, gave a more liberal meaning to the term "academic major" and made it possible for certain teacher training institutions to have vocational majors approved as academic.

In higher education, the increasing over-lapping of educational objectives of the state colleges, the junior colleges, and the University of California led to the formation of a liaison committee made up primarily of members of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California supplemented by appointees. The function of this committee was to study the entire higher education structure of the state and to make recommendations concerning it. Their recommendations resulted in the "Master Plan for High Education" which was passed by the legislature in July, 1961, to cover the needs of the state in terms of higher education until 1975. In brief, this master plan delineated very clearly the objectives and the functions of each of the three types of higher education in the state, the junior college, the state college, and the university. It recognized the fact that there would of necessity be some overlapping of functions but gave the university a clear province in the field of research and in training toward the doctorate as well as in certain professional colleges such as medicine and law. It gave to the state colleges the training in occupations and professional fields which required either the Bachelor's or the Master's Degree and reiterated the several functions of the junior college, and two primary of which were the providing of technical occupational training and courses paralleling the first two years of university and state college instructional programs so that students could easily transfer from the junior college to the four year institutions.

Impact on Agricultural Education

In spite of tremendous and dramatic changes occurring in world affairs, in agriculture, and in education in general, agricultural education during this time changed but little. In spite of the efforts of a competent staff of supervisors and administrators, the program of vocational education in agriculture during this period remained almost static. It is difficult to assess the reason for this. Perhaps it was due in part to the fact that vocational education was more costly than general education and that public education generally was becoming a burden on the taxpayers. Certainly the public was less concerned with vocational education and more concerned with the greater number of students in academic and general programs. The advent of Sputnik, too, focused the attention of the public on science and many of the abler students were counseled away from vocational programs. This is reflected in some of the data. The growth of vocational agriculture during this period was less than dramatic. In 1951, there were 210 departments. In 1961, only 20 more – 230. The increase in enrollment was even less notable. In 1951, 12,184; at the close of this era, 13,924. The young farmer program in spite of concerted efforts by staff members plus the adding of one man to devote special attention to this activity never seemed to reach its potential and the same could be said for adult farmer programs as well.

In spite of the tremendous growth in crop and fruit production throughout the state, the fact that dairying was concentrated in fewer and fewer operations and that the poultry industry declined drastically, supervised farming programs failed to reflect these changes. For example, in 1958, toward the close of this period, there were only 2,275 productive enterprise projects in fruit, field, and vegetable crops as contrasted with 11,453 in livestock and poultry.

The top state administration in agricultural education and vocational education, in contrast to national leaders in Washington, was quite concerned with this lack of reaction and with the fact that few changes were made in methods of instruction, few improvements, few major developments, especially as contrasted with the ferment which was taking place in general education.

The one activity that really flourished during this period was the Future Farmers of America program. There is no question but what the activities, both local and state, of the Future Farmers of American was a tremendous factor in developing leadership and other desirable characteristics in vocational agriculture students, but the increasing number of outside activities – fairs, shows, contests – did inhibit in many instances making improvements in and giving attention to organized class instruction by teachers. It is possible, too, that an attitude of smugness, of satisfaction with the status quo, rather pervaded the ranks of the teachers at this time. Salaries were rapidly increasing. There was increased attention by the public to the accomplishments of the Future Farmers organization, and there is no doubt that these accomplishments did much to foster continued support from administrators, legislators, and the general public for the total program.

Veterans Training

The year 1951 saw the last of the new students from World War II enrolling in the I on F program under Public Law 346. During this year, 140 schools were serving 10,583 veterans. The year 1954 saw almost the end of the I on F program for World War II veterans. All but eight departments had been closed out. The I on F closed out entirely in 1956. During the period it was in operation, it provided training to 17,800 returning veterans who were either farm

operators or receiving training to become farm operators. Training for Korean veterans under Public Law 550 was just beginning in nine schools with 250 veteran students involved. This training program was only mildly satisfactory. After two years of operation only 436 veterans were served, primarily due to the rigid controls put on this program by federal regulations which limited enrollment almost entirely to those who had complete control and operation of their own farms. The Korean program was finally closed out in 1960 officially but one school continued until 1961 when it, too, closed.

State Leadership in Agricultural Education

In spite of the fact that during this era there seemed to be few major changes in the programs of vocational agriculture in high schools and junior colleges, this was not due to lack of leadership nor lack of effort on the part of state staff. Their annual programs of work and the objectives which they emphasized indicate clearly their knowledge of and responsiveness to the changes which were occurring in agriculture and in education. Obviously they sensed the need for agricultural education to keep pace.

Among their major thrusts were the improvement of class instruction and of supervised farming programs. Early in this period, 1954-55, impetus was given to encouraging and aiding teachers in developing definite written four year courses of study and the use and development of daily or unit teaching plans. Later, major attention was given by a teacher committee under the leadership of E. M. Juergenson to develop a "core curriculum" for use throughout the state, recognizing that there were undoubtedly certain basics in agriculture and related science that were as important in one section of the state as in another and aiding teachers in the development of stronger four year courses of study. To further the strengthening of instruction, McMahan, as Chief of the Bureau, called together in 1958-59 a representative group of experienced agriculture teachers, generally leaders in their respective regions, to make a serious evaluation from a teacher's point of view of the organized instruction that was being provided; to make suggestions as to what needed to be done to improve it in the years ahead. As a result of their suggestions, studies were launched which later resulted in major changes both in content and method. Much was done by staff members, also, to analyze what was occurring in farm mechanics instruction and to improve the teaching in this phase of vocational agriculture.

At least equal emphasis was given to the improvement of supervised farming programs. One of the major vehicles used to do this was the supervised farming program competition. This competition was originally sponsored and supported by American Trust Company and Wells Fargo Bank in 1953. This was extended to all regions in 1955 and made more or less standard throughout the state. In this year additional sponsors were added and the California Banking Association undertook through its members to provide greater impetus to this very excellent program. H. F. Chappell, supervisor of the Central Region took the lead in originating and developing this fine activity. In addition, a committee of the Bureau developed a revised farm account book, and more emphasis was placed in regional and sectional teacher meetings upon the development of stronger supervised farming programs and especially upon the development of accompanying accounts and records.

With changes in teachers occurring in local departments so frequently, the need was recognized by the state staff for providing more continuity of program during these changes. The medium that they suggested and recommended to accomplish this and other ends was the use of strong local advisory committees. In spite of the impetus given by the state staff

during the early part of this era, there was resistance from local school administrators in some instances and local teachers in others, with the result that while a few strong advisory committees came into being there was not universal acceptance of this device. At the state level, however, an advisory committee was inaugurated in 1953 by McMahan to counsel him and his staff and to keep them informed concerning important agricultural trends and developments. The membership of this first committee and the agricultural enterprise each represented was as follows:

Carl Avrit, Chico – Dairy	Robert Couchman, San Jose – Poultry
George Emde, Lodi – Beef & Dairy	E. J. Peters, Wasco – Potatoes
Joe Rus, Ferndale – Sheep	Keith Mets, Holtville – General
Harvey McDougal, Collinsville – Beef Feeding	A. J. Thille, Santa Paula – Citrus
Waldo Weeth, Coalinga – Livestock & Certified Seed	

During this period, also, there was a continuing recognition of the important of developing or maintaining strong relationships with legislators, industry representatives, school administrators, and county school personnel, with the result that in general there were excellent relationships maintained during this period with practically all of these agencies.

As a result of the growing recognition of the increasingly close relationship between farming and the business and industries which serve it, a study was launched supported by funds made available by the bureaus of Business Education and Agricultural Education and sponsored directly by the chiefs of these bureaus. Rulon Van Wagenen for the Bureau of Business Education joined McMahan in sponsoring this study which was conducted by Dr. O. E. Thompson and S. S. Sutherland starting in 1956. Briefly, the results of this study showed rapid development of the industries supporting farming and the need for men trained in agriculture to work in these industries. Their growth combined with the decline in the number of actual farm operations indicated a greater potential employment opportunity in other related agricultural occupations than in farming itself and laid the groundwork for pilot programs in junior colleges to train such workers. Out of these two research efforts developed one of the landmarks of this ear. That was the decision of the staff to expand training to include preparing for occupations in agriculture requiring a knowledge of farming. This required a good deal of courage on the part of McMahan and the state staff. There was little inclination on the part of the U. S. Office of Education to accept this interpretation and to change any of the federal policies concerning reimbursement of state programs. In their eyes the one objective of vocational training in agriculture was to prepare for farming. The statement of expanded objectives of vocational agriculture was discussed thoroughly in 1958-59 and finally published in 1960-61. This included, in addition to the objective of preparing students for farming, to prepare them for continuing education in agriculture beyond the high school as well as for other occupations which required a knowledge of farming. A bulletin was prepared under the sponsorship of the teacher training committee of the Bureau designed to aid in counseling students for post high school education in junior and four year colleges. Early in this period, attention began to turn to the establishment of courses in general agriculture as contrasted to vocational agriculture in many rural high schools. For many years, schools in Los Angeles had offered courses in general agriculture, mostly in ornamental horticulture, and practically every junior high school within the city system offered such courses. It was felt that their establishment in more rural high school might give an opportunity for both boys and girls who had some interest in agriculture to study this subject and provide a somewhat better selection of pupils in the vocational offerings of the school. To aid in the establishment of these classes,

a guide was prepared by a committee of teachers and staff, under the leadership of Kenneth Cutler, supervisor in the Southern Region.

Teacher Training

The shortage of teachers which occurred earlier came to an end in 1951 and from there on, while there never was an oversupply, there remained a fairly good balance between supply and demand through the remainder of this era. At the University of California at Davis, E. M. Juergenson took over the duties of teacher training and Dr. O. E. Thompson was added to the staff. In 1957-58, Thompson took a year's leave of absence and was employed full time to take part in statewide evaluation of vocational education – all services. He devoted his efforts primarily to an intense study of agricultural education and a projection of needs in this area. The California State Polytechnic College began an extensive program in the preparation and distribution of teaching aids which were well accepted and widely used throughout the state.

In 1954, "Agricultural Briefs", a publication prepared first by Dr. Thompson, was issued with the periodic newsletter of the Bureau and summarized recent developments in agriculture for the use of teachers. Among other developments in teacher training during this period, attention turned to visitations to first year teachers by teacher trainers, supervising teachers, and supervisors to give specific aid to those who were just beginning their work as full time teachers.

Changes and Reassignments in Staff Personnel

At the peak of the veterans training program, several special supervisors were employed for short periods including Max Kipf in 1951-52, and Harmon Toone during the same years. In 1952, R. H. Pedersen devoted full time to the training of veterans and in 1953-54 was assigned to additional duties as assistant advisor to the Young Farmers program in the state, replacing J. D. Lawson who resigned in 1952 to accept a position with California State Polytechnic. In 1953, J. I. Thompson, Livestock Specialist for the Bureau retired after serving some twenty-two years. In the course of his work he visited and advised hundreds of teachers and thousands of students on livestock problems and made a tremendous contribution to the instructional and supervised farming programs in this field.

The latter part of this era saw more staff changes. In 1957-58, H. F. Chappell, the first full time regional supervisor employed by the Bureau of Agricultural Education, retired and was replaced by E. D. Graf, Jr. Chappell left behind him an outstanding record of accomplishments and had won the sincere respect and affection of all teachers in the state. In the same year, B. R. Denbigh, another of the "old timers", retired and Robert Pedersen who had been devoting full time to veteran and Young Farmer programs, replaced him as regional supervisor. In this year, also, E. W. Everett was promoted to the position of Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, taking over these duties in addition to those in connection with winding up the veteran training program. In 1958-59, two more of the older supervisory staff retired, M. K. Luther and A. G. Rinn. Chappell, Denbigh and Rinn were three of the supervisors who with E. W. Everett had formed a nucleus of the supervisory staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Education almost since its inception. They provided a dedication, aggressive leadership to the state program, the value of which can hardly be over-emphasized. D. E. Wilson replaced Hutchings as supervisor for the South Coast Region, Hutchings took over A. G. Rinn's duties in the San Joaquin Region and W. J. Maynard replaced Luther. Maynard was the first staff member to be selected by civil service examinations.

Assistant teacher trainers at the California State Polytechnic during this period included Dale Andrews and J. C. Gibson who served in 1959. Gibson had formerly served as a supervisor 1946-49. O. E. Thompson joined the staff at the University of California at Davis in 1953-54. In 1960, failing health caused the retirement of E. W. Everett and E. D. Graf replaced him as assistant Chief of the Bureau. S. L. Barrett was employed as a regional supervisor and took over Graf's duties as supervisor of the Central Region.

In Summary

As this period drew to a close, while there had been few significant changes in the basic program in vocational agriculture in the local schools, many other developments were noted which were having a significant effect upon this program and were to have an even greater impact in the future. It found the state with 18 state colleges enrolling over one hundred thousand students and with four year agricultural courses in the state colleges at Fresno and Chico and a growing agriculture department at California State Polytechnic at Pomona-Voorhies. It saw a significant rise in entrance requirements to the state colleges and the growing fear that more students who elected to complete four years of vocational agriculture in high school might have difficulty in meeting these requirements. The Master Plan for Higher Education in the state was formally approved and put into action.

Other developments in general education included the close of the 16 year career of Dr. Simpson as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the establishment of the new credential structure reducing the former number of credential types to 5, and growing concern by taxpayers and voters in the state over the increasing cost of education at all levels. For the first time, statewide bond issues for education including the state colleges and the University of California, were turned down by the voters.

In agricultural education there was a significant trend toward more research, supported in part by funds made available by the National Defense Education Act. A most significant study was completed by Jerry Halterman of the agricultural staff at the Modesto Junior College under the title of "Technicians in Agriculture" showing for the first time the extent of the employment of technicians in agricultural fields and highlighting the importance of providing training to meet this demand. Concurrently with this, there was a study completed with support from the same funds under the direction of S. S. Sutherland, pinpointing some 22 fundamental principles in biology basic to agricultural practices and suggesting course content and teaching procedures for giving students in high school classes an understanding of the applications of these principles.

Many local schools, as this period came to a close, were providing training in ornamental horticulture with many greenhouses, lath houses and other facilities being provided for this instruction and courses not only for high school students but for adults being established. Other highlights as this era closed was a change in reimbursement policies which essentially eliminated the requirement of double consecutive periods for all four years of vocational agriculture and provided for single period classes to be taught in certain of the years. A survey of departments showed that one-third of the local schools now employed more than one teacher and this provided considerably more specialization especially in the larger high schools. The major innovation in supervised farming programs was a rather significant growth in placement for farm and agricultural experience, the establishment of the "workerships" for providing paid summer work experience for agriculture students, and more complete farming

programs that provided for experience programs of various kinds in addition to productive enterprise projects.

Perhaps the most upsetting element during this entire era was the fact that while the state staff and teachers generally had accepted the broader objectives of instruction in vocational agriculture the U. S. Office of Education had failed to recognize them. Therefore there was considerable friction between state and federal services and criticism by the U. S. Office for the stand being taken in this state. At the close of the era, state staff members were looking forward hopefully to a change in this attitude and a broadening of objectives in the near future.

The New Era – 1962-1969

At the close of the decade 1951 to 1961 there were indications of massive change in the making. The state staff had adopted a new reimbursement plan which allowed the selecting of time and scheduling plans so that some students were allowed to spend less than the maximum amount of time provided in the overall plan which the school had selected. The Manpower Development and Training Act inaugurated in 1962 brought mandatory communication and cooperation with other government agencies, such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Employment in the training of adult workers. Carrying out the provisions of this act and setting up the training programs involved took much of the attention of supervisory staff during this and subsequent years. In this same year, President Kennedy appointed the Panel of Consultants for Vocational Education and this body launched into its task of surveying vocational education and making recommendations concerning new legislation to meet the training needs of the nation and play whatever part it might be able to play in lowering the then high unemployment rate.

The beginning of this era brought increased interest in education in all of its phases. The California Legislature in its 1962 sessions enacted more legislation relative to vocational education than in the previous ten year period. Both the appointment of the Kennedy Panel of Consultants, and the enactment of vocational legislation by the California Legislature grew out of the fact that there was a critical rate of unemployment, an increase in school drop outs, more juvenile delinquency, and an imbalanced school curriculum with too much emphasis on and concern for the college bound student at the expense of the great majority.

Early in this decade another landmark was reached when vocational education enrollment in California reached a point that made this state the first in the nation in the number of students enrolled in occupational training.

In 1962, the new and expanded statement of objectives of the vocational program in agriculture and also a statement concerning objectives of general agriculture and non-vocational instruction was published in pamphlet form and read as follows.

Objectives of the Vocational Program:

“For pupils in high schools and junior colleges who expect to be engaged either in farming or in agricultural occupations which require some competence in farming, chief vocational objectives are:

- To assist the student to make a beginning and to advance in farming.

- To provide the agricultural competencies necessary to qualify the student for entrance into agriculture or an agricultural occupation closely related to farming.
- To qualify the student to apply the principles of science and economics to the production and marketing of agricultural products.
- For students whose backgrounds and interests indicate they may become engaged in some agricultural occupation, the following exploratory objectives are in order:
- To provide information that will enable the student to make intelligent decisions concerning the choice of an agricultural career.
- To develop and maintain an interest on the part of students in an education in agriculture.

For students in high schools and junior colleges who expect to prepare for and eventually be engaged in one of the many professional and technical occupations which require some form of post-high school education, the chief objective is preparatory. The program aims at providing the information and understanding that will enable the student to plan intelligently for post-high school education in agriculture.

The general education objectives of vocational agriculture are:

- To encourage the student to participate effectively and display leadership in school and community affairs.
- To encourage the student to maintain a favorable home environment.

Objectives of General Agriculture Education

For those who do not expect to engage in an agricultural occupation, but who may have avocational interests in agriculture or who seek to add agriculture to areas of general understanding, an agriculture course or courses should develop understanding, appreciations, and interests concerning:

- The importance of agriculture to every citizen.
- The influence of a prosperous agriculture upon the welfare of other segments of society.
- The effect of an abundant productive capacity in agriculture upon the well-being of the nation and the peoples of the world.
- The conservation of natural resources.
- Maintenance of an attractive home environment.
- Intelligent purchase and use of agricultural products.

- Living and growing things.
- Avocational and vocational values and opportunities in the total field of agriculture.

Types of (Vocational) Programs

Programs are organized to serve three groups of persons:

1. In-school youth in junior high schools, senior high schools, and junior colleges.
2. Young farmers who are becoming established in farming, and who attend part-time classes in high schools and junior colleges.
3. Out-of-school adult farmers who wish to improve their competency by attending evening classes in high schools and junior colleges.”

In 1963 the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education was published by Health Education and Welfare and this report, together with the subsequent legislation enacted by Congress shortly thereafter, marks one of the really significant milestones in the development not only of vocational education in agriculture but of vocational education in general.

The recommendations made by the Panel which were largely incorporated into legislation and passed by Congress as Public Law 88-2120, tended to break down the traditional divisions on a subject basis, i.e. agriculture, home economics, industrial and business and instead made specific appropriations for the training of youth in high school, for courses in junior colleges or community colleges including the training of technicians, provided specifically for part-time instruction for training and retraining adult workers, and made special appropriations for youth with special needs – those who were either mentally or culturally disadvantaged.

The general aim as stated in the legislation was to provide training for useful employment and to make it (training) available “to every person in every section of the country in which this training might be needed”. To underwrite this program there was a tremendous increase in federal support provided.

The enactment of this legislation and the signing of it into law brought with it a series of regional conferences in which the state vocational staff met with school administrators in all sections of the state to explain the purposes and policies of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and to formulate plans for immediate action when it was funded. The actual funding of the Public Law 88-210 occurred in 1964-65.

Inauguration of the new types of programs provided by VE 1963 ushered in a period of sensational gains in enrollment in federally aided programs of agricultural education. Following a low point in enrollment in 1960-61, the tabulation below shows the increase both in the number of departments and students enrolled from 1961-62 through 1968-69.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>	<u>Students Enrolled</u>
1961-62	229	13,924
1962-63	224	14,219
1963-64	227	15,219
1964-65	230	16,837

1965-66	272	21,171
1966-67	281	22,137
1967-68	283	23,556
1968-69	294	28,621

The inauguration of instruction under VEA 1963 brought with it a drastic operational change in the manner in which supporting funds for vocational education were made available to local school districts. Programs of instruction under the new plan were funded on the basis of grants for specific courses and types of training, which were made upon approval of project applications submitted by the local districts and passed upon by a committee appointed by the state staff.

Another milestone which occurred in 1964 brought further changes in farm labor training. December 31, 1964 brought to an end the so called Bracero program under which hundreds of laborers from Mexico were brought into the United States to aid in the harvesting and cultivation of crops. As a result of this cessation of a supply of experienced labor, the Bureau of Agricultural Education was requested first by the State Department of Employment and later by the California Council of Growers to provide special courses for the training of domestic workers. This will be treated more fully in later pages.

Change and Impact

The Annual Descriptive Report to the U. S. Office of Education for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965 summarizes the changes which were occurring in agriculture and which provided the basis for the accompanying dramatic changes in agricultural education.

“Agriculture, in common with business and industry, has experienced rapid and continual change. This change has resulted in misconceptions and has raised questions as to what the term “agriculture” includes and implies. Some think of “agriculture” solely as “farming”, and they use these two terms synonymously. Others regard agriculture as a single occupation in which persons with similar training perform identical tasks.

Agriculture is a broad category of which farming or “production agriculture” is only one phase. Farming, in turn, is a group of occupations, with each occupation requiring specific skills and abilities, some similar and some dissimilar. Moreover, farming is the basic root from which grow all other phases of agriculture: distributing, processing, and service occupations.

These emerging concepts reflect the changes in agriculture which are occurring at an accelerated pace. Some of the more dramatic of these changes and their impact on agriculture are briefly described by the statements that follow:

- More people are employed in other phases of agriculture than in farming itself.
- Operational skills and managerial ability are essential requisites for success in farming.
- New agricultural occupations have emerged in the distribution, processing, and service areas.

- Application of science and mechanized equipment has transformed production agriculture.
- Efficiency of output and the productivity of farm units continue to improve.
- The rate of technology change in agricultural occupations makes it necessary to continue occupational training throughout the worker's career.
- The significant development of organizations and leadership services in agriculture has provided additional employment opportunities.

The magnitude of these changes emphasizes the important of providing workers in the broad field of agriculture with the best possible educational opportunities. Agricultural education is required, not only to enable workers to acquire the new technical skills, abilities, and knowledge needed to assure an adequate supply of food and fiber for the nation, but also to acquire those fundamental abilities of leadership and citizenship needed by all citizens.”

High School Agricultural Education in the Sixties

As a result of the newer objectives of vocational education in agriculture, new demands to assist with the training of farm labor, and the growing sophistication of agricultural production in general, there were many changes evident during this ear. Early in the 1960's several studies were made which also had their effect upon instruction. A teacher committee, as a result of growing concern with mechanization and the wider use of farm equipment, gave its attention to developing basic content for instruction in agriculture mechanics completing their work in 1964. This was done with the assistance of E. M. Juergenson of the University of California at Davis. Juergenson and Gerald Davis, Head of the Agriculture Department at the Nevada City Union High School conducted a study of possibilities for work experience education in that school district and for appropriate projects for students with limited opportunities. This study was funded by research funds made available by the State Department of Education.

As a result of the increasing sophistication of agricultural production and its greater reliance on the sciences underlying it, staff members of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, representative teachers from a number of high schools and junior colleges, agricultural instructors and professors from state colleges and the university, cooperated in a study of the biological principles basic to agriculture under the direction of S. S. Sutherland. This resulted in a publication in 1963 which identified twenty two of the most important biological principles upon which agricultural production is based and suggested teaching content and methods for this instruction in high school classes. This bulletin “Biological Principles in Agriculture” was published by the California State Department of Education, widely distributed and used nationally and internationally.

As a consequence of anticipated farm labor shortages due to the closing our of the Bracero program, the State Department of Employment requested the state staff to prepare material for courses of instruction to be used in local high schools for the training of farm boys as foreman and group leaders of less experienced youngsters who might be recruited for farm labor. In many schools this was essentially a course or a unit in labor supervision and labor relations.

As instructional programs in high schools began to reflect more and more the new programs made available under VEA 1963 some fears were expressed as to the effect of this expanded program upon the Future Farmers of America organization. The membership in this organization and its activities had been based primarily upon preparation for farming and the new aspects of instruction involved many students whose objective was work in agricultural occupations other than farming. Furthermore, pressures began to develop for admitting girls to full F. F. A. membership and, since this had traditionally been a boy's organization from its inception, there were questions in many minds as to the effect that this might have in the event that girls were so admitted. Later in the 1960's, 1968-69, girls did become eligible for membership but in spite of this and the admission of students of different objectives into agricultural classes, the Future Farmers of America program and organization continued to grow and to function effectively. There continued to be many excellent F. F. A. activities as leaders participated in state meetings of the Farm Bureau and other farm groups and it still continued to be a most potent factor in the training of high school youth in leadership and citizenship and to make an important contribution to their education.

Teacher Training

The shortage of teacher candidates for vocational agriculture which had been in effect for several years became quite acute at the beginning of this era and active recruitment became the order of the day. To further aid in meeting the shortage of teachers the program of internships was expanded to shorten to some degree the period of training and enable college graduates who had been engaged in agricultural work to enter the teaching profession without so great a financial sacrifice. The year 1967-68, for example, saw twenty two such interns in training.

The in-service training of teachers conducted by the Bureau of Agricultural Education in cooperation with California State Polytechnic and the University of California at Davis continued. One of the major factors in this program was the annual summer conference and so called "Skills Week" held at California Polytechnic annually during the month of June. Each of the two training institutions also continued to serve and to contribute in other ways to this in-service training. The California State Polytechnic College expanded and improved its program of publishing teaching aids and the University continued the publication of Agricultural Brief's bringing to teachers the latest developments in agriculture. Particularly noteworthy was the excellent work done by ornamental horticulture specialists from California State Polytechnic – Howard Brown and Anthony Amato. The college released these two men under an agreement with the Bureau to enable them to spend much of their time during 1963-65 to helping high school teachers establish local training programs in this field, select facilities and secure the cooperation and advice of local nurserymen.

As this era drew to a close there was evidence that new collegiate institutions would enter the field of training teachers of vocational agriculture. For many years all of the teacher training had been conducted at the two institutions mentioned above, but indications were that other institutions were interested in providing this training and the teacher shortage made it desirable to make such an expansion. The Fresno State College was approved for the pre-service preparation of agricultural teachers and the California State Polytechnic at Pomona will also begin in September 1969 to offer similar training.

Education for Out-Of-School Youth and Adults

The Young Farmer program, in spite of the efforts of a special supervisor, and regional supervisors, failed to gain wide acceptance. In fact, the low point so far as enrollment is concerned occurred in 1963 and the annual report for 1966-67 shows only a slight gain with enrollment figures. The schools and the members who are involved in this program carry on many worthwhile activities including statewide farm improvement contests and an annual state convention for both the California young farmers and young homemakers.

The MDTA program continued to grow with 1700 adults trained in pruning, gardening, and as general farm hands in 1963-64. This was probably the peak year. It was reported that 70% of the trainees were placed. Enrollment in this program continued high through 1965-66.

In another effort to compensate for the loss of the Bracero farm workers, the California Council of Growers and the Department of Employment requested in 1963-64 that a program be undertaken to train farm foremen and superintendents to work more effectively with relatively inexperienced farm labor which they expected to replace the experienced Mexican laborers. In the summer of 1963 the California Council of Growers made available a grant to cover the expenses of training a number of high school and junior college teachers at the University of California at Davis to present such courses and a training manual was designed and printed. A summary of training programs carried on from 1964 through 1965-66 showed approximately 410 foremen and superintendents trained in twenty four localities throughout the state. It was estimated by James Becket who directed this program, that these foremen and superintendents would have supervision over some 20,000 farm laborers. The following year 1966-67, thirteen more courses were held in different localities bringing the total supervisors trained to 550.

Although the Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided special funds for training of youth who were mentally retarded, culturally disadvantaged or otherwise handicapped, and in spite of special funds available for this purpose, little has been done thus far in agricultural education to provide such training. A notable exception was a program undertaken by Santa Cruz County primarily for the training of mentally retarded youth. A school farm and other special facilities were provided and the number of students both young men and young women mostly between the ages of 16 and 21 were enrolled. Students in this program were taught primarily to do repetitive tasks in the field of ornamental horticulture and domestic services of various kinds.

Agriculture in the Junior Colleges

In 1962 the first courses primarily for the training of technicians in agriculture were inaugurated at the Modesto Junior College. These courses were built around a core course in basic science and laboratory techniques and the first two areas of occupational training were in the training of technicians in artificial insemination of dairy and beef cattle – golf course superintendents, landscape specialists for city, county and state employment. Other junior colleges conducted surveys of their own local areas to determine the need for technician training. Among these were Mt. San Antonio at Pomona, College of Sequoias at Visalia, and Shasta College at Redding. Studies at Modesto and Redding indicated the need for the training of technicians in the general area of conservation, rural recreation and related fields and as a result courses have been established at these institutions to train workers for employment in this general field.

Growth in the program of junior colleges instruction in agriculture during the period beginning in 1962 has been consistent and highly satisfactory. In 1962, sixteen junior colleges enrolled some 1,726 students, while in the latest report available, 1968-69, thirty four junior colleges

were offering instruction in agriculture and enrolled 3,580, almost doubling enrollment in this period of time.

Personnel Changes in the Bureau Staff

Beginning in 1965 there were numerous changes in the personnel of the staff of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, occasioned in part by the retirement of three long time staff members. In 1965, Byron J. McMahon retired as Chief of the Bureau after many years of distinguished service in such capacities as regional supervisor, assistant teacher trainer, and assistant chief of the Bureau. He was replaced by Donald E. Wilson. S. S. Sutherland retired at the same time from his position as teacher trainer at the University of California, Davis, and his duties carried on by E. M. Juergenson. O. E. Thompson assumed the chairmanship of the Department of Agricultural Education at the University and later the scope of the department changed and augmented and now is called the Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences. George P. Couper, special supervisor working primarily with the Future Farmer organization, also retired in 1965 and was replaced in 1966 by Leland H. Ruth.

In 1966-67, Emil LaSalle was added to the regional supervisory staff, assuming responsibility for the South Coast Region. R. E. Matthews was added to the staff of the Division of Vocational Education as consultant in agriculture in the junior college service. W. D. Reed joined the staff as assistant regional supervisor working in the Central Region.

During the following year, J. T. Davis, formerly teacher of agriculture at Nevada Union High School replaced Leland Ruth and W. D. Reed, who had been serving as assistant regional supervisor was promoted from that position to supervisor for the Central Region replacing S. L. Barrett who became a regional coordinator for vocational education with offices in Sacramento. O. S. Gilbertson replaced B. E. Harrison as assistant teacher trainer at California State Polytechnic during this same year.

In 1968-69 two additional institutions were approved for training teachers of vocational agriculture – Fresno State College, where Lloyd Dowler will head up the department and California State Polytechnic at Pomona under the leadership of Allan Christensen.

An Overview of Significant Developments in the Sixties

In 1964 California became the most populous state in the nation. In spite of the fact that it continued to lead the U. S. A. in the value of its farm products produced annually, less than 10% of its population was employed in agriculture; three fourths of the population were concentrated in three great metropolitan areas, and the state had become a giant so far as industrial production was concerned. It is interesting to note that in spite of this trend toward urbanization and industrialization the sixties also was a period of greatly increased enrollment of full time students in both high school and junior college agriculture. During the period from 1962-68, enrollment which had been almost static during the previous decade more than doubled.

At the same time other striking developments more closely related to the educational program were taking place. Vocational agriculture throughout the years had traditionally been an "action" program. Changes had been made as result of experience in the field with little effort made to change and plan based on the finding of research. In contrast, this era saw

tremendous growth in research. It started in the late fifties with the impetus given by the National Defense Education Act and later by funds made available through VE 1963.

A massive and most significant study is now underway to obtain data on which to design a "master plan" for agricultural education at all levels in California. This study is supported by a research grant from the U. S. Office of Education and is under the direction of Dr. O. E. Thompson of the University of California at Davis, who planned it and is the director. Dr. James Becket of the same institution is the principal researcher with the aid of consultant Dr. G. F. MacLeod, and a statewide committee of educators and specialists.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963

The following quotation from the Annual Descriptive Report of 1964-65, describes the impact of this legislation as it became operative:

"Although the impact of Public Law 88-210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, upon California's program of vocational education has already been noted briefly, this descriptive report for 1964-65 would be incomplete without a more extensive account of the profound effect of this federal legislation. Just as the Smith-Hughes Act of nearly a half century ago planted the seed for continuing and successful cooperative effort between the federal government and the state governments to strengthen instructional programs keyed to occupational preparation, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided the means to reap a long-hidden harvest of competency, knowledge, and experience in establishing and operating programs of job preparation. The dimensions of vocational education were expanded, the purposes of vocational education were widened, and the potentiality of vocational education was honored by this act. Even more significant than the quadrupling of funds was the flattering emphasis placed upon vocational education as one of the basic solutions to society's problem of keeping pace with technological progress.

In 1964-65, mainly because of the impetus of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the program of vocational education in California advanced into a new era of development. Previously unserved occupations were assisted. The downward trend of vocational education offerings at the high school level was reversed. Traditional programs of training were transformed. Interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum development were restored. Experimentation became acceptable. Research attained a universal popularity.

In short, 1964-65 was an exciting period in the long history of vocational education in California, and the developments that occurred in that year foretell future contributions even more significant than those of the past.

California was the first state to make the provisions of the 1963 act operational. One of the major reasons why the state was able to move so rapidly into taking advantage of the support was the fact that provisions of this law not only provided financial support but on a legal basis for many of the agricultural programs which were already well underway, such as instruction in agriculture and various phases of agricultural business education. Another factor in its rapid implementation was the holding of a statewide conference on vocational education in Los Angeles shortly after the provisions of the act were fully known and accepted in which 1,000 people were brought together to discuss its implementation and to gain information concerning it. The State Director of Vocational Education, Wesley P. Smith, deserves credit for conceiving,

planning, and calling this conference as it enabled all phases of vocational education to move rapidly ahead.”

In Conclusion

In the fifty years during which vocational education in agriculture has been in operation the program has grown from the twenty two schools operative in 1918-19 enrolling some 337 pupils to 283 schools in 1968 serving 23,556 students, in federal support nationally for vocational education from the 7.2 million dollars in the original Smith-Hughes Law to a potential of over half a billion dollars 50 years later.

That the underlying philosophy and operation in agriculture has been in operation of this program has been sound is documented in the report of the so-called Arthur D. Little Committee to the California State Board of Education in October 1968. This was a report made by an independent firm of educational consultants employed by the State Board of Education some years earlier to make a study in depth of the operation of the State Department of Education and the several educational programs which it directed, to provide the State Board with an evaluation of these programs, and to make recommendations for adjustments. Their statement with respect to vocational education in agriculture reads in part as follows:

“Here is the instance of occupational education that came closest to rejecting the duality accepted by both the “academics” and the “vocationalists” of 50 years earlier. But it did so by building on and out from the “vocationalist’s” emphasis on occupational education.

In California, vocational education in agriculture serves high school students preparing to farm; high school students preparing for direct entry into off-farm agricultural occupations and those who will take additional technical training; high school students planning advanced study in agricultural colleges....

The very nature of modern agriculture requires that the student receive training in the sciences that involve animals, plants and soils. Principles of breeding and insect control are included. Practical instruction in the science of plant and animal growth is part of vocational education in agriculture. The training extends further to give emphasis on such technological phases as selection, operation, care and maintenance of farm machinery and mechanical skills needed on the farm. Interrelated with both the science and the technology is the overriding subject of management. Students keep records on the supervised farming programs... Record analysis and decision-making on the basis of records is emphasized. Most students also complete the other basic high school courses that qualify them for college entry.

Science, technology, practical skills and management are integrated in instruction and application. There is no duality between “academic” and “vocational”.

Abstract learning is linked directly to concrete practice, which in turn is related back to abstract learning, etc. – the circle of learning is completed.

College-bound and non-college bound are in the same program, have equal opportunity to discover and to establish their particular interests and aspirations.

The practical applications are realistic, conducted frequently as commercial farming operations that not only enable a teenager to act and feel like a man, but expect him to do so.

The Vocational Agricultural student is expected to participate significantly in the selection of his supervised projects, and in the emphases of his related instruction. He is less “done to” and “cared for” than doing and caring on his own – a difference not only in relation to most other Vocational Education, but to education in general. In other words, the philosophy of agricultural VE is student-centered, not program- or employer-centered.

The style of relationship between student and teacher is a partnership, particularly in the supervised projects. This is a concept shared with T & I teachers who also get into practical work with their students: in this sense, the pedagogy of VE is on the whole different from academic education that places more emphasis on the unequal authority of the teacher.

Vocational Agriculture was not to be a “separate and different” track, leading toward specific work stations or given prestige, income, and career opportunity. Instead, it was defined as a complex of tracks leading to a complex of stations in life that did not have to be specified by the student before he had the experience on which to base his selection. Thus he could travel on all the tracks within the general area of agriculture.

In this philosophy, California’s Vocational Agriculture anticipated recent developments in the general philosophy and definition of occupational education.

Again, what made this open traffic philosophy operational was the integration of academic with vocational curriculum that led the college-bound to enter the program, thus reinforcing the open rather than the closed status structure of the VE program.

Much attention has been directed to the declining importance of farm proprietorship in the U. S. economy, toward changing manpower requirements in agriculture, and therefore, toward the inappropriateness of continuing emphasis on traditional Vocational Agriculture. But these discussions have obscured the most significant contribution that Vocational Agriculture can make to all occupation education: A potential residing precisely in its philosophy of learning, of student and community involvement, of theoretical and practical exploration in a broad area of economic activity, and the rejection of a duality between college-bound and work-bound education.”

The fact that vocational education in agriculture in California is successful and has been accepted by parents, school administrators, educational leaders and agricultural industry is a tribute to a forward looking leadership and a sound philosophy. It is a tribute also to the hundreds of sincere, hard-working, and devoted teachers who have carried on this program in local high schools and junior colleges throughout this state. It is a tribute also to their state organization, The California Agricultural Teachers Association, which since the early 1930’3 has been the “right arm” of the state staff in developing agricultural education to the high status it enjoys.

Certain names, however, stand out as having had a significant impact upon this program and its development over the last half century.

J. B. Lillard, the first state supervisor, who guided this program in its first faltering steps.

Julian A. McPhee who succeeded Dr. Lillard and shepherded it through the trying years of the great depression.

Howard Chappell, E. W. Everett, A. G. Rinn, and B. R. Denbigh, his early assistants, who along with livestock specialist J. I. Thompson, Future Farmer of American guide, George P. Couper aided in the development of this program through its early years and who continued each to make his unique and important contribution until retirement in the 1950's and 1960's.

Byron J. McMahon who succeeded Dr. McPhee as Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, who with his staff of regional and special supervisors and the teacher training staffs at the California State Polytechnic and the University of California, Davis, directed this program during the post-war years of the 1940's and the equally frustrating 1950's.

Wesley P. Smith who succeeded Dr. McPhee as state director of vocational education, who since his original service to vocational education was in the field of agriculture, has continued his interest in and support for this phase of vocational education.

Donald E. Wilson and his present staff who are continuing with the same kind of devotion and sincere dedication to the cause of training and developing youth and adults for useful careers in the ever expanding complex of agriculture, and who now have the task of guiding the program and the tremendously expanded activities which will be supported by the latest federal legislation.

E. D. Graf, Assistant Chief of the Bureau, who heads up the task force whose assignment it is to spearhead the development of the state plan to implement the latest legislation in support of vocational education.

This newest legislation is Public Law 90-576 and is an act to amend and expand the provisions of Public Law 88-210. As this publication goes to press, state plans are being drafted to enable the state to implement it and to utilize the federal support authorized in this act. It should give a tremendous further impetus to the continuing task of training and retraining the agricultural workers needed to produce, harvest, process, and distribute the products of California farms.

VOLUME III – 1969 to 1974

Continued Growth, Expansion, and Adjustment

At this "point in time", June, 1974, it is not possible to assess whether this five-year period marks an epoch in agricultural education, the continuation of an epochal period, or the beginning of one which may continue for x number of years. However, the period has been one of major effort by the professional staff in program adjustment, planning, and development and it has been one of many changes in agricultural education in California.

The impact of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), and the Amendments of '68 (Public Law 90-576) previously have been noted. With no attempt to analyze these public laws and their longtime effect, suffice it to observe that this legislation has brought about more change in the nature and scope of vocational education than any other legislation since the National Vocational Act of 1917 (Public Law 347, Sixty-fourth Congress).

Many of the provisions of the federal legislation since 1963 have resulted in desirable changes and in needed expansion in vocational education. These changes are reflected in growth tables, and other developments are reflected elsewhere in the HISTORY. One provision which was introduced in the Amendments of '68 has been less favorably viewed by agriculture. This is the provision ending the authorization, appropriation, allocation, and disbursement of federal funds by subject matter categories. The entitlement system of disbursing these funds ended the funding by categories which had been followed for over 50 years.

Simultaneously, local education agencies were given almost complete authority to decide how their funds were to be spent. Many of them chose to use a good share of the funds for employing a vocational coordinator, a "project writer", and/or establishing work experience courses or other new areas of vocational education. This procedure decreased the federal funds available to support vocational agriculture and other continuing vocational education programs.

Historically, this five-year period has been a time of greater growth and expansion than any other five-year period beginning with 1918. As an example, in 1969-70, the total enrollments in Vocational Agriculture in California were 28,558; in 1973-74, this figure was 44,872, a growth of 16.314. The preceding five-year period, 1964-65 to 1968-69, saw an increase of approximately 8,000 which was easily the greatest increase up to the time. The 1969 to 1974 period also saw a corresponding increase in the number of secondary school vocational departments and in the number of teachers. Thus, we can see that the words written by Professor Sutherland were certainly prophetic!

Some of the data included in the following chart have been reported previously but the complete record to date is presented in this chart for easy comparison. In addition to the recent outstanding growth which it reports, the information also reflects that while FFA membership has increased, it has not done so at a comparable rate with enrollments. Agricultural educators believe that the FFA organization has benefits and values for every student enrolled in vocational agriculture, and this matter of FFA membership is receiving the attention of FFA members and officers, department heads and teachers, Bureau supervisory staff members and agricultural teacher educators. Perhaps a desirable change already is in the making because the May 22, 1974 issue of the "VO-AG SERVICE LETTER" reports that FFA membership for the year 1973-74 increased by 8.2% over 1972-73, a marked improvement over immediately preceding years.

Factors believed responsible for the consistent and somewhat phenomenal growth in agricultural education in the first part of the 70s are:

- improvement in the breadth, content, and quality of the instruction
- the increasing number of female students enrolled
- development of new, expanded, and more specialized courses
- provision for semester and "mini" courses
- an increase in the total number of courses and "programs" offered in the departments

- a surge of interest, particularly in ornamental horticulture and related courses, in the urban area schools resulting in the establishment of many new departments
- an updating of the titles of courses
- the inauguration and expansion of Regional Occupational Programs and Centers – a result of new monies for vocational education and,
- increased awareness by many parents of the beneficial educational and individual leadership development values of secondary agriculture for their sons and daughters.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE ENROLLMENTS AND FFA MEMBERSHIP IN CALIFORNIA
1918-1974

Year	Number of Departments	Number of Teachers	Vo-Ag Enrollment	FFA Chapters	FFA Membership
1918-19	22	23	337	-	-
1919-20	32	32	640	-	-
1920-21	39	34	1,097	-	-
1921-22	50	68	1,281	-	-
1922-23	57	89	1,475	-	-
1923-24	63	93	1,838	-	-
1924-25	71	108	2,163	-	-
1925-26	75	101	2,537	-	-
1926-27	81	90	2,880	-	-
1927-28	85	170	3,279	-	-
1928-29	95	194	3,975	29	228
1929-30	105	219	4,531	88	2,085
1930-31	115	233	5,096	111	3,064
1931-32	119	237	5,450	117	3,087
1932-33	123	217	6,260	126	4,021
1933-34	126	173	6,816	127	4,903
1934-35	127	132	7,021	128	5,215
1935-36	137	141	7,174	147	6,077
1936-37	155	242	8,211	163	7,106
1937-38	163	246	8,915	162	7,790
1938-39	175	258	9,263	174	8,427
1939-40	187	269	9,648	186	8,868
1940-41	194	285	10,313	192	Not Recorded
1941-42	195	276	10,169	195	Not Recorded
1942-43	176	261	8,973	176	Not Recorded
1943-44	162	233	7,208	162	6,897
1944-45	167	212	7,907	167	7,005
1945-46	165	210	9,652	165	7,725
1946-47	170	229	9,993	170	8,505
1947-48	178	254	10,709	178	9,092
1948-49	191	281	11,514	191	10,002

1949-50	208	325	12,037	208	10,737
1950-51	210	357	12,184	210	10,810
1951-52	214	369	12,029	214	10,856
1952-53	233	371	12,230	221	11,143
1953-54	233	378	12,836	224	11,707
1954-55	232	376	13,553	225	12,181
1955-56	235	385	12,640	225	12,190
1956-57	232	383	12,864	228	11,838
1957-58	236	423	13,291	230	11,941
1958-59	234	383	13,827	232	12,501
1959-60	233	366	13,701	233	12,094
1960-61	230	359	13,463	228	11,804
1961-62	229	345	13,924	226	12,137
1962-63	224	345	14,219	224	11,738
1963-64	227	356	15,429	225	12,573
1964-65	230	357	16,837	225	12,588
1965-66	232	374	18,009	226	12,746
1966-67	240	490	20,197	234	13,081
1967-68	265	516	20,900	237	12,967
1968-69	268	544	25,041	245	14,543
1969-70	272	440	28,558	252	14,933
1971-71	269	453	31,928	256	16,671
1971-72	280	489	36,580	258	17,483
1972-73	290	544	39,954	272	18,312
1973-74	330	584	44,872	281	19,882

Note: Prior to 1967-68, enrollment figures included junior college students.

The "Program Approach": Planning, Development, Elements, Standards

In the first half of the 70s, much of the Bureau staff effort has been devoted to developing concepts, attitudes, procedures, and matters related to the "Program Approach".

Developing understandings of the seven United States Office of Education "Programs", describing and clarifying the "elements" of each program, and preparing supporting materials for use by staff and local schools, all have been part of the scene. Rather extensive Statements of Operational Standards were developed and distributed to assist in the implementation of this approach.

Considerable time was given to an explanation and discussion of the Program Approach and the materials mentioned above at Sectional, Regional, and state-wide meetings of teachers.

A "Student Occupational Experience Folder" was developed to assist students in career and vocational planning within the "Programs". Several selected local high school departments assisted in the try-out of this teaching and counseling aid.

While not necessarily an integral part of the instructional development for the Program Approach, the Bureau has updated, improved, and developed various reports used in collecting data and in complying with state and federal requirements under this instructional approach.

One of the many considerations of the Bureau in this area has been a review of the results of the study of agricultural education in California conducted by the University of California, Davis. This study focused on occupational opportunities in the agricultural industry. Study of the report by agriculture teachers, Bureau staff members, and other leaders indicated the areas where greater emphasis in training should be placed. They were (1) more on-the-job training for supervisors of the agricultural work force, (2) labor management, (3) farm management and agricultural sales and services and (4) agricultural mechanics, the fastest growing are needing trained employees. Other areas noted as needing attention were career education, responsibility of being an employee, and improving skills in communications.

Instructional Aids and Curriculum Development

The IMP-VEP project (Instructional Materials Program-Vocational Education Productions), conducted by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, continued its production and distribution of many high quality instructional aids under its cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Agricultural Education. These materials are distributed not only in California and other states but internationally, as well. Also, materials produced by the American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials (AAVIM) are made available to California schools through IMP-VEP at a reduced cost because of an annual contract with AAVIM funded by the Bureau.

In curriculum development, a committee of teachers and staff members appointed by the President of CATA and the Chief of the Bureau, respectively, in 1969-70, recommended a specific approach and procedure for Curriculum Development. Dr. O. S. Gilbertson, assistant teacher trainer at Cal Poly, SLO, was chairman for the Bureau and gave valuable leadership to the committee in finalizing its recommendations. Later, Warren Reed, Assistant Chief and Sanford Beck, Regional Supervisor, were assigned to follow-up on this undertaking and they are continuing the leadership necessary to implement curriculum development under the Program Approach.

In the summer of 1973, Richard Rogers was appointed as a Specialist by the Bureau to devote a major part of this time to the Curriculum Development Project. He began his work with attention to curriculum guidelines and teaching outlines for introductory agriculture classes. At the 1974 CATA Conference, this project was described and the first publication "California Vocational Agriculture Curriculum Guidelines – Introduction to Agriculture" were distributed to the teachers. Also, in the field of curriculum, the Bureau is exploring the possibility of developing instructional programs concerned with quality environmental controls.

Regional Occupational Programs and Centers

This five-year period marked some additional growth in this part of vocational education. The Bureau encouraged the establishment in appropriate locations of courses falling within this category. A 1972-73 status report to the California Legislature on Regional Occupational Centers and Programs, reported 27 ROPs/ROCs offering agriculture with a total of 2,707 having been enrolled. Bureau supervisory staff members also have the assigned responsibility for monitoring all ROPs/ROCs in their geographic or otherwise assigned supervisory regions. While some evidence of substantial contributions to this form of expanded vocational education in agriculture is apparent, it is still too early to adequately measure the effects of these parts of the newer effort in vocational education.

Disadvantaged and Handicapped

Occupational training in agriculture for students falling within these designated categories has received attention with the Bureau devoting time to serious study of how training could be provided. Experts in this field have discussed the problems at staff meetings and a number of school districts have endeavored to provide training in specialized classes as well as in the regularly established courses. Some of the schools which have consciously made an effort are: Los Angeles Unified School District; La Selva Beach (Santa Cruz County); Fullerton Union High School District; Round Valley Union High School, Covelo; Torrance Unified School District; Salinas High School; Rio Linda Senior High School; Encina High School, Sacramento; Central High School, El Central; Healdsburg Union High School; and Exeter Union High School.

In the above listed schools and also in other schools, a major thrust has been in providing auxiliary services, i.e., tutorial services, use of individualized instructional and learning materials, and teacher aides. While not all such students have achieved equally, over the years the agricultural education program has accomplished almost phenomenal results with many handicapped and disadvantaged youths. A problem exists in being able to design and operate effective separate classes under existing regulations and because of the hazardous working conditions and safety requirements in many agricultural occupations.

One very specific project for students falling in the disadvantaged category will be described here even though it also fits in the Teacher Education section. This is the college scholarship program in agricultural education proposed by the Bureau and funded by the Bank of America. Under this project, a first group of six students was selected in 1969. Two of this first group are now in their first year of teaching, four more will have completed their undergraduate degree and requirements for teaching in June, 1974. Each year thereafter, between five and six minority students can be expected to be added from this source to the agriculture teaching force in California's secondary schools.

Supervised Occupational Experience and Record Book

This phrase of the vocational agriculture and FFA program (formerly commonly referred to as projects) has been undergoing some changes and beneficial development. Generally considered the core of the vocational training in agriculture, it has needed revitalizing. It is hoped that the newly approved and adopted "Supervised Agriculture Training and Experience Record Book" will prove to be a most useful teaching-learning tool. This book was very thoroughly tested in the field, revised twice, and finally prepared for printing by a Bureau committee headed by W. J. Maynard, Regional Supervisor.

The nature of the supervised experience, or practices, being conducted by students has been under scrutiny for some years and, beginning in 1973-74, a major committee of the Bureau has been assigned the responsibility to carefully study and make recommendations for needed adjustment and improvements. The six-man committee will be chaired by Dr. Gilbertson, now head of the Agricultural Education Department at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. Undoubtedly, representative teachers from the field also will have important in-puts for this study.

Several identifiable factors currently influence the scope, kind, and quality of occupational experiences. They include:

- class enrollments too large to permit adequate supervision of each student's occupational experience program
- needs by different students, in the same classes, for different occupational experiences
- Difficulties in correlating the occupational experiences engaged in by students with their occupational goals.
- Undue influence of fairs and shows upon the selection of "projects" by students
- Non-vocational students currently enrolled in vocational classes

Cooperative Vocational Education

During the first years of this program, Specialist Dennis Hampton worked in producing guideline materials and stimulating local departments to participate in pilot programs. From six to eleven different schools did so at various times. Subsequently, Jerry Barkley, served for one year and Richard Rogers is completing his first year in this position. In 1973-74, 28 different local schools provided cooperative vocational education agriculture classes. Also, during the year a handbook "On Target in Agriculture" was developed and provided all state supervisory staff members and teacher educators. The publication is aimed at assisting teachers in developing and conducting successful classes.

Some of the classes have been very rewarding and indicative of beneficial results which can be achieved via this type of instruction. Certain obstacles such as too small class size, poor retention of trainees until trained, changing work stations, and more effective placement of graduates must be solved, and more time and trial is needed, before an evaluation of results can be properly made.

Future Farmers of America

In September 1969, the Bureau staff gave approval for implementing the establishment of a California FFA Foundation. Continued effort resulted in final formation and incorporation by December 1972. Special Supervisor (and Assistant FFA Advisor) Jerry Davis and State Advisor Donald Wilson were the compelling forces behind this accomplishment. In earlier years, thought had been given to the desirability of forming such a foundation but it seemed apparent then that if a California Foundation were formed, there could well be some negative results affecting considerable financial support already being received by the California FFA. This situation having changed, it seemed a propitious time for establishing a foundation.

The state advisorship also has worked diligently toward strengthening and improving the state FFA organization, particularly with regard to greater participation at the national level as well as greater activity by the state officers in meeting with leaders in agriculture, industry and business, and with more area FFA officers and members.

Previously, reference has been given to a percentage decline in membership in the FFA. Membership was 19,882 in 1973-74, compared to 12,573 ten years earlier which seems a good growth but the percentage has not kept pace with class enrollments. Reasons for the lower

percentage membership may be the larger number of students who enroll for only one semester or one-year courses, and the number of non-rural students. During the earlier years of vocational agriculture, the majority of students had rural backgrounds, expected to enter agricultural production work upon graduation, and tended to enroll for two, or more, years of course work in agriculture. Some answers on how to stimulate the students who have somewhat different backgrounds and different needs, for membership and more participation in the FFA may be reported in the results of a special study project (EPDA), to be reported later.

The admission of more female students to vocational agricultural classes, and to membership in the FFA, has added another dimension to the total program. It is generally considered that girls tend to be faster and at times more diligent students than boys. Whether this is true of not in agriculture, it is a fact that they are very able competitors in the classroom and in co-curricular activities. With the advent of more female students, there has been an increasing demand for female agriculture teachers and, in 1973-74, eleven such teachers were employed in California vocational agriculture classes.

The first regularly elected female state officer of the FFA was Shirley Burch, of Norte Vista High School, Riverside, who was elected in May, 1972. Perhaps her term was made easier after a foundation was laid for girl officers by the appointment of Kristi Silkwood, Sierra Joint Union High School, Tollhouse, to complete the term in 1971 of Tony Gallant, State Treasurer, who was killed in an automobile accident.

Agricultural Education in Community Colleges

Previous to 1968, the Junior Colleges in California had been a part of the State Department of Education and their programs in agriculture had been included in the data in this "History". By legislative act in January, 1968 (Senate Bill 669), these schools were separated from Secondary Education and a separate State Board was created for their administration. It should be reported here, however, that as the program of agriculture in the secondary schools has grown, so has that in the Community Colleges. The following chart, provided by Ted Sypolt of the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, will be somewhat illustrative of the program growth in these institutions:

TREND IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION 1969-74

Year	No. of Colleges Having Ag. Depts.	No. of Ag. Instructors	Student Enrollment
1969-70	36	131	4,878
1970-71	37	140	4,083
1971-72	40	159	6,915
1972-73	41	159	11,607
1973-74	41	177	12,208

Relationships between secondary school and community college teachers of agriculture are very strong with many of the latter performing distinct and valuable services for secondary agriculture and for the FFA. Also, a number of the colleges have active Collegiate Chapters of Young Farmers.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, Warren Reed, Ralph Matthews, and Ugo Lea, Modesto Junior College Agriculture Department Head, have led in an effort to better articulate secondary school and community college agriculture programs. Ralph Matthews became the first Specialist in Agriculture in the Community College organization. When he moved to the position of Dean, Program Planning, Vocational Education for the Community Colleges on June 11, 1973, Ted Sypolt, who had been with the College of the Desert, was selected as his replacement.

It also should be recorded that many community college teachers of agriculture are active members and participants in the agriculture teacher professional organization (CATA) particularly at the regional and state levels. In June, 1971, the constitution and by-laws of the CATA were amended to provide for a Community College Division. John Schueber, of the Modesto Junior College Agriculture staff, was the first person to hold the newly created office of State Vice-President, Community College Division.

The California Agricultural Teachers' Association – Reorganization in 1971

Little has been written previously in this HISTORY of the many contributions of the CATA as an organization, and of its officers and members, to the growth, development, and status of secondary and post-secondary agriculture in this state, yet the contributions have been distinct and important.

The CATA is truly a professional association of high caliber and it is so recognized among the family of Vocational Associations, and by other educational and industrial groups.

Providing initiative in establishing and perfecting procedures for conducting FFA leadership and other training activities, the CATA also has led in developing and conducting many undertakings for teacher upgrading and improvement. The association conducts sectional, regional, and state-wide meetings and conferences; the 1973-74 Annual Conference being the fifty-fifth of its history. It assists in developing important guides and outlines, such as teaching and curriculum materials, fairs and shows regulations governing FFA exhibits and exhibitions, and procedures for CATA-FFA-YF relationships.

The association officers recently have taken a leadership role in developing the newly created California Council of Vocational Education. At the 1974 CATA Conference, the association was presented Charter No. 1 in "CAVE", as a result of this leadership.

At the 1971 Conference, major changes were made in the structure of the organization, including the reorganization of the previous seven Departments into three major ones – CATA Affairs Department, Adult and Youth Activities Department, and the Curriculum Development Department. The new departments will operate, as did the previous ones, at the Regional as well as at the State level. Also, two new Divisions were added with a State Vice-President serving as Chairman for each division. It has already been reported that John Scheuber was elected the first Vice-President for the Community College Division. Gordon Tibbs, Director of Agriculture at San Benito High School, Hollister, and a former President of the CATA, was the first person to be elected Vice-President, Secondary School Division. The amended Constitution and By-Laws also provided for another new state officer, that of President Elect, while doing away with the former Vice-President position.

Another accomplishment in the CATA during this time period was the successful establishment of a CATA Newsletter, the GOLDEN SLATE, with James Hart of J. W. North High School, Riverside, as its main architect and Editor. An excellent job has been done in developing this newsletter into an interesting and useful publication.

It is tempting to go back in time and list all of the officers of the CATA, beginning with Charles Booth in 1920-21 (he also served a second term), but this would make a very extensive list. A listing of the Regional and State Officers is available in records of the Bureau of Agricultural Education. Also, a list of the Past Presidents is available from The Past Presidents' Club. However, Presidents during the past five year period were:

1969-70	Earl Penix, Hartnell College, Salinas
1970-71	Edward Leal, Modesto Junior College
1971-72	Harold Seigworth, J. W. North High School, Riverside
1972-73	Richard Crabill, Big Valley High School, Bieber
1973-74	Lloyd Van Camp, Oroville High School

Continuing Education; Adult and Young Farmer Education

Excerpts from the "End-of Year Report (1973-74), Adult and Young Farmer Education" by Jack F. Lawrence, Specialist for the Bureau in Continuing Education, adequately illustrate recent accomplishments in this part of the total program:

"... five state-level Agri-Leader Seminars have demonstrated the major thrust... (average attendance 18)... five more regional-level... Seminars... and the distribution of... Agri-Leader Guides to all participants... a special seminar brochure 'Speaking Techniques – Young Farmer Style'..."

"... San Benito and Gonzales co-hosted State Convention... 300 during the 2 ½ day affair... a 9% increase in statewide membership..."

"Two in-service workshops on Continuing Education... 37 participants..."

"... expansion of... courses for farm employees... conducted last winter... into a Farm Job Ladder project as part... California Career Ladder (across the board vocational education) System... funded by... Department of Labor and a project... develop a cadre... lay instructors... (Office of Education grant - \$30,000). This project to involve... Bureau Specialist, the teacher trainer at California State University, Chico, and school districts in eight northern California counties."

Reorganization – State Department of Education and the Vocational Education Unit

The earlier history of the organization of the State Department of Education and the place of Vocational Education in it is briefly outlined previously. That historical description may indicate that aggressive leadership for vocational education as a unit, at the state level, was somewhat intermittent and lacking in vigor during the earlier years. Strong leadership with continuity really did not come into being until 1944 when Julian A. McPhee was asked to assume the position of State Director of Vocational Education concurrently with his duties as President of California State Polytechnic College. He began the welding of a strong headquarters staff and a closer working relationship between the several services. This work was continued by Wesley P.

Smith who was assistant to McPhee in vocational education and who was appointed to the position of State Director when Dr. McPhee resigned it to devote his full energies to the multi-campus development of Cal Poly.

In the late 1950s, pressure had mounted within the state and the state legislature for some reorganization and improvement of services of the State Department of Education. The latest available chart for the reorganization is dated December, 1973. A push to reorganize the vocational education section was a part of this effort. Also, and perhaps coupled with this were desires on the part of the Chief State School Officers and the Vocational Education Directors of the nation to exercise more direct control over the individual services in vocational education, and over their staffs.

At the federal level, reorganization of this nature did occur and, as a result, the role, status, and number of persons employed in vocational-technical education at the national level was definitely reduced. Certain vocal spokesmen on the national level espoused a universal emphasis of the individual services, some of which had become quite strong in their own right. Part of the salesmanship of the across-the-board approach was – to raise the level of vocational education, to give it a new image and vitality, and to pull the several services together in a concerted and coordinated effort, thus becoming a more integral part of the total public school education program and system. This somewhat limited explanation may lay the foundation for understanding the efforts which intermittently and then more persistently surfaced over an approximate twenty year period, from 1940 to 1960, to accomplish the concepts described.

At a state-wide meeting of vocational education staff held in San Diego in 1963, State Director Smith laid out in detail the type and specific nature of the organization in vocational education which he expected to develop. Walter Arnold, Associate commissioner for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., participated in this meeting and added his support to the type of structure advocated by Director Smith. Subsequently, through administrative directive, pressure of several kinds were placed upon the Bureau to effect change in structure and function but the effort was discontinued, in the face of persistent criticism of and resistance to such pressures.

In 1967-68, again by administrative directive, three Regional Offices for Vocational Education were established in the state; one each in Sacramento, Oakland, and Los Angeles, and individual Regional Supervisors of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, as well as staff members of the other vocational service areas, were assigned certain relationships and duties through these offices.

Progressively, pressure was brought to bear and instructions issued by the State Director's Office for the further reorganization, reassignment, and reduction in numbers of staff members of the several services, including and particularly affecting Agriculture. Directions were given for the closing of those regional officers of the Bureau of Agricultural Education located away from Sacramento. On August 15, 1972, Regional Supervisors Robert Pedersen and Maurice Fleming were ordered separated from the Bureau and transferred to the Oakland and Los Angeles Vocational Education Regional Coordinator's staffs, respectively, for across-the-board duties in vocational education.

In this total action, apparently little serious consideration was given by top level administration within the Department to the excellence of the agricultural program and the needed and most

effective services which it was rendering to local school districts and to the agriculture students of the state.

When the specific and planned actions by the Department became more widely known, a surge of critical responses was received by the Department of Education from the CATA, agriculture students and parents, school district administrators, adult leaders in agricultural industry and business, especially interested state legislators, and other concerned citizens. As a result of this response, further consultation occurred within the Department. Representatives of the Bureau of Agricultural Education were involved in this discussion, a representative group of the CATA met with Department Administrative officers, and just previous to a scheduled legislative hearing on the matter, the administration reassessed its position and issued a letter rescinding its previous actions. Fleming was restored to the Bureau staff, although Pedersen was not and remained with the Oakland Regional Coordinator's office.

Important points which were most favorable to the welfare of the Bureau and its program in this episode appeared to be the success of the Bureau in achieving its goals and objectives, the effectiveness of and the apparent need for the services rendered, recognition of its needed functions, and the necessity to maintain status and service identity. In brief, the forces supporting vocational education in agriculture were successful in reaffirming the very effective organization of the Bureau and its excellence in accomplishment. The attack upon it was overcome with a resulting further reinforcement of the solid foundations of this segment of public education at the secondary level. Success is frequently subject to attack, however, and it may behoove the agricultural education forces to learn from experience and further strengthen an already good public information and relations program.

Teacher Education: Institutions, Supply and Demand, Pre-Service and In-Service Preparation, Workshops, Conferences, Special Projects and Research

As has been previously reflected in this HISTORY, teacher education in vocational agriculture is an integral part of the total program of vocational education in agriculture. Since 1918, certain amounts of federal vocational education funds have been allocated and used for support of the teacher education function. The working relations between state supervision and teacher education have always been close and harmonious in California (as contrasted to some of the states) with the teacher educators being considered adjunct members of the Bureau staff, attending all regular staff meetings, serving on committees, conducting surveys and studies for the Bureau, and otherwise performing in full coordination with the supervisory staff. Conversely, the Chief of the Bureau and other members of the supervisory staff have been closely allied with teacher education. This close relationship evolved from a very direct participation during the earlier years of vocational agriculture and, more recently, in the approval of candidates for the fifth, or "cadet", year of training (vocational funds involved), in supporting field observation and evaluation of student and apprentice teachers, and in consulting and advisory capacities to the teacher training institution.

Teacher demand has been especially strong since the early 1960s with the supply generally less than the demand. During the present five year period, the teacher shortage continued at nearly the same level as in the previous several year period. Additional full-time intern teachers have been employed each year to fill the gap. At the time of this writing, it can be predicted that a fairly large number, perhaps 30 to 40, such interns may be needed to meet the very strong demand for new teachers for 1974-75, in addition to nearly 100 new teachers prepared in 1973-74 through the "regular" teacher education institutional program.

Teacher recruitment has been a problem for about ten years, California, through legislative action, has been experimenting and trying different approaches and procedures for teacher certification. The Fisher Bill (SB 57), enacted in 1961, was the first major effort. It was designed to drastically reduce the very large number of teaching credentials which were on the books, and to update the process of preparation of teachers. It did reduce the number of credentials but it also made problems for the most effective preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture. Generally, it was not considered a satisfactory solution to certification and quality teacher preparation.

In July, 1970, the legislature acted again, passing the Ryan Bill (AB 122). This bill, in addition to changing names of teaching, supervision, and administrative credentials, established a Commission separated from the State Department of Education for administering the process and services of issuing the state certificates. Proponents of this bill claimed that it would provide for greater education courses, more efficient processing of credential application and, at the same time, allow more flexibility in the design of teacher preparation and have fewer rigid requirements and specifications. Only time will make it possible to determine the efficacy or realization of all of these claims.

Agriculture was not included as a single subject in the Ryan Bill, and several critical problems resulted from this omission and from other feathurs. Through activity by the CATA, supporting cooperation and leadership action of the teacher preparation institutions and the Bureau, from other concerned sources, this omission was corrected with legislative enactment and approval by the Governor on May 3, 1973 of AB 220 which established agriculture as a single subject.

This action clears the way for more definitive planning and development by the teacher education institutions for the training of agriculture teachers. A major task remains in determining scope and content, and in constructing evaluative instruments, or other means for determining the qualifications of teaching candidates. In this study, the Bureau supervisory staff and also practicing teachers should participate. It is not a simple undertaking to devise a program to prepare quality teachers for the ever changing agriculture scene. Future needs and excellence of training must be considered, as well as immediate occupational needs of the industry and procedures for increasing the supply of quality teachers. It may well be that a two-track system for preparing and qualifying teachers should be instituted; one, the more typical institutionally centered process and a second, utilizing a more innovative on-the-job apprentice, or intern, teacher system.

It should be noted also that in 1974, the Commission authorized the Specialist Credential in Agriculture. Use of this form of certification could be effective in developing and supplying teachers with unique competencies to fit certain instructional situations.

Another segment of the total teacher education program is that concerned with in-service education, or preparation, of teachers. Almost from its inception in California, the agricultural education program has been concerned with and involved in providing, conducting, and participating in meetings, workshops, seminars, and conferences, the sole goal of which has been to improve teaching competencies and the quality of secondary school education in agriculture.

A system of regular meetings with teachers was inaugurated in 1926-27 by the Bureau and, with the growth and development of the CATA which had been founded July 13, 1920, these

evolved into monthly meetings, seven to nine per school year, cooperatively planned and conducted by the CATA and the Bureau.

Regional CATA meetings, another provision for professional growth and program improvement, are held generally twice each school year, as well as one during the Annual Conference. General business, professional considerations and reports, industry field visits, technical demonstrations, and speakers constitute the program, again cooperatively planned by the CATA regional officers and the Bureau regional supervisors, and presided over by the CATA officers.

The Annual CATA Conference, referred to above, constitutes a major effort for professional growth and improvement. Traditionally held on the campus of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, the program is cooperatively planned between the CATA, the Bureau and more recently the Community College Chancellor's Office, with Cal Poly and the CATA Region-at-Large providing unlimited additional cooperation and support. Also, traditionally, the head teacher educator at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, has served as chairman for the Conference and Skills Week Planning Committee of the Bureau. He has been accorded a privileged leadership role in working with these various organizations in constructing the total program and seeing it conducted to a successful conclusion. For over twenty years, H. H. Burlingham endeavored to carry out the wishes of the groups for building a Conference and Skills Week program which would accomplish the goals of professional and technical upgrading, development of good fellowship, esprit de corps, and individual leadership development. Since these two events are recognized within the state, and nationally, as being outstanding professional undertakings, it appears that the goals have been accomplished. Dr. Gilbertson inherited this responsibility following the 1972 conference and Skills Week and is carrying on the tradition of excellence for these affairs.

The 1974 Conference was the fifty-fifth, with the first occurring during the summer of 1920. A chart reflecting the attendance of agriculture teachers at the Annual Conference and Skills Week at San Luis Obispo since 1964, has been provided by Dr. Gilbertson (see below).

CATA CONFERENCE AND SKILLS WEEK
ATTENDANCE RECORD SINCE 1964
(CORRECTED COPY)
NUMBER REGISTERED

Year	Total	Skills		Total	CATA Conference	
		Skills Only	Skills & Conf.		Conf. Only	Conf. & Skills
1964	104	18	88	285	197	88
1965	135	6	129	316	187	129
1966	123	9	114	326	212	114
1967	115	20	95	315	220	95
1968	137	37	100	349	249	100
1969	122	6	116	390	274	116
1970	129	29	100	363	265	100
1971	128	28	100	363	265	100
1972	198	57	141	529	398	141
1973	239	64	175	461	255*	2068

* These are corrected numbers. In the original report, 76 people who registered for the Conference but did not sign the roll sheet and seven people who did not register for Conference but did sign the roll sheet, were omitted.

In 1973, "satellite" Skills sessions were held at California State University, Chico and California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, in an effort to more conveniently serve more teachers in a broader geographic area of the state. Attendance was 35 and 65 teachers, respectively.

The agriculture teacher education institutions have, of course, provided both undergraduate and graduate extension and on-campus courses, particularly in the summer for the professional and technical improvement of teachers.

In addition to the professional meetings reported under the sections on Cooperative Vocational Education and Continuing Education in Agriculture, a very important series of workshops have been organized and conducted by William Wills, Specialist in In-Service Education. During the past five year period many teacher hours have been devoted to this type of self-improvement. Industry and technical experts have been secured to serve as consultants or instructors in many of these workshops. In several, agriculture teachers who are specialists in the particular study area have been the instructors. A chart, in summary of a report prepared by Specialist Wills, is given below.

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WORKSHOPS FOR TEACHERS

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Workshops</u>	<u>Number of Participating Teachers</u>	<u>Total Teacher Participation Hours</u>
1969-70	5	90	2,430
1970-71	13	220	5,940
1971-72	15	206	4,821
1972-73	17	219	5,391
1973-74	22	248	4,695

Welding, Intern Teaching
Workshop

Total	72	983	23,277
-------	----	-----	--------

The majority of the above listed workshops were conducted for 27 hours (three days), although some were operated for only four or eight hours. While Mr. Wills is based at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, practically all of these workshops were held at widely scattered locations in California.

In research and studies during 1969-74, several projects not previously described were conducted by the teacher education institutions, in most cases with the cooperation of the Bureau of Agricultural Education and, in several instances, with supervisory staff members acting as consultants or discussion leaders.

One of the projects conducted by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, grew out of the need to study the administration of multi-teacher departments of agriculture and develop a guide for the more effective operation of such departments. The study was funded under the Education Professions Development Act. The material to be published was planned also to be used as a reference for study in the preparation of teachers. Project Director was O. S. Gilbertson, Associate Professor, Agricultural Education Department. A series of initial seminars was conducted and follow-up meetings held with the 79 selected agriculture teachers who participated. As the study progressed, it was determined that the results were quite applicable to the better administration and operation of any vocational agriculture department regardless of the number of teachers. The resulting handbook of how and why to do it, ADMINISTRATIVE HANDBOOK FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS, was published and distributed in 1973.

A second EPDA project was conducted by Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, with Larry Rathbun, Assistant Professor, Agricultural Education, as Project Director. This project was designed to identify means of achieving greater involvement of students with special needs in Future Farmers of America membership and activities. Project Director Rathbun describes the project and its results as follows:

“... FFA Chapters were experiencing challenges in the involvement of students of diverse socio-economic-cultural backgrounds in the activities of the local vo-ag and FFA program... a series of three workshops were conducted to study... with 63 participating agriculture teachers... to explore techniques and practices which would be useful... the first report... a reference booklet TOWARDS GREATER INVOLVEMENT OF STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS IN FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA ACTIVITIES...highlighting some 165 individual activities... the booklet also gave impetus to development of a new FFA Achievement Award Certificate, currently being field tested.”

In 1971-72, a third EPDA project was undertaken by California State University, Fresno, with Professor Lloyd Dowler, head of Agricultural Education, as Project Director. This project was designed to assist vocational teachers to work more effectively with handicapped students. Nine workshops were held at various places in the state with approximately 200 persons participating, 40 to 50 of whom were teachers of agriculture.

The summer of 1972 saw the University of California, Davis, engaged in an EPDA funded project with Elwood M. Juergenson, Professor, Agricultural Education, as Project Director. The

purpose of the project was to improve the technical competencies of vocational teachers through summer placement study in industry and business. Twenty-five teachers, many of whom were teachers of agriculture, participated in this program. Gary Blomgren of the Delta College Agriculture Department was the major consultant.

During the year 1971-72, Professor Dowler, Agricultural Education Department, California State University, Fresno, also was involved in directing and summarizing a survey of School Farm Laboratories. An extensive questionnaire was used in the seven regions of the state, to ascertain such things as the numbers of such facilities in the state, their scope, and operating policies and procedures. The result was published June 1, 1972 as "A Survey to Determine the Use of the School Farm Laboratory in Teaching Vocational Agriculture in California High Schools". It was distributed to all cooperating high school vocational agriculture teachers.

In 1973-74, the Agricultural Education Department at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, is involved in five research or study projects.

1. Developing an Annual Evaluation of the University-Bureau sponsored Instructional Materials Program-Vocational Education Productions project. This is a service to the Bureau and the University and is being administered as a practical training experience for graduate students in developing evaluative instruments and procedures.
2. A study of "The Expectations of Vocational Agriculture Teachers Regarding the Field Responsibilities, Duties, and Activities of the Bureau of Agricultural Education". This survey has been completed and the final report is now being prepared. It was funded as a VEA Small Research Grant project.
3. "A Study to Identify and Validate Beginning Vocational Agriculture Teacher Technical Competencies in Beef, Sheep, Swine, and Horse Husbandry". Another VEA Small Research Grant, it is making possible this start in developing a list of minimum technical agriculture competencies which each new teacher should possess.
4. A VEA Small Research Grant funded in June, 1974 is to provide for studying "Involvement of Vocational Agriculture Students in Vocational Agriculture Student Organizations:.. It will seek to identify reasons for a declining percentage of enrolled students as members of the FFA, and to propose dynamic solutions to reverse the trend.

Staffing and Staff Changes: Bureau of Agricultural Education and Teacher Education Institutions

More changes probably have taken place in the Bureau supervisory and specialist staff, in the agriculture teacher education staffs, and in the headquarters staff of Vocational Education during this period than in any other five-year period.

In 1969-70, E. David Graf, Assistant Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education, was appointed as Chief of the newly established Program Planning Unit in Vocational Education. Warren Reed, Regional Supervisor, Central Region, replaced Mr. Graf as Assistant Chief.

On December 29, 1969, Maurice E. Fleming, who for a number of years had been agriculture instructor, head of department, and supervising teacher at Willow Glen High School, San Jose, was added to the staff as Regional Supervisor and assigned to the Southern Region. He followed W. James Maynard who had requested transfer from the Southern Region to the Southwestern Region. Mr. Maynard had been with the Bureau since 1949, first as an area supervisor for the Veterans Institution On-Farm Training, subsequently on the headquarters staff in Sacramento and, in 1959, was assigned as Regional Supervisor for the Southern Region, replacing Merrill K. Luther when that individual resigned from the Bureau staff to assume a position with the University of Arizona in an overseas project in Iraq. Soon thereafter, Luther transferred to a similar project⁵ in India under the University of Illinois.

On August 20, 1969, Kenneth B. Cutler retired from the Bureau staff having been Regional Supervisor and FFA Advisor for the Southern Region for 20 years, being appointed to the Bureau staff on August 1, 1949. During his tenure, Mr. Cutler dealt with the burgeoning problems such as the development of classes in general (non-vocational) agriculture, agricultural education in urban communities and the "Inner city", and with devising different types of supervised practice for non-farm students.

Also employed by the Bureau in 1969-70 were three specialists. These men were employed under contractual agreements of the Bureau with Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo and the University of California, Davis. They were William D. Wills, based at Cal Poly, to provide In-Service Teacher Education primarily in agricultural mechanics (later broadened to other fields), Jack F. Lawrence, based at U. C. Davis, to provide state-wide service in the Young Farmer program and Adult Education, and Dennis F. Hampton, also based at Davis, to work in the area of Work Experience Education in Agriculture (later Cooperative Vocational Education).

On August 8, 1969, J. Everett Walker, Regional Supervisor and FFA Advisor for the Superior Region, retired from the Bureau after many years of dedicated service to vocational agriculture and the FFA as a teacher, department head, regional supervisor and FFA advisor. He also worked actively with the Young Farmers program in his region. Mr. Walker's primary concern always was the welfare of the student and he worked unceasingly in developing activities and procedures which would motivate FFA members and reward their extra effort and achievement. In January, 1970, Ted B. Gregg, from the agriculture staff at Sierra College, was named Mr. Walker's successor.

Effective September 1, 1970, Warren D. Reed was appointed Assistant Chief on a temporary authorization. Following regular state personnel procedures, examinations, etc., he was appointed to the position with full authorization on May 3, 1971. On May 21, 1971, Sanford I. Beck, formerly director of agriculture at Yuba City and then more recently in secondary administrative work at Willows, was appointed to the position of Regional Supervisor for the Central Region.

On January 1, 1971, Gilbert A. Hutchings, Regional Supervisor and FFA Advisor for the San Joaquin Valley Region, retired. He also was a man who had rendered long and faithful service to vocational agriculture and the FFA; as a longtime teacher at Bakersfield High School and then 22 years as a regional supervisor in both the South Coast and San Joaquin Valley Regions. Quality livestock and quality projects were major loves of Mr. Hutchings and he strove to improve them both. Mr. Hutchings served in all State Offices of the CATA, being President during 1944-45. Jerry L. Biggs, from the agriculture staff at Hartnell College, Salinas, joined

the Bureau staff on February 1, 1971 to replace Mr. Hutchings as Regional Supervisor of the San Joaquin Valley Region.

In 1971-72 more changes took place in the supervisory staff of the Bureau. Already reported were the reassignments by administrative order of Maurice Fleming, Regional Supervisor, Southern Region and Robert Pedersen, Regional Supervisor, North Coast Region, from the Bureau staff to the Regional Vocational Education Offices at Los Angeles and Oakland, respectively. Fleming was subsequently assigned back to the Bureau and his Regional Supervisor duties as of January 31, 1973. These latter shifts resulted in some confusion with the CATA and FFA-YF relationships and breakdowns in communications occurred. In order to help alleviate this situation, Assistant Chief Warren Reed in June, 1973, was asked to assume some supervisory responsibilities for FFA and CATA relations in the North Coast Region. Jerry Barkely, of Tulare High School, was employed to take Dennis Hampton's place as Specialist for Cooperative Vocational Education when Hampton resigned to go to California State University, Chico to assume the teacher education duties there. Barkely served one year when he returned to Tulare High School. The position was filled in the summer of 1973 by Richard Rogers.

Along with these changes in the supervisory and specialist personnel, a number of resignations, additions, and other changes occurred in agricultural teacher education staffs. IN this connection, some updating for 1968 is needed. In September of that year (rather than in 1967, as previously reported), Dr. Osmund Gilbertson, a graduate of the University of Minnesota, became assistant teacher trainer at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. During part of the summer of 1968, Donald Rodrigues, head of the Ventura College Agriculture Department, substituted for H. H. Burlingham, head of the Agricultural Education Department at Cal Poly while he was on special assignment in Thailand working with Chieng Mai University and the Ministry of Education on the development of a trial program and curriculum for preparing teachers of agriculture, agricultural extension service workers, and rural development leaders. In September, 1969, Dr. Paul Peterson, a graduate of the University of Missouri, was added to the staff at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, as an assistant teacher trainer. In June, 1970, Dr. Peterson resigned from the position at San Luis Obispo to accept the position of Agriculture Teacher Educator at California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, succeeding Allan Christenson who had handled the beginning of the program there in 1969-70.

Previous reference has been made to the approval of two additional vocational agriculture teacher preparation institutions – Fresno State College and Cal Poly, Pomona – and the first two teacher trainers in these institutions, Lloyd Dowler and Allan Christenson. It would be proper to report that Professor Dowler had been Dean of Agriculture at Fresno for 18 years, from 1951-69, before resigning from that position to take charge of the agricultural education teacher training duties. Allan Christenson had been on the Animal Science faculty at Pomona for several years before being asked to take on the agriculture education duties, on a part-time basis for the first year. The first year of operation by these two institutions as agriculture teacher training centers (1969-70) was under an agreement with the Bureau which involved no funding. Subsequently, they both have received financial support from vocational education funds through the Bureau under inter-agency agreements. In the spring semester, 1971-72, Professor Dowler was on sabbatical leave and his place was temporarily filled by Kenneth Easter, recently retired had of the agriculture department at Dos Palos High School. The fifth agriculture teacher education institution – California State University, Chico – was added to the list on July 1, 1972, with Dennis Hampton as the teacher educator.

In September, 1970, Larry P. Rathbun, Director of Agriculture at Los Banos High School, was added to the Agricultural Education staff at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, filling the vacancy created by Dr. Peterson's move. In June, 1972, Rathbun received an EPDA award for graduate study leading to a doctorate at The Ohio State University. His place was filled temporarily by Richard Rogers, who had been head of the agriculture department at Patterson High School for several years.

On July 1, 1972, Herbert H. Burlingham retired from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, as Professor Emeritus, Agricultural Education, after 42 years service in the field of agricultural education. During his 12 years in secondary education, he served as department head, teacher of adult classes in agriculture, advisor of two local out-of-school young adult groups (pre-Young Farmers), a critic (supervising) teacher for six years, and as a teacher and local coordinator of war-time training classes in machinery operation and welding. For over five years, he was Regional Supervisor and FFA Advisor for the Superior Region. During this time, he rejuvenated and re-established the status of vocational agriculture in this region, as well as supervising various war-time training classes, including promotion and installation of Community Canneries. In 1941-42, Mr. Burlingham was President of the CATA, having progressed through all state offices of the organization. He actively participated in the Pacific Region Vocational Agricultural Education Seminars and, for two years, was Chairman of its Workshop Sessions.

For 24 ½ years, Professor Burlingham was head teacher trainer at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, and became first head of the Agricultural Education Department when the program was given department status. Many hundred young men and later, several young women, completed preparation for agriculture teaching under his advisorship and supervision. Over 300 teachers successfully completed work for Masters degrees. Scores of persons from other countries came to his department for guidance in improving their technical and professional competencies, most of them returning to their homelands to continue, or assume, teacher, supervision, or administrative duties in schools, institutions, universities, Ministries of Education and Agriculture, the United Nations, or other agencies. A goodly percentage also proceeded to graduate institutions to complete doctoral programs.

From 1949 until retirement, Mr. Burlingham was the college coordinator and Bureau chairman for the Skills Week and the CATA Conference. The University-Bureau IMP-VEP Program (now a separate operation) had its early beginning in the Agricultural Education Program. He assisted in the preparation and editing of numerous professional pamphlets, brochures, and other publications and was co-author of "Selected Lessons for Teaching Off-Farm Agricultural Occupations". Upon retirement, his position was assumed by Dr. O. S. Gilbertson who had worked four years with Professor Burlingham.

Also in July, 1972, Dr. Elwood M. Juergenson retired from the University of California, Davis, where he had served 22 years as professor of agricultural education, first as assistant teacher trainer and then for seven years as head teacher trainer. Earlier, he was Director of Agriculture at Linden High School for ten years, during which period he also served as a critic (supervising) teacher.

Dr. Juergenson was well noted for his ability to develop creativity in his students and for editorship and authorship of many publications designed for use by high school agriculture students and teachers. During his participation on the staff of the Bureau, he exerted leadership in developing curriculum guides and teaching outlines. He was active in

professional agricultural education endeavors and organizations, including being Editor, for the Pacific Region, of the Agricultural Education Magazine, as well as being a regular contributor to it and other publications. Dr. Juergenson's position was filled by Dr. J. Kenneth Baker, in September, 1972. Dr. Baker, a graduate of The Ohio State University, had taught vocational agriculture thirteen years in three high schools in Oklahoma, the last four years at Stillwater where his vocational agriculture classes were used as a laboratory school by the university. More recently, he served six years on the agriculture faculty at Modesto Junior College. He came from an overseas assignment in Venezuela to assume the position at the University of California.

A chapter in the leadership in Vocational Education in California ended on January 1, 1973, when Wesley P. Smith retired as State Director of Vocational Education. Mr. Smith began his career in vocational education as teacher of agriculture at Ferndale High School. He moved to San Luis Obispo High School in 1938 as the teacher of agriculture and "critic" teacher, cooperating with Cal Poly and the Bureau in teacher training activities. In 1942, he became directly affiliated with the Bureau devoting half-time to Regional Supervisor duties and half-time as assistant teacher trainer. Shortly thereafter, he became assistant to Julian A. McPhee, after McPhee assumed the added role of State Director of Vocational Education. When President McPhee resigned the latter position to devote his full time to the expanding programs at Cal Poly, Mr. Smith was named to the position as State Director. Mr. Smith served for 25 years and had been a dominant figure in vocational education, both in California and nationally. Among other activities, he served a term as President of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education.

Prior to his resignation, Mr. Smith had been in ill health for several months and he elected to leave the post in order that the work of his office should proceed expeditiously and under vigorous leadership. The position was filled on August 22, 1973, with the appointment of Samuel L. Barrett who had moved from his position as a Regional Coordinator of Vocational Education to assist Mr. Smith, and then to serve as Acting Director following Smith's retirement.

Closing Statement for the Period 1969-74

The opening paragraphs to this part of the HISTORY, indicated it to be a time of much change. It is hoped that the intervening paragraphs and historical sketches have clearly and accurately recorded at least the more significant occurrences and achievements.

On review by the writer, however, it is apparent that some important happenings have been omitted. References have been made to the expansion, growth, and changing nature of program, but a significant matter such as the development and status of agriculture classes in urban areas received little attention. In this connection, and as an example of innovative development, the curious reader is referred to the October issue of "AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION" magazine. Ronald Regan, Supervisor of Agricultural Education (now Environmental and Agricultural Education), Los Angeles Unified School District, interestingly describes the nature and scope of the agricultural education program in the elementary and secondary schools of that city.

Also, in his resume' of the Twenty-Fifth Annual Awards Banquet for Los Angeles Beautiful Student Planting Program, Mr. Regan presents a pictorial record of this rather unusual educational and public information activity.

Many new things have been dealt with in this period but not described, such as OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Act), BOAC (Building Our American Community – a new national FFA endeavor), and the development by the Bureau with input from teachers and administrators of a new instrument and process for self-evaluation of departments of vocational agriculture “Procedure for Applying for Local Program of Vocational Agriculture”.

“Career Education” received tremendous attention from many sources during this period but one would have to record now that this concept, so vigorously proposed by Sidney Marland, Deputy Commissioner, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., and avidly grasped by many educators, was not funded federally or locally for substantial support and appears to be losing vitality.

Nothing has been written of inflation, or price squeezes, or national and international conditions such as international trade agreements, wheat sales to Russia, or of political chicanery, unemployment, or labor problems in agriculture. All of these are important but it seemed desirable in preparing this update to place higher priority on a more complete account of the pertinent happenings in the educational and professional field.

It is apparent that new dimensions in the program of agriculture and other types of vocational education have been reached. Innovative and distinctly different kinds of agriculture classes have been introduced in new and different kinds of communities – in the “inner city”, in the “upper-class” residential area, and in the long hold-out against classes in vocational agriculture. Teachers with different and more specialized, or limited, subject backgrounds are employed to teach many of these classes, and women vocational agriculture teachers while not in great numbers, certainly are not uncommon!

In looking to the immediate future, perhaps a listing of the first six of the fifteen “Priorities for 1974-75” will indicate the major concerns and planned efforts by the Bureau of Agriculture Education for the year:

- Development of the Program Approach to Vocational Education in Agriculture, including implementation in local education agencies, and the development of the necessary curriculum and instructional materials.
- Preservice vocational agricultural teacher education.
- Instructional materials development.
- Vocational agriculture student leadership development activities.
- Consultative services in vocational agriculture to local education agencies.
- Inservice education for vo-ag teachers and administrators of vocational agriculture programs.

Yes, 1969 to 1974 has been a time of many unusual and important happenings but the writer feels that it takes no crystal ball to predict that the next time period in agricultural education will produce another array of interesting facts to be recorded.

VOLUME IV – 1974 to 1981

Volume IV of A HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS in the most recent update of this historical effort. The preparation and publishing of the earlier sections (periods) are described in a FORWARD prepared by this author which appears at the beginning of the present compilation. Volume I, the Period 1901 – 1940; presents an interesting and quite complete story of the earlier history of agricultural education in California's public schools. At that time, junior colleges were included in the secondary school system.

In Volume I and in Volume II, the Period 1940 – 1969, Professor Sutherland drew from his own knowledge, as well as referring to the Annual Reports submitted by the Bureau of Agricultural Education to the U. S. Office of Education.

The material from the 1969 – 1974 update included in Volume III came from the personal knowledge of the present author, through consultations with various other professionals, and from reports and publications as given in the List of references at the end of this volume.

From 1917 to 1974, the path of secondary agricultural education in California has been onward and upward. There were some momentary setbacks or hesitations, as recorded in the HISTORY but expansion was generally steady. Growth in numbers of secondary schools offering courses in agriculture, including vocational agriculture, had almost always increased except in the World War II period. Numbers of students enrolled had risen, as had membership in the Future Farmers of America.

Desirable developments in curriculum and in teaching procedures had taken place. Teachers were dedicated and avid for improving materials and methods of teaching.

Nineteen sixty three saw the beginning of change in the amount of federal funds provided for vocational education and in the amount of federal funds provided for vocational education and in the provisions for the allocation of such funds by the states. More total funds were available but the uses of such monies had new direction. The amount of support for the old-line, established categories was generally reduced.

Another development in the 60's was a change in concept by some educational leadership as to how the federal funds could best be used. Certain individuals in leadership roles at the national level advocated a shift toward more generalization in the administration and methods of providing services to local educational agencies. Instead of the emphasis on specialists in the four categories of vocational education and, particularly in the case of agriculture, such specialists rendering direct, on-site services to schools, teachers, and students, the advocates of the different approach emphasized the administration function and the use of vocational educators (generalists), as opposed to the use of specialists.

The adoption of these concepts by some Chief School Officers (State Superintendents of Public Instruction) and by some State Directors of Vocational Education resulted in organizational changes and changes in delivery systems by some states. In a few years, some of these same states reversed themselves. In California, this approach to the administration of vocational education resulted in considerable conflict, as is reported in the text.

The separation of the Community (Junior) Colleges from secondary education, in California, in 1967 resulted in a further confused situation. The governance function for vocational education became weakened and competition for federal vocational education funds developed. A Joint Committee for Vocational Education was formed in 1968, in an endeavor to solve these problems. It has not done so, as described in the update, but its reorganization as a Joint Policies Council may assist in resolving the dilemma.

This introductory is lengthy. It was believed desirable to give the above explanations, in order that the reader might be better prepared for study of the material presented in the following pages.

The general atmosphere in which agricultural vocational education has operated in the secondary schools of California in 1974-1981 has been different than in any other time frame. Controversy has been rampant within the professional organization with strong division in opinion between the general vocational educationists and the subject matter specialists. Strong differences of opinion exist as to the most effective organization for the delivery system. The governance system functions with difficulty.

The author believes that those forces responsible for vocational education in the public school system of this great state face a critical challenge. If an effective, vital state-wide program is to be a part of public education, then its place in the hierarchy must be redefined and established. Proper legality and adequate provision for funding, including aid to local educational agencies, must be attained. If agricultural vocational education (including provisions for general agricultural education) is to continue, or is to be re-established, as a leader in this phase of practical education, there needs to be a re-statement of concepts, purpose, goals, and procedures endorsed and supported by the organization.

Open mindedness in analysis and in solving of problems must be exercised. Undoubtedly, compromise will be necessary but goals, structure, and procedures must be agreed upon. Long range planning must be achieved, in order to design and provide for a viable program.

A program to fit California's educational needs and to provide for continued development is imperative.

NUMBERS – Secondary Vocational Agriculture Departments, Teachers, and Enrollments; FFA Chapters and Memberships

During the period June 1974 – December 1981 there was continued growth in numbers of departments, teachers, and enrollments through the school year 1977-78 (see chart below). Generally during the seven year period, the number of FFA Chapters increased somewhat – from 297 in 1974-75 to 323 in 1980-81. The high point of paid up FFA memberships was achieved during 1976-77, with 20,311. Membership generally decreased or remained static during the following four year period.

VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE ENROLLMENTS AND FFA MEMBERSHIPS IN CALIFORNIA 1974-75 TO 1980-81 Inclusive (Supplemental to Chart in Volume III)

No. of	No. of	Vo-Ag	No. of	No. of FFA
--------	--------	-------	--------	------------

Year	Departments	Teachers	Enrollments	Chapters	Members
1974-75	348	636	48,862	207	20,071
1975-76	373	680	51,087	306	20,091
1976-77	412	723	51,935	315	20,311
1977-78	424	739	52,000	314	19,452
1978-79	412	682	45,378	318	17,251
1979-80	407	651	45,581	319	17,399
1980-81	405	536	45,780	323	17,737

(The figures above do not include data from Community Colleges.)

From the above chart, it can be seen that enrollments remained relatively high after 1977-78. This condition is both good and not so good. It is good because it indicates the continued strong interest in agricultural education. It is not so good because it represented, and still represents, an over-loading of classes with too many student contact hours per teacher for effective instruction. The most apparent weakening was in the supervised occupational experience activities.

Teachers exhibited much fortitude during this period, when they diligently endeavored to conduct a quality program in the face of adversity.

Curriculum Development – Program Guidelines – The California Curriculum Development Project

The genesis of the California Curriculum Development Project was reported in Volume III. Credit was given to the early initiators and leaders in the Program Approach – Curriculum Development activities.

In its further development, the Program Approach, patterned on the U. S. Office of Education seven “Programs,” was consolidated with the Curriculum Development effort. A unique and important feather of this project has been the early and active part taken by the California Agriculture Teachers’ Association and its individual teacher members in planning, writing, testing, improving, and adopting the guidelines as they have become available.

The project has been marked by extraordinarily excellent participation and cooperation between teachers, teacher organization, teacher educators in five different teacher preparation institutions, and state level agricultural education supervisors. Initiative by the Bureau of Agricultural Education and dedicated effort by all those who had leadership roles was responsible for this fine performance. A contract by the State Department of Education with the University of California, Davis, utilizing Part 3 Vocational Education funds was the vehicle for providing specialist services.

The first Specialist, working in a part-time coordinating capacity was Jerry Barkley. Employed in 1972-73, Barkley was a vocational agriculture teacher on leave from Tulare High School District. He had taken the place of Dennis Hampton, Specialist for Cooperative Vocational Education who had moved to California State University, Chico, as agriculture teacher educator. In the summer of 1973, Richard Rogers, a former vo-ag teacher at Patterson High School, who had been on the agriculture teacher education staff at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, was employed as the project Specialist.

During Rogers' tenure, the Steering Committee devoted major efforts to developing materials for promoting the Program Approach and to refining the guidelines to be followed for curriculum materials development. A beginning was made in preparing the first course – Introduction to Agriculture. Also, during this period, a series of presentations on the Program Approach and the Curriculum Guidelines were held throughout the state. Another vo-ag teacher, Lee Holmes, relieved Richard Rogers in December of 1975 when Rogers took over the position of teacher educator at U. C. Davis. Lee Holmes resigned in June of 1976 to pursue doctoral studies at Iowa State University.

In October, 1976, Jean Landeen, a vo-ag teacher at Grace Davis High School, Modesto, was employed as Specialist for the project. She occupied this position and coordinated the work until November, 1980, when she was appointed to the position of Agriculture Supervisor for the North Coast Region. During her period of service, the Introduction to Agriculture course was pilot tested in three high schools, Sunny Hills-Fullerton, Oakdale and Ferndale. This course material has been reprinted twice and was updated before the second printing.

A report prepared by Miss Landeen lists completion of the following course guidelines:

Agriculture Production Vol. I	1977
Forestry	1977
Ornamental Horticulture	1978
Agricultural Supplies/Services	1979
Agricultural Mechanics	1980
Agricultural Production Vol. II	1980
Agricultural Resources/Rural Recreation	1981

In addition, Agricultural Production Vol. I and Ornamental Horticulture have been updated and reprinted. It is planned that guidelines for Agricultural Products/Processing will be completed and released in 1982.

Landeen goes on to report "Over 400 teachers have been involved in planning, developing, writing, implementing, and reviewing the process and products. The effort has produced a workable scheme for program development and has produced teacher designed and written curriculum guides to implement the scheme."

David Whaley, formerly a vo-ag teacher at Santa Rosa High School, was employed on June 12, 1981 to carry on with the work of the project following Jean Landeen's transfer. Whaley reports beginning development of 20 teaching units, to consist of 80-90 LAPS (Learning Activity Packages) in Ornamental Horticulture. These are to be designed for handicapped/disadvantaged students.

Curriculum Guidelines for the various programs are produced for sale by Vocational Education Productions (VEP), California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

Teacher Preparation – State Certification, Pre-Service and In-Service Education

Problems continued during 1974-1981 with recruitment and required courses and course content for state certification. Some of the anticipated solutions in meshing technical and professional preparation for teachers of vo-ag with state requirements were not achieved.

Changing guidelines by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, plus the added university courses designed to satisfy the competencies demanded by the Commission, made the recruitment of potentially strong candidates difficult. Such students frequently were not willing to take one or more years of work beyond the normal four years for their first degree, to satisfy state certification requirements. This has been particularly true during a time when they could enter agriculture careers at the end of four years at incomes as great, or greater, than those in beginning teaching.

The original reasons given for establishing the Fisher Bill (1961) and the Ryan Bill (1970) have never been fully satisfied and it is doubtful if they ever will be unless major revisions are made in present guidelines and requirements.

Initially, the number of different credentials was reduced, but today there are so many variations of certificates that this original objective has been lost in the shuffle.

The quality of teachers – their teaching competency – was to have been improved. The evidence does not bear out achievement of this goal.

More flexibility was to be provided teacher preparation institutions in the design of their teacher preparation programs. Again, according to a comparison of several programs, this has not been accomplished.

In the preparation of teachers of vocational agriculture, problems have been augmented rather than reduced or eliminated. In this field where strong subject matter competencies have previously been expected and required, there has actually been a diminution in such competencies. Added numbers of course units, most a result of certification requirements, have discouraged students from applying for admission to the pre-service preparation program.

To date, there is no evidence that the present preparation programs are producing teachers more highly qualified than those prepared in 1959.

From 1917 to 1963, a major influence upon quality agriculture teacher preparation (pre-service education) and professional improvement (in-service education) had been federally supported for such services. Starting with the Vocational Education Act of 1963, such funds have been substantially decreased. Of those federal funds available for limited use in teacher education, state guidelines and formulas have made it difficult to obtain a beneficial share for agricultural education. The loss of partial aid to student (apprentice) teachers has discouraged some candidates.

For many years, professional/technical improvement activities such as Skills Week, other special seminars and workshops, and certain sessions during the annual CATA Conference had been partially or fully supported by federal vocational education funds. In 1978, no federal/state funds were made available through allocation by the State Department of Education for the latter activities. As a result, for the first time since the Department of Education had sponsored these in-service educational events, its name, and that of the California Community Colleges, was deleted from the Call to Conference and Skills. The CATA was the lone sponsoring organization. With the continued cooperation and support of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, it was possible to conduct the programs by the participants paying a registration fee.

Up until 1976 and under certain conditions, school districts had either partially or fully aided their vo-ag teachers to attend the annual Conference and Skills Week. As a result of reduced or non-existent federal funds for support of this form of in-service education, plus the effect upon school districts of Proposition 13, this aid to teachers was virtually eliminated. As a result, the 1979 Conference and Skills Week were each shortened from the traditional 4 ½ days to 3. The events were carried out in satisfactory fashion with somewhat reduced attendance. Conduct of the work of the Conference experienced some difficulty because of the time limitations.

In 1979, some state/federal funds were reinstated and credit for joint sponsorship was again given to the State Department of Education and the California Community Colleges. In order to provide adequate financial support for the activities, however, it was necessary for the teachers to continue payment of fees.

The following chart shows the attendance at the Annual CATA Conference and the Skills program, from 1974 to 1981, inclusive. This supplements the data of the previous update.

**CONFERENCE AND SKILLS ATTENDANCE
1974 – 1981**

Year	Total	Skills Only	Skills & Conf.	Total	Conf. Only	Conf. & Skills
1974	176	35	141	474	333	141
1975	169	25	144	549	405	144
1976	147	33	114	514	400	114
1977	159	29	130	560	430	130
1978	153	31	122	421	299	122
1979	222	26	196	460	264	196
1980	209	20	189	451	262	189
1981	244	35	209	469	260	209

In 1978-79, a new form of on-the-job aid to vo-ag teachers became available. Identified by the acronym ATAC (Agriculture Teachers as Consultants), it consists of a professional visit by a highly qualified teacher to another teacher who requests such aid. Financed by Subpart 3, Vocational Education funds, this has proved a useful service, particularly during the time when on-site services of Regional Supervisors were reduced.

Information on other forms of in-service education for the period 1974 – 1980 is not readily available, but the chart below records some of these activities. Starting in 1976, federal Subpart 3 Program Improvement and Support Services funds were utilized to provide for workshops, seminars, and institutes, as such funds were available. In more recent years, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, has been the repository and administrator for grant funds under Subpart 3 for use in agricultural education.

The other agriculture teacher preparation institutions, as well as several of the community colleges, have conducted Satellite Skills programs, and other workshops, for the benefit of teachers in their geographic areas of the state. The following chart presents a summary of such programs conducted in 1980 and 1981.

PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED FOR VO-AG TEACHERS

(In-Service Education)

Activity	1980		1981	
	No. Held	Total Attend.	No. Held	Total Attend.
Satellite Skills (usually 3-4 days in length)	4	93	3	64
Teacher Leadership Institute (1 each for Supervising teachers & FFA Advisors)	2	93	2	125
Other workshops (on Technical & Professional subjects, ½ to 3 days in length)	10	Not Avail.	11	369
First Year Teacher Visitations (by teacher ed. Institution representatives)	22	22	18	18

In addition to the activities accounted for above, three workshops for Vocational Education Student Organization Advisors were held on the campus of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. The first, in August, 1979, attracted 225 advisors of local chapters of FFA, FHA-HERO, FBLA, VICA and DECA.

In August of 1980, a similar workshop was held at Cal Poly, this time with 195 local advisors participating. Again held at Cal Poly in 1981, 219 advisors attended. The evaluations by the participants have been most enthusiastic. From these conferences, each three days in length, and from follow-up reports from the field, it is apparent that local vocational education student advisors cooperate more fully, more willingly share resources and ideas, and can achieve greater unity than do the state level staff persons in the Department of Education. The first held workshop was funded through Subpart 3 funds, the last two with AB 8 money.

HELPFUL HINTS TO HAPPINESS – A SURVIVAL GUIDE FOR FIRST YEAR TEACHERS was produced early in 1981 by the Agricultural Education Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. Edited and authored by the author of the present HISTORY update, it was another undertaking for professional improvement and support. Designed to be an assist to beginning vo-ag teachers in helping them solve some of the new challenges, it is a compendium of hints and suggestions. Ten experienced vo-ag teachers contributed to the guide. It is anticipated by the Agricultural Education Department that separate monographs may be made available from time to time for addition to the loose-leaf manual.

REORGANIZATION OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION UNIT, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION – ACTON, REACTION, AND RESULTS

Background Information

In Volume III of the HISTORY, a section was devoted to the above topic. A review of those pages will help to set the stage for more easily understanding the happenings to be reported in this portion of the update.

The proponents for reorganization of the Vocational Education Unit, particularly as it applied to the subject matter structure, believed that vocational educators (generalists) could do a more

effective job in servicing the needs of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) than could the subject matter personnel (specialists). The needs, as perceived by the Department of Education officials were those concerned with administrative shores, such as submitting plans for programs, claims for funds, and other required reports.

As the intentions of the Department to reduce subject matter personnel continued after 1974, the opposition to such plans strengthened its position.

This opposition came from many sources concerned with the welfare and retention of the subject matter services to schools. It came from secondary vocational education teachers and their students. It came from vocational education teacher organizations and from organizations such as the California Association, Future Farmers of America. It came from parents, agriculturists, and agriculture/industry organizations. It came from certain legislators. Strong support came from most of the agriculture teacher educators in the five agriculture teacher preparation institutions.

As a result, early in 1977, a coalition of these individuals and groups was formed under the banner of Citizens for the Advancement of Vocational Education (CAVE). Its primary purpose was to spearhead the opposition to the plans of the Department of Education and to raise money to conduct an opposition campaign.

The name of the group was soon changed because of an identity problem with the California Associations for Vocational Education (CAVE). The latter organization had been originally supported by and was fairly representative of vocational teachers and their associations, but it had become dominated by secondary school district and community college vocational education administrators; organization coordinators, ROP/C Directors, Deans for Vocational Education, Program Managers, etc. The new name chosen to replace Citizens for the Advancement of Vocational Education (CAVE) was Supporters for Action in Vocational Education (SAVE).

SAVE expanded the initial work of CAVE. Additional funds and other aids were solicited, the lobbying action became more intense, and more legislative contacts were initiated. A network system for sharing information, plans, and contacts was instituted. Newsletters were issued and proposals for legislation were made.

SAVE worked with and represented CATA, CIEA (California Industrial Education Association), and CBEA (California Business Education Association), as well as many individual persons. The Home Economics Association did not lend active organizational and financial assistance to SAVE, although many individual members were strongly supportive.

The Department of Education, through the efforts of one of Dr. Riles' chief deputies, undertook a strong, but unsuccessful drive to overcome the effects of the opposition. Subsequently, the Department temporarily drew back from its immediate plans for further reorganization of the subject matter structure in Vocational Education. The pressure of the opposition undoubtedly influenced this withdrawal, but other major concerns of the Department were taking much attention from 1974 to 1977.

The Vocational Education Unit needed to consolidate and formalize its administrative structure, including that of three Regional Coordinators Offices. The positions of the three Regional Coordinators apparently had been operated for several years without specific budgetary

provisions. The Department also was giving extensive attention to developing new and innovative programs such as Bilingual Education and Early Childhood Education.

Also, during this interval, the Department and its Vocational Education Unit was adapting to new provisions in federal funding made in Title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1976. These were substantial changes to those already encompassed in the 1963 Act. The state was required through its allocation of the federal funds, to reduce sex bias and stereotyping in all programs of vocational education. New emphasis was to be given to programs for the disadvantaged, handicapped, and limited or non-English speaking students. In addition, there was to be special allocation of funds to economically depressed areas and those with special manpower needs.

In addition, the Act of 1976 required states to increase their share of funding for state level administration, as follows:

- 20% sharing in 1977-78
- 40% sharing in 1978-79
- 50% sharing thereafter

This requirement made a serious problem for California, as expenditures from state monies for state level administration of vocational education historically had been rather small, whereas the expenditure of federal dollars for state administration had been comparatively large. For many years in California, the larger share of the state's matching of federal funds had been through the expenditures of the local education agencies.

In retrospect, it appears that California would have been wise, as some states were, to have earlier secured state legislation which would have provided for allocation of state funds specifically for support of vocational education classes. Vocational programs generally are more costly to operate than the so-called academic classes, and LEAs would be more willing to provide more adequate support for vocational classes if they had additional state monies for this purpose.

New requirements in the Federal Amendments were also of concern to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office. In their deliberations on the 1977-78 and 1978-79 budgets, they made specific recommendations for reduction of staff in the Vocational Education Unit.

An adequate review of these recommendations and resulting negotiations appears in an unnumbered and unpublished paper, Vocational Education in California, June 1976 – November 1978, prepared by the State Director of Vocational Education. Background information, dates, and recommendations from the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office are given. Also, included are resumes of the stance of the Department of Education on these recommendations, and its proposals for augmented funds which would have retained the positions. There is some evidence that the Department of Education did not vigorously oppose the cuts which it would largely make at the subject matter staff level.

During January and February of 1978, the coalition SAVE mounted a very active campaign directed at government officials and agencies dealing with the budget, actively protesting the indicated decimation of the subject matter servers. Progress was reportedly being made when

the specter of Proposition 13 became of paramount concern. Further consideration of budget matters were delayed pending the outcome of the June, 1978, election.

Proposition 13 was passed with a strong affirmative vote. As a result, the Governor's 1978-79 budget disregarded the augmentation requests of the Department of Education, and the recommendations previously made by the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office for reductions in Vocational Education were mandated. Immediately, the Department of Education moved, through the Office of the State Director of Vocational Education, to reorganize the Vocational Education Unit with the resulting demolition of the Bureau of Agricultural Education.

Because of later happenings, it is appropriate to record here that during this period of time there was considerable dissatisfaction in the Legislature with various procedures of the Department of Education. Certain legislators believed that the Department leadership had not lived up to previous commitments to them. A particular point of argument became the procedures used by the Department for allocation of federal vocational education funds to local school districts. Administrators of smaller school districts (usually rural) and their patrons were very unhappy with the formula used by the Department for allocation of federal vocational education funds for 1977-78. School districts serving the more populous centers were greatly favored by the formula. The Rural Caucus of the Legislature became unified on this matter and Dr. Riles was forced to change the formula for 1978-79.

With such conditions existing in the legislature, it was relatively easy for SAVE to find active interest in its campaign.

The above rather extensive introduction leads to the action which took place in the reorganization of the Vocational Education Unit in summer 1978.

Action

On July 1, 1978, by administrative order of State Director of Vocational Education Samuel Barrett, the reorganization occurred. It significantly affected the structure and personnel of the subject matter delivery system. Changes were ordered in titles, personnel, positions, assignments, and relationships within the structure.

The immediate and specific changes in agricultural education were:

- The Bureau of Agricultural Education, and the other subject matter Bureaus, were eliminated.
- The Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, Donald E. Wilson, was demoted to the position of Agriculture Program Manager. He had not supervisory responsibilities for state-wide vocational agriculture programs or for the direction and evaluation of agriculture field supervisors (Regional Supervisors).
- The position of Assistant Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education, was eliminated and the incumbent, Warren D. Reed, was directed to serve as Agricultural Education Consultant in the Southern Regional Vocational Education Office (Los Angeles), or seek other employment.

- The seven Regional Supervisors of Agricultural Education were retained as Agriculture Education Consultants. They were no longer to be members of a state-level agricultural education unit and were placed under the direct responsibility of the Regional Vocational Education Coordinators in the Coastal (Oakland), Central (Sacramento), and Southern (Los Angeles) offices.

These Consultants and their work would be under the control of the respective Regional Coordinators who would approve the work schedules and make assignments. They would be evaluated by these officers. Approximately 50% of their time would be devoted to work other than agricultural education, such as programs dealing with the Handicapped, Disadvantaged, Limited and Non-English Speaking, Migrant education, and the elimination of Sex Bias and Stereotyping.

- Jerry T. Davis, a Special Supervisor in the Bureau organization and Assistant State FFA Advisor, was demoted to Vocational Education Student Organization Consultant. He was to advise both the FFA and FHA (Future Homemakers of America). Patently, Mr. Davis was not qualified by training or experience for advising Future Homemaker students. He was to devote approximately 50% of his time to these advising duties; the other portion to be assigned in the Vocational Education Unit. This new position was not in line responsibility to Donald E. Wilson.

This total reorganization was to be in place by August 1, 1978. It accomplished the complete dismantling of what had been a most effective system for delivering services directly to the secondary schools of the state.

Another matter of grave concern to SAVE and its associates was that of the State governance of Vocational Education. It was believed that the State Board of Education (Department of Education) had been neglectful of vocational education. The Department had already depreciated the status of the Vocational Education Unit in the hierarchy of its administrative structure. It was further charged that the Department's emphasis on vocational education was slight and its leadership ineffective. So, the governance function of the Department received major attention from SAVE, as to be recorded under Senate Bill 1028.

Reaction

The immediate reaction of most of the members of the Bureaus to the July 1, 1978 action of the State Director was that of frustration, resentment, and discouragement. These staff members had devoted their professional careers to building renowned educational programs in their fields of expertise and they could not readily accept the concepts upon which the Department of Education officials based their plans. Certain leaders in the Bureaus endeavored to convince their superiors to reconsider their plan but to no avail. Opposition by staff individuals was soon prohibited by Department directives and policies. One staff member who had made an error in distributing an opposition statement on Department stationery to teachers in his region was severely reprimanded by the Department.

The initial reactions of vo-ag teachers were negative, as were those of their students. They were discouraged regarding their futures in professional teaching, and in the future of being prepared for employment in agriculture/agricultural business. If it had not been for the inspirational activities of many individuals, including the leadership of the CATA and the positive

response by teachers, local programs of vocational agriculture might well have suffered more permanent damage.

The reaction of SAVE was prompt. The network went into high gear and a campaign was designed. The results are outlined in the following paragraphs.

Results

A result of the Reorganization was a reduction in 1978-79 of the number of secondary schools offering vo-ag classes, a reduction in the number of teachers, fewer vo-ag classes available, and a resulting decrease in the number of students. Of course, the effect of Proposition 13 was a contributing factor in these reductions because, in the Spring and Summer of 1978, local schools had a most difficult task in planning and budgeting for school year 1978-79.

The most direct result, in opposition to the action by the Department of Education was the initiation of the legislation to correct what were believed to be errors by the Department. The first legislation proposed (SB 1028) was initiated before the July, 1978, action by the Department. The reasons for the introduction of SB 1028 are briefed immediately below.

SB 1028 (Dills) – Introduced in April, 1977, this Bill was very drastic in intent. It called for separating the governance function for vocational education from the State Board of Education (Department of Education) and placing it under a new State Board for Vocational Education. The development and introduction of the bill came about because of the mounting frustration and exasperation of those opposed to the attitude of the Department toward the subject matter structure and its services to schools.

The Principal Author was Senator Ralph Dills, a long-time carrier of education legislation. It attracted favorable attention from a goodly number of other legislators and listed an adequate number of co-authors.

The bill was strongly opposed by the Department of Education, the California Teachers' Association, the Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, and other compatible organizations. However, it moved successfully through the Senate Education Committee and to Senate Finance.

In January, 1978, it was evident that not enough affirmative votes could be mustered to pass it out of the Senate Finance Committee. After in-depth study by Senator Dills and SAVE, a decision was made to enter into negotiations with Dr. Davis Campbell, State Department of Education, to determine if a reasonable compromise might be reached. Dr. Larry P. Rathbun of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo (more on his part in all this later), worked with Senator Dills and Dr. Campbell. It was agreed that the bill would not be called for hearing, subject to certain conditions. Dr. Rathbun reported, "It was further agreed that State Superintendent of Schools, Wilson Riles, would appoint and fund a Study Committee to examine the entire problem facing vocational education and formulate legislation appropriate to its solution." The subject of this Commission, its appointment, recommendations, and outcomes will be treated in a separate section of this update.

AB 2494 (Perino) – This bill was designed to restore funding in the state budget for the 26 vocational education positions which the Department of Education gave up in 1977.

AB 247 (Waters) – Was reintroduced as AB 934 (Waters) – Senator Waters' bill would have provided \$500,000 annually for the support of vocational education student organizations.

Bills AB 2494 (Perino) and AB 934 (Waters) were lost in the wake of Proposition 13. Practically all legislative action came to a halt previous to the June, 1978, election.

AB 8 (Waters) – Introduced in January, 1978, it was passed by the legislature and signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown in August, 1979. This bill provided for an annual allocation of \$500,000 for the support of vocational education student organizations. The most important reason for the strong support by legislators was the tremendous pressures brought to bear by their constituents – students, parents of these students, student organizations, vocational teacher organizations, and agricultural industry representatives. The bill did not designate, or provide, funds for administration of the programs and this proved to be an unfortunate omission.

AB 991 (Greene) – Developed in 1979, this bill as first written was, in many ways, similar to SB 1028 (Dills). It again raised the question of governance, and assisted in keeping the pressure on the Department of Education. The opposition was essentially the same as for 1028, and the bill met a similar fate. SAVE and its backers were not able to assemble enough affirmative votes. The then current fiscal and political situations were not favorable for such response.

Several times during the period 1979-81, consideration was given by those concerned with the welfare of secondary agricultural education to instituting legislation which would have separated agricultural vocational education from the Department of Education and placed it under a different Department of state government. There was some favorable political reaction to this approach. The group finally decided, however, to work toward retraining agricultural education in the Department of Education, but mandating a state-level structure of Agricultural Vocational Education. The provisions of the resulting legislation (SB 187 – Nielsen) is discussed more fully below.

SB 990 (Vuich) – Introduced March 29, 1979, signed into law September 21, 1979.

This bill was initiated by Senator Vuich and not by SAVE but it is included here because it was another bit of legislation which kept the heat on the Department of Education leadership. The bill requires that:

- The California Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Training, mandated under Federal Vocational Education Acts, provide the same services to the Legislature as it renders the State Board of Education, the Board of governors of the California Community Colleges, the California Post-Secondary Education Commission, and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Advisory Council.
- The State Board of Education obtain Legislative approval of any State Plan for Vocational Education prior to submitting it to any other state agency involved with seeking funds under federal legislation.

Senator Vuich asked SAVE for support for this bill which was willingly given.

SB 187 (Nielsen) – Introduced January 29, 1981; signed into law September 18, 1981. Senator Jim Nielsen, a legislator much concerned about the welfare of agricultural education and the total agricultural industry of the state, approached the California Agricultural Teachers'

Association in the Summer of 1980 and volunteered to author and carry a bill which would address the problems faced by the system of secondary agricultural vocational education. His offer was enthusiastically embraced by the CATA, and a bill was written.

This bill was generally approved and supported by members of the Legislature. Principal Co-Authors were Senator Vuich, Assemblywomen Carol Hallett, and Assemblyman Waters. Thirty-six co-authors from the Senate and Assembly appeared on the bill.

Recognizing the importance of the agricultural industry to the well being and stability of the state, the bill declared the intent to the Legislature to provide a comprehensive Agricultural Vocational Education program within the state school system, in order that there by a continued source of trained and qualified individuals for employment in agriculture and agri-business.

More specifically, the bill created within the State Department of Education (1) an Agricultural Vocational Education Unit to assist school districts in the establishment and maintenance of educational programs, (2) a staffing level of an appropriate number of full-time employees, (3) provision for the Department to adopt rules and regulations to implement the bill and, (4) a position of State Supervisor of Agricultural Education.

It also requires the Department to accomplish staffing of the Unit by reassigning priorities in staff assignments within the Department. Provision is made for the establishment of an Advisory Committee of agriculturist representatives of the various and diverse areas of the agricultural industry in California. This committee is to develop recommendations for state programs in agricultural vocational education for presentation to the Legislature, for its approval and adoption.

Recommendation of the Advisory Committee are to 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 individual in agriculture.
- Strategy for articulating the state program in agricultural vocational education through the state school system, and
- Consumer education outreach strategy regarding the importance of agriculture in California.

The Advisory Committee is to present its recommendations on, or before, January 1, 1983. It is to be terminated on June 30, 1983.

The Bill, in its final form, omitted a requirement for establishing rules and regulations including standards. However, an expressed intent of the Legislature was included that "school districts and county offices of education are strongly advised to follow the guidelines set forth in this article."

After passage and signing into law of SB 187, the members of the Agricultural Education staff formed an ad hoc committee to consolidate concepts of what a revitalized unit and program for agricultural vocational education should be and do. A principle purpose of developing such a

statement was to have available a document which would be useful for reference by those studying proposals for programs, curriculums, and strategies. The committee is working at:

- Developing a definition of agricultural vocational education for California's public school system – both vocational and general education in agriculture.
- Designing a suggested delivery system and funding provisions for both programs.
- Outlining suggested standards for evaluating the processes and products of a the system.

The ad hoc committee presented a progress report at the December, 1981, staff meeting for discussion purposes. No deadline has been set for completion of the planned document, but it is anticipated that this should be sometime in Spring, 1982. At the time of the December meeting of the agricultural education group, there was no indication as to how expeditiously the State Superintendent of Public Instruction would move forward on implementing those initial provisions for which he is responsible. It is presumed that such action will not take place until a new State Director of Vocational Education has been appointed.

Samuel L. Barrett resigned from the State Director's post as of July 13, 1981. Since that time a search has been on for his replacement. It is generally believed this appointment will take place in December, 1981, or January, 1982. It is anticipated that those responsible for SB 187 will not be too patient in waiting for action by Dr. Riles.

The outcomes and long-time effects of SB 187 on agricultural education in California (perhaps on all of vocational education) will depend upon two things. One factor will be the way in which the Department of Education implements the intent and the provisions of the Bill. The other major influence will be the degree and persistence of the follow-up by the Legislature and the other proponents of the Bill. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee of agriculturist representatives, resulting action by the Legislature, and the continuity of action by the Department will be of vital importance to the future of agricultural education in California public schools.

This item should be a most interesting one for the next update of the HISTORY.

SB 157 (Greene) – Introduced February 28, 1980. The insertion of information on SB 157 seems necessary at this time, in order that the story of recent legislation effecting agricultural education in secondary schools be complete. This Bill was not fostered by SAVE but came about because of the actions of that body.

This Bill was initiated and sponsored by the Department of Education and was its interpretation into legislation of the Report of the Commission on Vocational Education. SAVE was asked to support the Bill, but "Since the definition of subject matter service areas and the funding approach, as well as governance, were absent from the original draft, SAVE and the agricultural education group decided not to support it."

As negotiations on this Bill took place, Senator Greene withdrew as Principal Co-Author and Senator Montoya took his place. This Bill cleared the Senate Education Committee without a single negative vote and also was passed by the Senate Finance Committee in a similar

manner. However, it was never scheduled for a floor vote in the Senate and died with the adjournment of the General Session in the summer of 1980.

Before closing this section, a description of later results should be included.

It will be recalled that the original orders, both written and oral, of the State Director not only did away with the structure of the subject matter Bureau, but also eliminated any responsibility of the "Program Managers" for supervision of programs and staffs. The subject matter staff members (consultants) were under the supervision and control of the Regional Vocational Education Coordinators. The student organization advisors (Consultants) were even more in limbo. There was not state level subject matter staff organization.

Through leadership and perhaps some initial subterfuge, the agricultural education group, including teacher educators of the agriculture teacher preparation institutions, maintained contact with each other and conducted periodic meetings.

As weeks progressed, approval was given by the State Director for this group to meet once per month, if necessary. This was a greater frequency than previously practiced when Bureau of Agricultural Education staff meetings had been held, usually every two-three months. However, travel budget were not increased to permit such frequency of meetings, nor were they deemed necessary.

As it has developed, the drastic changes initially ordered in operations in state level agricultural education matters have not actually occurred, or they have been altered, as indicated:

1. No state level staff organization – The staff has been permitted to meet in order to take part in program planning, discussions of program operations including those concerned with Future Farmers of America and Young Farmers, and conduct of in-service improvement.
2. Reduction by 50% of Agricultural Consultant time to be devoted to agriculture education – Generally, the Consultants have been able to utilize the time they consider necessary to render on-site services to schools and teachers.
3. Management and work plans of Consultants to be approved and evaluated by Regional Coordinators and to be adjusted by the Coordinators as they deemed advisable to provide services in other areas – Very little, if any, interference has occurred with plans and schedules for work in agricultural education.
4. No chain of command or responsibility (which would seem to prohibit direct communications) between the Program Manger, Agricultural Education Consultants, and the vocational education student organization Consultant – For a short time, such communication was reduced, but soon the total agricultural education staff was free to carry on direct communications useful and necessary to conduct of a state program of agricultural education.

These appear to be the most unusual developments in consideration of previously projected plans and the orders of the State Director and upper level officials of the Department of Education. It is a matter of conjecture as to how much the political pressures of SAVE, the actions of agricultural interests, and the developing legislation influenced these rather major

adjustments, but it is reasonable to assume that they had considerable bearing upon the matter.

Another situation may have influenced an apparent defusing of any aggressive follow-up by the Department. State Director Samuel Barrett retired from state service at the end of July, 1981. Acting State Director Jerry Levendowsky was soon to depart on leave for graduate study, and the new State Director of Vocational Education was not appointed until late in December, 1981.

Before leaving the subject of the Reorganization, recognition should be accorded those, other than members of the Department of Education staff, who gave outstanding service in the opposition to the plans of the Department of Education to eliminate the Bureau of Agricultural Education and thus reduce on-site services to teachers and students in local educational agencies. In the course of events, numerous individuals assumed opposition roles. State officers, regional officers, and other leaders in vocational teacher associations actively engaged in appearances before community groups and legislative committees and sub-committees. They worked with key legislators, talked with agriculture industry leaders and spokesmen, and initiated action by their respective professional associations.

In the CATA, state officers and area leaders were most effective in stimulating positive action by the constituencies of legislators. Regretably, the names of all who performed diligently for agriculture cannot be included, but a few who performed meritorious service should be recognized.

One was 1977-78 State CATA President Ken Harris, later first Executive Director of the CATA. Another was Donald L. Hendricks, 1978-79 State CATA President. Because of his advantageous location at Oakdale (convenient to Sacramento) in a populous rural region of the state, and his contacts with several state legislators, Hendricks was called upon time after time to speak for vocational agriculture and the FFA.

Dr. Larry P. Rathbun, Head, Department of Agricultural Education, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, devoted hundreds of hours and distinguished leadership to the cause. He did so with full approval and support of his superiors at the University and at considerable personal sacrifice. Among his many activities were:

- Serving as Coordinator of SAVE.
- Initiating and advising on many plans of the vocational teacher associations.
- Preparing informational papers.
- Speaking before many groups, including giving testimony at many legislative committees and sub-committees.
- Working with the legislative advocate for SAVE and influential legislators and their aides in preparing legislation.
- Serving on the Commission on Vocational Education.

The subject of the reorganization and resulting actions has taken a major place in this HISTORY. It was a happening of major consequences in the time span 1974 – 1981, and an important episode not only because it occurred but because of the reasons why it happened and how it was conducted. It had a great effect upon many individuals and groups. Will the ultimate results prove positive? Will they be productive of a stronger and more effective program of agricultural education in California's secondary schools?

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION – Progress and Teacher Leadership Developments

From its inception on July 13, 1920, the California Agricultural Teachers' Association has exerted a positive effect upon the quality and scope of agricultural education in the public schools of California. The organizational and educational activities conducted by the association through monthly sectional-get-togethers, regional meetings, and an annual Conference has had direct effect upon the total agricultural instructional work, including the developed excellence of the Future Farmers of America organization – local, sectional, regional, and state.

CATA has long been recognized by other professionals and by the agricultural industry of California as an outstandingly effective teacher association. Supporting the state program of the State Department of Education's Bureau of Agricultural Education, CATA has been a strong arm of the total agricultural education effort.

This position has been continued during 1974-81. The organization has aggressively met new challenges and changes. As the historically strong leadership of the State Bureau of Agricultural Education was weakened by threatened actions and then by direct action, the teachers responded to the need for greater support and action in protecting the welfare of the state-wide system.

The CATA, as an organization, became active in building a network for political action. The officers, and other leaders, devoted literally hundreds of hours in related activities. They made appearances, and organized appearances of others, before legislative committees. They worked with interested and concerned legislators and their aides in providing such persons requested information.

At that June, 1979, Conference the membership voted to increase the annual dues from \$35 to \$120, to become effective with the year 1980-81. The change was to provide for a more stable financial condition of the organization and to make possible the employment of an Executive Director. The position was filled in January, 1981, with the appointment of Ken Harris. Mr. Harris had been the 1977-78 CATA State President and a practicing vo-ag teacher up to the time of his appointment to the Executive Director's position.

The dedication, professional enthusiasm, cooperation, and leadership of the members and officers has resulted in positive action by the State Legislature and the Governor in providing the vehicle (SB 187) for reconstituting the leadership of the State Department of Education in California's secondary agricultural vocational education system.

CATA PRESIDENTS

1974-75 Dixie Mitchell, Westmont High School, Campbell

1975-76	William R. Jantzen, Madera High School
1976-77	Jay Palmer, Shandon High School
1977-78	Kenneth K. Harris, Hughson High School
1978-79	Donald L. Hendricks, Oakdale High School
1979-80	James C. Hart, Arlington High School, Riverside
1980-81	Bernard J. Crane, J. W. North High School, Riverside
1981-82	Joe Russo, Kings River Community College, Reedley

Exemplary Program Award

A description of this award, begun in 1978, is included in the CATA section because the grants are made at the Annual CATA Conference, held at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. Actually, this award program is sponsored by the State Agricultural Education Staff and supported through personal financial contributions by the State Supervisor and Teacher Educator staff personnel.

The concept of state-wide recognition of outstanding instructional programs was first developed in 1977 by a State Staff committee under the chairmanship of Dr. J. Kenneth Baker, North Coast Regional Supervisor. The rationale for establishment of this unique award was that exemplary instructional programs in vocational agriculture should be recognized within the framework of the profession.

Vocational agriculture teachers, like most persons, place emphasis in terms of time and effort on those activities which are personally rewarding and highly valued by their peers and supervisors. Traditional award programs for both teachers and students have been based upon achievements which are means to an end, in most cases, rather than ends in themselves.

In this instance, an accepted major goal of vocational education in agriculture is the placement of those who complete instructional programs in the occupation for which they have been trained. Thus, exemplary instructional programs are those which best achieve this end, or goal. The awards are recognition for teachers, their vocational agriculture departments and local school districts which excel in such accomplishment. It is viewed that this award program will encourage more departments to meet the occupational needs of their students.

The record of Exemplary Program Award winners for 1978, the first year awards were made is not available. More recent awards are:

<u>PROGRAMS</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>
Ag. Production	Fillmore	Hollister	Hollister
Ag. Mechanics	Santa Maria	Fall River, McArthur	(Not Available)
Ag. Supplies	(Not Available)	San Jacinto	El Capitan, Lakeside
Ag. Products	Righetti, Santa Maria	Righetti, Santa Maria	Tracy
Forestry/Nat. Res.	Manchester, Fresno	Manchester, Fresno	Manchester, Fresno
Orn. Horticulture	Manchester, Fresno	Manchester, Fresno	Manchester, Fresno

State Winners receive a crisp \$50.00 bill during the awards ceremony at the Annual Conference.

The Commission on Vocational Education

This commission was appointed by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles in early 1978, following the pressure engendered by AB 1028 was that SAVE would be given the opportunity to recommend persons for membership on the Commission. Such recommendations were made after consultation with various organizations both in and out of vocational education. Also, there was a tacit understanding that Dr. Rathbun would be consulted as to the person to be named chairman of the commission. The latter did not occur.

Of the 32 Commissioners appointed by Dr. Riles, the majority were administrators of school districts, school district supervisory personnel, or ROP/C administrators. Several representatives of the employer/industry/business/labor union segments were included. Three vocational subject matter teachers were named, including Elmer Danbom, an agriculture instructor at Eureka High School. Three high school student representatives were listed, including a State Officer of the FFA. One consultant to a legislative committee and one lone individual identified as a parent appear on the roster. Not a single agriculturist was appointed. Larry Rathbun was the SAVE representative.

Dr. Riles charged the Commission to recommend to him on the following issues:

1. The vocational and career needs of students.
2. The needs of industry, labor and society.
3. The capacity of the educational system to respond to the needs of industry, labor and society.
4. Strategies and resources, both fiscal and human, needed to support quality vocational education programs at the local level.

Samuel L. Barrett, State Director of Vocational Education, was assigned as Executive Secretary to the Commission. He was assisted by five other staff persons and by five secretaries. As the Report was approaching final form, certain Department personnel were unhappy with its contents and endeavored to influence votes by some members. One aide was heard to remark that if certain passages were not changed, it would never see the light of day.

As the title – A Unified Approach to Occupation Education – Report of the Commission on Vocational Education – suggests, much emphasis is given to philosophical considerations of what should be and for justification for the Unified Educational System. The language in the Philosophy Statements “Although the major responsibility of the occupational education component is work preparation, all other components, at all levels share in that responsibility. Conversely, occupational education cannot ignore the vital interpersonal, citizenship, and basic skills that are primarily the responsibility of other components, can be interpreted as a backhanded slap at vocational education.”

Undoubtedly, vocational education forces would be happier to see these statements worded ‘Although the major responsibility of all other components of the system are for developing interpersonal, citizenship, and basic skills, vocational education shares in that responsibility.

Conversely, the other components cannot ignore the vital job preparation skills which are primarily the responsibility of vocational education.'

The Report devotes 19 pages to more general aspects of the responsibility of the Commissioners, emphasizing the Unified approach implicit in the title. It outlines the components of a quality educational program and the position of occupational education in it.

One analysis of the Report is that it contains many goals which are highly desirable ones. In specificity as to organization, structure, and processes to accomplish the goals, it leaves much to further determination. It seems to offer little which will resolve the problems of vocational education; the problems which brought about the Commission and its study.

There is one exception to the thought expressed in the above paragraph. On page 5 of the report, five services of the State Department of Education to school site occupational education programs are listed. If these services are adequately and faithfully provided, the Department will do much to re-establish a strong vocational educational program in California and its position of positive leadership.

The report was submitted to Dr. Riles on February 28, 1979. It was held on back burner for several months being prepared for distribution sometime in late spring or summer, 1979. A memo to Commission members from Dr. Riles dated July 13, 1979, set the date of distribution at that time. Actual distribution, however, took place at a later date only after repeated inquiries and requests from certain Commission members and State Legislators.

The only visible action by the Department as a result of the recommendations in the report was introduction of the aborted SB 157 (Greene-Montoya). From the standpoint of subject matter centered vocational education, the results of AB 187 (Nielsen) may have more immediate effect than the recommendations of the Report of the Commission.

The California Association, Future Farmers of America

In this period of time when the usual vigorous leadership of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, State Department of Education, was being eroded within the Department and its services curtailed to schools and the FFA, it was feared that these conditions would have a detrimental effect upon the FFA. Initially, there was an adverse effect but vigorous actions by FFA members and their association, and by parents and many other organizations in the state, brought about legislative support which resulted in enactment of AB 8 (Waters).

Quite promptly signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown, this measure assisted materially to rejuvenate state level advisorship services to the FFA, as well as to the other vocational education student organizations. Dedicated local teacher/advisors, in this period of discouragement and also the willingness of area Agriculture Consultants to go an additional mile beyond their official assignments immediately after Reorganization were prime factors in insuring the welfare of the FFA.

Through use of AB 8 support funds, vocational education student advisor workshops were held in 1979, 1980 and 1981. The 1979 event attracted 175 local advisors; in 1980 – 225; and in 1981 – 219. According to Jerry T. Davis, Assistant State FFA Advisor, these Advisor Workshops, coupled with the effect of the similar FFA officer/leader training sessions, have

been most beneficial. He stated, "There has been very definite stimulation to chapter activities and greater development of leadership in individual FFA officers and members."

The author has not endeavored to secure evidence as to the effect of AB 8 on other student organizations. Since state level activity was participated in, it is hoped that positive results were achieved.

Among other state level FFA projects accomplished in 1981 were:

- Publication of a book LEADERSHIP IN AGRICULTURE – A HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA FFA 1928 – 1980, compiled by Jerry T. Davis, Assistant State FFA Advisor.
- Preparation and distribution of Informational Papers on the FFA.
- Development, publication and distribution of two Membership Handbooks. Distributed to all California FFA members and others.

In 1980, a change was made in the make-up of the membership of the California Future Farmers of America Foundation. Previously, the majority of the Directors had been vo-ag teachers and, in their high school days, FFA leaders/officers. They had rendered devoted and able service during the initial organization and activity of the foundation. It was determined that a change should be made to bring into directorship more industry persons – individuals who had broad contacts in the business/industry sector and who had expertise in fund raising. The result has been advantageous and the Foundation is in a healthy financial situation through grants, gifts of property, including a 350 acre farm, and similar contributions.

The present Directors of the Foundation are:

Kristann DeSilva, Agriculture Teacher
Larry Dutto, CATA President & Agriculture Teacher
Steve Easter, Secretary, California Almond Growers
Leland H. Ruth, Executive Vice President, Ag. Council of California (Chairman)
John Welty, California State Grange (Secretary/Treasure)
Walt Shaw, Radio Station KRAK (Director Public Information)
Dick McMillan (Vice Chairman)
William B. Staiger, Executive Vice President, California Cattlemen's Association
Michele Wakeham, President, California Association FFA
Ole Mettler, President, Farmers & Merchants Bank of Central California
Jeff Thompson, Agriculture Instructor
Jim Van Maren, California Chamber of Commerce
Stan Mollart, Agriculture Instruction
Don Wilson, State FFA Advisor

In general, the California Association, Future Farmers of America is healthy and achieving its objectives.

A group of California State FFA Officers met on July 5, 1980 and initiated a club identified as California Past State Officers. While not an official or integral part of the California Association,

Future Farmers of America, it is concerned with the welfare of vocational agriculture and the FFA in California. Self-identified as “watch dogs for agricultural vocational education and the FFA,” it will be interesting to see if the group becomes a viable one which will accomplish its objectives. Tom Munter, a past State Officer, is chairman pro-tem and the group is embarked upon a members drive. CALIPSO is the acronym for the organizations.

In the summer of 1980, the State Department of Education agreed to set aside and make available \$450,000 from Sub-part 3 funds for use in development and encouragement of student vocational education organizations. For agriculture and the FFA this meant \$450.00 for each local chapter. The money could be expanded to support any regular and proper activity or project of the chapter which would be of benefit to it. Travel of members and offices could be supported as would the purchase of certain materials and equipment.

It has been observed that this fund has been of distinct benefit to certain FFA chapters. State-wide effect will undoubtedly depend upon success in local administration of the funds. No measurement of total effectiveness has been conducted to date. This should be done if provision can be made for a proper survey.

Vocational Education Productions (VEP), California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Continuing a program of producing multi-media instructional materials for vocational agriculture initiated by the Agriculture Teacher Training program in the late 1950's with two color film strips, VEP now publishes a catalog listing nearly 200 different items. The materials consist of instructional manuals, colored slides, color transparencies, cassettes, curriculum guidelines, workbooks, and complete teaching-learning kits consisting of several parts and various materials.

The program uses an extensive system for gathering information as to the needs and desires of its primary patrons – the teachers of agriculture in California's secondary schools and community colleges. It involves panels of these teachers in providing guidelines for production, frequently uses teachers as basic writers, and utilizes the services of recognized specialists in developing the materials. The quality of the visuals has been excellent.

The State Department of Education through its Bureau of Agricultural Education, and using federal funds, has stimulated Cal Poly's VEP efforts which uses a faculty/staff Advisory Committee to guide its operations. An annual evaluation of the program and its products is directed by the university's Agricultural Education Department with official copies going to the Cal Poly Foundation and representatives of the State Department of Education.

VEP also acts as the State Center in California for the instructional materials produced by the American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, Athens, Georgia.

State Staff Changes: Agricultural Education, Department of Education and Teacher Education Personnel

The period of 1969-74 saw many changes in state level personnel and the current seven year period records even a greater changing of personnel. Some of these changes will have been mentioned in other sections of this update, in describing various management decisions and actions.

Attention is directed now to the omission in the HISTORY for 1969-74. Joe Sabol, formerly an instructor in the Agriculture Department at Mt. San Antonio College, Walnut, resigned from that school in the summer of 1972 to accept appointment in the Agricultural Education Department, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

From August, 1972 until November, 1975, the North Coast Region was without the services of a regularly assigned supervisor. Regional Supervisors in several other regions and Bureau Assistant Chief Warren Reed were called upon in various years and for various periods of time to work with various schools in the Region. Regional supervisors involved were Ted Gregg, Sandy Beck, Emile LaSalle, and Keith Smith. This chaotic situation caused much unhappiness among school administrators, agriculture teachers, students, FFA members and regional officers and parents. They were unhappy, not because of lack of effort by those trying to do two jobs, but because of the relative inaccessibility, lack of advice and counseling, and the leadership to which they were accustomed.

In the summer of 1974, W. James Maynard, Regional Supervisor, Southwestern Region, retired after twenty-six years of service in vocational agriculture at the state level. A meticulous individual of high ethical standards, Mr. Maynard took pride in rendering quality advisorship to the Future Farmers and the Young Farmers in his region. He had major responsibilities in representing the Bureau and the FFA with the Great Western Livestock Show and the Los Angeles County Fair.

At the start of the 1974-75 year, the Southwestern Region was without a replacement for Mr. Maynard. Maurice Fleming (Southern Region) and other staff persons endeavored to fill the temporary gap. Later in the year, C. Paul Stark, agriculture director at Riverdale High School was employed on a temporary basis to take Mr. Maynard's place. In the following year (1975), Mr. Stark was given permanent status.

Early in 1974-75, Regional Supervisor Sanford I. Beck, Central Region, was assigned to other duties in vocational education (Acting Regional Vocational Coordinator) by the State Director. To help fill the gap in the Central Region, Keith V. Smith, who had formerly taught vo-ag at El Dorado High School, Placerville, and who was on special assignment in agricultural education at the University of California, Davis, was assigned supervisor duties for the northern section of that region.

Jerry Biggs, San Joaquin Valley Regional Supervisor, was assigned the added duty for schools in the southern section of the Central Region. This condition continued until 1976, when Sandy Beck was reassigned to the Bureau of Agricultural Education and the Central Region.

In the summer of 1975, Alan S. Damann, who was a vo-ag teacher at Hemet High School, resigned from that school to accept a position in the Agricultural Education Department, at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo.

In November, 1975, Dr. J. Kenneth Baker resigned from the position of Agriculture Teacher Educator, University of California, Davis, to accept the position of North Coast Regional Supervisor. This appointment relieved the situation described in a previous paragraph.

In June, 1976, Emile LaSalle, South Coast Regional Supervisor, retired from state service. Mr. LaSalle was another person who had devoted many years of dedicated service to vo-ag

teaching and supervisory work. A dynamic individual, he worked assiduously to inspire students and teachers to excel. He was an inspiration to those with whom he had contact.

With the reassignment of Sandy Beck, in June 1976, to the Central Region from his temporary post as Acting Regional Vocational Education Coordinator, and the resignation of Mr. LaSalle from the South Coast post, Keith Smith was transferred to the latter position in June, 1976.

Also, in June, 1976, two of the Specialist positions and their programs were eliminated. This was a result of changes and reductions in available federal funds. Jack Lawrence, Specialist in Young Farmer and Adult Education, stationed at the University of California, Davis, left the post to assume direction of the vo-ag program at Dixon High School. William D. Wills, Specialist for In-Service Education, conducted through California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, left that position for retirement.

In August, 1976, Dr. James G. Leising, formerly a vo-ag teacher in Nebraska, came from graduate study at Iowa State University to assume the position of Agriculture Teacher Educator at U. C., Davis.

In the summer of 1976, Dr. Osmund S. Gilbertson, Head, Agricultural Education Department, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, resigned to accept appointment as head of the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at the University of Nebraska. Dr. Gilbertson had been at Cal Poly for eight years.

Upon Dr. Gilbertson's resignation, Dr. Larry P. Rathbun, who had been on the Ag. Ed. Staff at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, since 1970, was appointed Acting Head and the following fall was appointed head of the department.

In September, 1976, Dr. Floyd J. Lark came from graduate study at Oklahoma State University to Cal Poly, Pomona, as assistant teacher educator. At the end of the school year (1976-77), Dr. Paul Peterson, head agriculture teacher educator there resigned to move to his home state of Utah as Consultant in Agriculture Education (State Supervisor equivalent). Dr. Lark was promoted to Dr. Peterson's previous position.

October, 1976 saw the employment of Jean Landeen as Specialist for Curriculum Development to fill that Bureau of Agricultural Education/University of California, Davis, position. Miss Landeen had taught vo-ag at Grace Davis High School, Modesto, and was engaged in graduate study at U. C., Davis.

In September, 1977, Jim Morris was employed in the Agricultural Education Department at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. Mr. Morris had taught vo-ag at Bret Harte High School, Angeles Camp. He stayed at Cal Poly until August, 1979, when he accepted a position as Assistant Vice President for Agricultural Public Relations, Bank of America, San Francisco.

At the end of 1977-78, Dr. Floyd J. Lark resigned from Cal Poly, Pomona, to accept a similar position at the new Panhandle State University, Goodwell, Oklahoma. Flint Freeman served in an acting capacity until September, 1980, when Dr. Richard Hylton came from graduate study at Mississippi State University. He had previously been a vo-ag teacher in Virginia.

In August, 1978, Dr. Richard Rogers returned to California from his graduate study at the Iowa State University to become Agriculture Teacher Educator at California State University, Fresno.

In July, 1978, South Coast Regional Supervisor, Keith Smith, resigned from that position to accept one as a teacher educator in agriculture at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo. A part of his duties encompassed acting as Assistant State Advisor for the California Young Farmers, under a Sub-part 3 contract between Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, and the State Department of Education.

Keith Smith's position as South Coast Regional Supervisor was filled in August, 1978, by Warren D. Reed, formerly Assistant Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education.

In January, 1980, James Morris accepted the position of Agriculture Education Coordinator (Teacher Educator) at California State University, Chico, taking the place of Dennis Hampton who was on leave from the university working for the Economic Institute, Davis, California. Mr. Hampton returned to his position at Chico in January, 1981, at which time Mr. Morris left CSU, Chico, to come back to Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo until August, 1981, at which time he entered agriculture production work at Lockeford, CA.

In November 1979, J. Kenneth Baker was transferred within the Department of Education from his position in Agricultural Education to that of a Consultant in the Office of the Regional Coordinator for Vocational Education. Baker's vacancy in Agricultural Education was filled in January, 1981, by Jean Landeen who left her job as specialist for Curriculum Development.

At the end of December, 1981, Dr. Alan Damann, who had been on the Agricultural Education Department staff at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, since 1975, resigned his position to enter private employment.

State Director of Vocational Education, Department of Education

Samuel L. Barrett began his service as State Director in August, 1973, serving in this capacity until July 13, 1981, when he retired from state service. In his professional career, Mr. Barrett had been a vo-ag teacher, a Regional Supervisor of Agricultural Education, a Regional Coordinator of Vocational Education (Central Office), an assistant to the then State Director Wesley P. Smith, and Acting Director following Mr. Smith's retirement in January, 1973.

As is apparent from a perusal of this HISTORY, Mr. Barrett served as State Director during a period of considerable change in the nature and scope of public school vocational education, particularly influenced by changes in the form and amount of federal funding for this area of education. Mr. Barrett was in the position of needing, and not getting, visible and strong support from his superiors in the State Department of Education. While vowing to make the program of vocational education of top priority, actual action by the Administration was leveled at endeavoring to change the role and state structure of vocational education.

A divided house between the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges contributed to a conflict of interests and pressures, primarily centered on the allocation of federal vocational education monies and on the place, in California's public school system, where vocational education should be emphasized. This continuing situation does not make for a unified, coordinated approach to the total program of vocational education in the state.

Information in late December, 1981, was that (Mrs.) Pat Langlin, Regional Coordinator for Vocational Education in the Southern (Los Angeles) Office, had been appointed State Director of Vocational Education by State Superintendent Wilson Riles. Mrs. Langlin's professional background has been in Business Education. According to agricultural education personnel who have worked with her, Mrs. Langlin is a capable organizer who has had very effective working relationships with colleagues and those under her supervision. In her new position, Mrs. Langlin has been assured of initial understanding and cooperation from the state agricultural education staff.

Under date of December 23, 1981, in a letter of response to one from Senator Jim Nielsen, Dr. Riles outlined a tentative schedule for implementing the initial conditions of SB 187. He included, by January 30, 1982, selection and appointment of the State Supervisor of Agricultural Vocational Education, the selection and appointment of the Advisory Committee by February 29, 1982 and, within a month of the appointment of the State Supervisor, "specific work plans for the Agricultural Vocational Education Unit...."

A factor which will continue to influence the action of the State Department in providing for the administration of vocational education will be available financial resources. Dr. Riles referred to this item in his letter to Senator Nielsen. The supporters of agricultural vocational education must be aware of the critical nature of this factor and how it will influence administrative decisions of the Department.

State finances are in dire straits and agricultural vocational education supporters will do well to undertake a long-range plan for achieving more adequate staff funding. It is supposed that the Department leadership will move toward treating all areas of vocational education the same as that accorded agricultural vocational education under the provisions of SB 187. It is quite apparent that it will behoove all of the subject matter areas in vocational education to unify and consolidate their efforts, if adequate financial provisions are ultimately to be attained.

What actually transpires in the next year, or two or three, regardless the priority and positive support afforded vocational education in the public secondary schools by the Department of Education, will be most interesting to observe. If the present top administration remains in control, then the agricultural vocational education supporting forces must remain alert and active in keeping the pressure on the upper hierarchy. It will be imperative to continue nurturing legislative interests and concerns, in order to insure that "an agricultural vocational education unit to assist school districts in the establishment and maintenance of education programs established pursuant to the provisions of this article is consummated and adequately provided for by the Department of Education.

Conclusion

The period June, 1974 through December, 1981 has been a challenging one for agricultural education in California secondary schools. The challenge has been for the teachers and the state staff in agriculture to maintain positive attitudes and to continue providing an active educational program for the students, in light of many frustrations and discouragements.

The passage of Proposition 13 resulted in reduced financial support for secondary schools, and public school administrators were faced with troublesome decisions. Reduced federal vocational education funds for support of the traditional, on-going programs added to the problem. The destruction of the Bureau of Agricultural Education, including reduction and

elimination of personnel and services to schools further stimulated frustrations. It was a time of confusion and instability.

There have been achievements and plus factors in secondary agricultural education. New strengths in support and unit were accomplished. The California Agriculture Teachers' Association reached a new level of responsibility and maturity.

Legislation was passed and signed into law which provides specifically for a new structure of agricultural vocational education. It provides the framework for development of revitalized, even new, educational program in agriculture in California. The only lack is adequate state funding for state administration and supplemental support to local educational agencies (LEA's). When economic conditions improve, this lack must be addressed.

The new legislation (SB 187) may provide the vehicle for a new lease on life, dependent upon the good faith of the Department of Education leadership, and united efforts to eventually secure necessary funding to support an exemplary educational system. Some phases of agricultural vocational education have weakened during this period and these must be rejuvenated, or replaced, with more effective methods. Needing particular attention are total teacher load, the year-around educational effort in agriculture, provisions for more practical (less theoretical) in-class instruction, and more adequate provisions for hands-on supervised occupational experience.

Recruitment of high potential agriculture teacher candidates needs stimulation. State teacher preparation and licensing provisions, as they currently work to the detriment of producing quality beginning teachers, should be modified to improve the system.

In concluding this update of the HISTORY, it seems apropos to suggest that agricultural vocational education, and indeed the other subject matter categories of vocational education, should move to obtain more concrete data which will support legislation needed to more adequately provide an effective state structure and supplemental state funds for conduct of strong local vocational training programs. An in-depth study of the delivery systems for vocational education in several other states (if not already available) might yield valuable information as to the most effective systems, and why they are most effective.

Management decisions in California which are based only upon administrative evaluation of numbers and upon consideration related to the sole responsibility of the Vocational Education Unit "for administering the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P. L. 88-210) and the Education Amendments of 1976 (P. O. 94-482) as it applies to secondary vocational education in California," will never, in the opinion of this author, result in the development within the Department of a vocational education system of excellence which will meet the vocational/occupational needs of California.

California had a highly regarded delivery system at one time, before 90% of administrative efforts was channeled to devising and conducting paperwork, presumably to meet Federal program requirements. It appears that top level management (administrators), and their analysts, become over-whelmingly engrossed in paperwork and other convoluting processes of administration. There is little energy or creativity left to come out at the end where quality service and leadership in the subject matter categories should be available to LEA's and students.

As there is not apparent official statement of Policies and Goals for a California system of Vocational Education, separate and independent of any federal/state plan, the development of such a statement should be a first priority of the Department of Education. Such a statement should include a section presenting Philosophical considerations and Concepts, and sections dealing with the subject matter categories, recognizing the differences in educational needs and processes of these categories, as well as their similarities.

It is past time for constructing a CALIFORNIA system of Vocational Education. Vision is needed in doing so, as well as plans for developing state funding which will supplement local district expenditures. Plans for utilization of federal monies should be a part of such a total plan but not the over-riding influence, as it has been in the past decade.

There is an existing lack of coordination and absence of a unified directive force for the myriad programs and funds devoted to training and retraining youth and adults for employment, as reported by the Assembly Bill 576 Task Group "Vocational Education and Youth Employment Training Programs in California." Also, in this area of lack of coordination, a recent survey of certain literature on various aspects of vocational education in this state turned up a veritable jungle of data. Scores of studies, surveys and reports by individuals, committees, commissions, councils and task groups are listed. Whether mandated, or not mandated, the reports too often appear self-serving; recommendations are frequently disregarded.

It is recognized that the administration of the governance function over a complex educational program of many facets is not a simple task. None-the-less, it must be addressed and the responsibility accepted with good faith.

While a similar state structural form for the different subject matter categories of vocational education had functioned effectively in past decades, their individual processes and operational practices had wisely been permitted to differ. This necessitated an understanding administration. The construction and application of formulas for the allocation of federal funds also has called for good judgment and capable administration.

Two public education systems are involved with vocational education, secondary education and the community colleges. Several other government agencies, federal and state, are involved with vocational training and this makes for competition (particularly for funds), duplication, and lack of unity in purpose.

The administrative system is an operation which should receive guidance and advice from knowledgeable sources, including the patrons to be served. Such input should be thoughtfully considered when arriving at policy and operational decisions, rather than relying solely on managerial judgments of officers who have little, if any, expertise in the field being governed.

From the evidence, the total program of vocational education in the public schools could be governed more effectively. Dr. Thomas M. Bogetich, Executive Director, California Advisory Council on Vocational Education (CACVE), in his paper "A Historical Perspective: Conditions Leading/Contributing to the Issues of Vocational Education Governance and State-Level Services in California," not only provides a well documented perspective, but offers seven (7) recommendations for attention:

1. A definition of the purpose and role of vocational education within academic and general education.

2. Elimination of burdensome paperwork and administrative inefficiencies, duplication, etc.
3. Development of a unity of purpose among the entire vocational education family.
4. Establishment of program standards, accountability measures and evaluative criteria emphasizing educational and student outcomes.
5. Needs assessments to justify State-level services and financial support to meet unmet needs.
6. A viable planning process which results in maximum services to students using all available resources.
7. Making existing governance structures work more effectively.

This author finds merit in Dr. Bogetich's historical review. His recommendations could serve as a good springboard for further careful study. All vocational education forces, and those sincerely interested in strengthening the program in California, would do well to read his paper. Out of an in-depth study, participated in by a broad representation, might come some solutions to the problems and controversy presently plaguing an educational system which should be, and can be, a vital force in public education.

HISTORICAL RECORD OF MEMBERS OF THE STATE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION STAFF, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1) AND AGRICULTURAL EDUCATORS OF CALIFORNIA COLLEGIATE INSTITUTIONS APPROVED FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE (2)

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION(S)</u>	<u>YEARS OF SERVICE</u>	<u>RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED</u>	<u>PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION</u>
Dale W. Andrews (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1951-58	Reassigned	VP for Administration, CPSU
Ed. B. Angier (1)	Supervisor Ag. Education LA City Schools	1939-47	Re-Assigned LA City Schools	Retired, Ventura, CA
Kenneth J. Baker (2)	Head, Teacher Ed. UC Davis	1972-75	Resigned	
(1)	Regional Supv.	1975-80	Resigned	Voc. Ed. Cons., Oakland, CA
Karl Bakken (1)	Regional Supv. Temporary	1978-79		
	Regional Supv.	1979		Regional Office, LA, CA
Jerry Barkley (1)	Special Curriculum	1972-73	Resigned	Dean, Voc. Ed., KRCC Reedley, CA
Samuel Barrett (1)	Regional Supv.	1960-68	Transferred	
	Regional Coord.	1968-73	Promoted	
	Voc. Ed. State Dir.	1973-81	Retired	Davis, CA
	Acting Regional Coord. Voc. Ed.	1974-76	Re-Assigned	
	Regional Supv.	1976		Sacramento, CA

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
Sanford Beck (1)	Regional Supv.	1971-74	Transferred	
James Becket (1)	Special Curriculum	1964-70	Resigned	
	Voc. Ed. Impr. Ed.	1970-77	Resigned	Voc. Ed. Coord. Woodland
Jerry L. Biggs (1)	Regional Supv.	1971		Fresno, CA
Eugene Boone (1)	Asst. State Supv. OSYA	1941-42	Re-Assigned	Modesto, CA
Herbert H. Burlingham (1)	Regional Supv.	1942-48	Resigned	
	(2) Head, Teacher Ed. CPSU	1948-72	Retired	San Luis Obispo, CA
Howard F. Chappell (1)	Regional Supv.	1927-58	Retired	Deceased
Allan Christenson (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1969-70	Re-Assigned	Dean of Agriculture, CPSU
George P. Couper (1)	Information Spec. CPSU	1931-33	Re-Assigned	
	Special Supv. & Asst. State FFA Adv.	1933-65	Retired	Sacramento, CA
W. E. Court (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1937-39	Re-Assigned	Retired, Loomis, CA
Kenneth B. Cutler (1)	Regional Supv.	1949-69	Retired	Deceased
Alan S. Damann (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1975-81	Resigned	San Francisco, DA
Jerry T. Davis (1)	Spec. Supv. & Asst. State FFA Adv.	1967		Sacramento, CA

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
B. R. Denbigh (1)	Regional Supv.	1931-58	Retired	Deceased
Lloyd Dowler (2)	Head, Teacher Ed. CSU Fresno	1969-78	Retired	Fresno, CA
Kenneth Easter (2)	Teacher Ed. CSUF	1972-79	Retired	Dos Palos, CA
E. W. Everett (1)	Regional Supv.	1926-39	Re-Assigned	
	Asst. Chief & Coord. I-on-F Train.	1939-47	Re-Assigned	
	Asst. Chief	1957-60	Retired	Deceased
Weir Fetters (1)	Regional Supv. & Teaching Aids	1941-42	Re-Assigned	
	Coordinator RWPT	1942-44	Retired	Stockton, CA
Maurice Fleming (1)	Regional Supv.	1969-78	Resigned	Foreign Service Officer, US Dept., Bamako, Mali
Flint Freeman (2)	Teacher Ed. CSPU	1978		Pomona, CA
J. Cordner Gibson (1)	Regional Supv.	1946-49	Resigned	
	(2) Teacher Ed. CPSU	1957-61	Re-Assigned	Retired 1977 as Dean of Ag & Natural Resources, CPSU
Osmund S. Gilbertson (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1968-72	Promoted	
	Head, Teacher Ed., CPSU	1972-76	Resigned	Head Teacher Ed., University of Nebraska

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
E. D. Graf (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1955-56	Resigned	
(1)	Region Supv.	1956-60	Re-Assigned	
	Asst. Chief	1960-69	Re-Assigned	
	Chief, Program Planning Unit Voc. Ed.	1969-77	Retired	Sacramento, CA
Ted B. Gregg (1)	Regional Supv.	1970		Chico, CA
F. L. Griffin (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1922-25	Re-Assigned	Deceased
Dennis Hampton (1)	Special Work Exp. Coordinator	1969-72	Resigned	
(2)	Head, Teacher Ed. CSU Chico	1972		Chico, CA
Byron Harrison (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1967-68	Resigned (to West Hills College)	Chairman, Ag Production University of Minnesota
Leonard Harzman (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1977-78	Resigned	Western Illinois University
Leo Herndon (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1965-67	Resigned	Deceased
Ted Hirayama (1)	Supervisor Ag Ed. LA City Schools	1978		Los Angeles, CA
W. Lee Holmes (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1978-80	Resigned	Teacher Educator, Washington State University

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
W. G. Hummel (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1917-22	Re-Assigned	Deceased
Gilbert L. Hutchings (1)	Regional Supv.	1949-71	Retired	Fresno, CA
Elwood M. Juergenson (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1948-65	Promoted	
	Head, Teacher Ed. UCD	1972-75	Retired	Woodland, CA
Max Kipf (1)	Special Supv. Veterans Training	1951-52	Retired	Deceased
Jean Landeen (1)	Curriculum Spec.	1976-81	Resigned	
	Regional Supv.	1981		Oakland, CA
F. Jay Lark (2)	Teacher Ed. CSPU	1976-78	Resigned	Teacher Educator, Panhandle State University
Emile LaSalle (1)	Regional Supv.	1966-76	Retired	Atascadero, CA
Jack F. Lawrence (1)	Specialist YF & Adult Ed.	1969-77	Resigned	Executive Director, Colusa County Board of Supervisors
J. D. Lawson (1)	Special Supv. & Asst. State YF Adv.	1948-52	Resigned (Retired from CPSU)	Santa Barbara, CA
James G. Leising (2)	Head, Teacher Ed. UCD	1977		Davis, CA
J. B. Lillard (2)	State Supv. Voc. Ag.	1917-23	Resigned	Deceased
Merril K. Luther (1)	Regional Supv.	1948-59	Resigned	Deceased

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
Lester O. Matthews (1)	Supervisor Ag. Ed. LA City Schools	1947-67	Retired	Weed, CA
W. James Maynard (1)	Supervisor I-on-F & State Office	1948-58	Re-Assigned	
	Regional Supv.	1958-74	Retired	Santa Ana, CA
Chester O. McCorkle (1)	Exec. Sec. FFA & Cal Poly	1932-35	Re-Assigned	
	Subject Matter Specialist & CPSU	1941-42	Re-Assigned (Retired as Exec. Dean from CSPU)	Deceased
Byron J. McMahon (1/2)	Regional Supv. & Teacher Ed.	1932-35	Re-Assigned	
(1)	Asst. Chief	1942-44	Promoted	
	Bureau Chief	1944-65	Retired	Sacramento, CA
Julian A. McPhee (1)	Asst. State Supv.	1925-26	Promoted	
	State Chief	1926-44	Resigned (To fulltime Pres. and from CSPU 1968)	Deceased
William Michaud (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1979		
(1)	In-Service Ed.			

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
Jim Morris (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1977-78		
(1)	In-Service Ed.	1978-79	Resigned	
(2)	Teacher Ed. CSUC	1980-81		
	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1981	Resigned	
Robert Pedersen (1)	Regional Supv. & I-on-F	1949-52	Transferred	
	I-on-F Supervisor	1952-58	Transferred	
	Reg. Supv. & Asst. State CYF Advisor	1958-71	Transferred (Reg. Voc. Ed. Office, Oakland)	Walnut Creek, CA
Charles Perrin (1)	Regional Supv.	1927-28	Resigned	Deceased
Paul Peterson (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1969-70	Resigned	
	Head, Teacher Ed. CSPU	1976		
Warren D. Reed (1)	Asst. Reg. Supv.	1966-67	Promoted	
	Regional Supv.	1967-69	Promoted	
	Asst. Chief	1969-78	Re-Assigned	
	Regional Supv.	1978		
Ronald D. Regan (1)	Supv. Ag. Ed. LA City Schools	1967-70	Resigned	Head, OH Dept. Cal Poly

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
Albert G. Rinn (1)	Regional Supv.	1927-59	Retired	Deceased
Richard A. Rogers (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1972-73	Rresigned	
	(1/2) Specialist Curric. & Teacher Ed. CPSU	1973-76	Resigned (Grad School)	
	(2) Head, Teacher Ed. CSU Fresno	1978		
Leland Ruth (1)	Special Supv. & Asst. State FFA Adv.	1966-67	Resigned	Exec. Sec. Ag. Council of CA.
Joseph E. Sabol (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1972		
H. M. Skidmore (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1924-29	Re-Assigned	Deceased
Keith V. Smith (1)	Regional Supv.	1974-78	Resigned	
	(2) Teacher Ed. CPSU	1978		
Wesley P. Smith (1)	Regional Supv. & Asst. Teacher Ed.	1942-43	Transferred	
	Asst. to State Director Voc. Ed.	1943-44	Promoted (State Dir. Voc. Ed.)	San Luis Obispo, CA
C. Paul Stark (1)	Regional Supv.	1975		
Sidney S. Sutherland (1)	Teacher Trainer & Spec. in Farm Mech.	1931-32	Promoted & Re-Assigned	
	(2) Head, Teacher Ed. UCD	1932-65	Retired	Deceased

NAME	POSITION(S)	YEARS OF SERVICE	RESIGNED RE-ASSIGNED RETIRED	PRESENT STATUS AND LOCATION
J. I. Thompson (1)	Livestock Spec.	1931-53	Retired	Deceased
Orville E. Thompson (2)	Teacher Ed. UCD	1954-65	Promoted (Head of Dept. of Applied Beh. Sci. UCD)	
Harmon Toone (1)	Spec. Supv. I-on-F	1950-52	Resigned	
(2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1954-57	Re-Assigned (Retired Head of Dairy Sci. Dept.)	San Luis Obispo, CA
J. Everett Walker (1)	Regional Supv.	1948-69	Retired	Chico, CA
Richard Werner (1)	State Supv.	1923-26	Transferred (Commission On Secondary Education)	
	Regional Supv.	1927-32	Resigned	Deceased
Donald E. Wilson (1)	Regional Supv.	1959-65	Promoted	
	Chief	1965-78	Transferred	
	Program Manager	1978		
Harold O. Wilson (1)	Asst. State Supv. OSYA	1941-42	Transferred	
	Regional Supv.	1942-46	Resigned	San Luis Obispo, CA
C. Paul Winner (2)	Teacher Ed. CPSU	1947-48	Re-Assigned	San Luis Obispo, CA
Wm. D. Wills (1)	Specialist In-Service Ed.	1969-77	Retired	San Luis Obispo, CA

List of References

1. Development of Secondary School Agriculture in California, Circular of the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of California, No. 37, August 1911.
2. Report California State Agriculture Soc., 1859.
3. Report College of Agriculture and Agriculture Extension Station, 1917-18.
4. Agriculture in the High Schools, Leroy Anderson, Cir. 47, University of California, 1909.
5. The Growth of Agriculture as a High School Subject in California, Thesis, J. A. Dowdell, University of California, 1932.
6. Personal Letter, Howard Dickson, Head of Agriculture Department, Kern County Union High School, Apr. 15, 1940.
7. Division of Secondary School Agriculture In California, Cir. 67, University of California, 1911.
8. Biennial Report of the Commissioner of Industrial and Vocational Education, State Board of Education, 1916.
9. Vocational Education – General Regulations of the State Board of Education for Establishment & Maintenance of Federal & State Aided Vocational Education In California, Bulletin 23, July 19, 1917, California State Board of Education
10. Bulletin No. 23 – Vocational Education, California State Board of Education, October 22, 1917.
11. Report of the Special Legislation Commission, Authorized by AB1335 by the Forty-fourth Session of the Legislature of California, 1923.
12. Biennial Report of the State Department of Education, 1927-28.
13. Annual Descriptive Report for the State Board of Vocational Education, 1928.
14. Biennial Report, California State Department of Education, 1929-30.
15. California State Department of Education, Biennial Report, 1930.
16. Annual Descriptive Report for the Board of Agricultural Education, 1965-66.
17. Annual Descriptive Report to the U. S. Office of Education, June 30, 1965.
18. Annual Descriptive Report to the U. S. Office of Education, 1964-65.
19. Vocational Education in California – Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow, Report to the California State Board of Education, October 1968, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

20. Minutes of Meetings, California Bureau of Agricultural Education, 1969-70 to 1973-74.
21. Summary of R-2 Reports, California Bureau of Agricultural Education, 1969 to 1973.
22. Vo-Ag Service Letters, California Bureau of Agricultural Education, 1973-74.
23. Minutes, California Agriculture Teachers' Association, 1969 to 1974.
24. Regional Occupational Centers and Programs, Status Report to the California State Legislature as Required by Education Code Section 7463, California Department of Education, 1974.
25. Constitution and By-Laws, California Agriculture Teachers' Association, Amended, 1971.
26. List of CATA Past Presidents, revised 1974, CATA.
27. End of Year Report (1973-74) – Adult and Continuation Education, Jack F. Lawrence, Bureau of Agricultural Education.
28. Organization Chart, California Department of Education, December 12, 1973.
29. Administrative Handbook for Vocational Agriculture Departments, Report, California Polytechnic State University, 1972.
30. Agricultural Education magazine, October 1968.
31. Resume' of Twenty-fifth Annual Awards Banquet for Los Angeles Beautiful Planting Program, Report, Ronald Regan, Office of Environmental and Agricultural Education, Los Angeles Unified School District, June, 6, 1974.
32. California Vocational Agriculture Curriculum Guidelines – Introduction to Agriculture, Publication, California Bureau of Agricultural Education, 1974.
33. Achievements for 1973-74 and Goals, Objectives and Priorities for 1974-75, Report, California Bureau of Agricultural Education, June 17, 1974.
34. Vocational Education in California, June 1976 – November 1978, a paper, Office of the State Director of Vocational Education.
35. A Unified Approach to Occupational Education – report of the Commission on Vocational Education, California State Department of Education, 1979.
36. Letter, July 1979, Dr. Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, distributed with copies of the Report of the Commission on Vocational Education.
37. Letter, June 16, 1978, Samuel L. Barrett, State Director of Vocational Education, addressed to County and Secondary District Superintendents, Directors and

Coordinators of Vocational Education and ROP/C, and Presidents of Vocational Education Professional Organizations. Title – Reorganization of the State Department of Education Vocational Education Unit.

38. Journal of the California Industrial Education association, Volume III, No. 1, December, 1978.
39. Report – Curriculum Development, California Aggie Style, Jean Landeen, Working Draft.
40. Letter, State Director of Vocational Education, Samuel L. Barrett to Herbert H. Burlingham, June 16, 1981.
41. Senate Bill 187 (Nielsen), signed into law September 18, 1981.
42. Assembly Bill 8 (Waters), signed into law August 1979.
43. Report – Exemplary Program Award – by Dr. Joe Sabol, an Agricultural Teacher Educator, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, December 1981.
44. Letter from Dr. Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Education, California, to State Senator Jim Nielsen, dated December 24, 1981.
45. A Historical Perspective: Conditions Leading/Contributing to the Issues of Vocational Education Governance and State-level Services in California, Thomas M. Bogetich, Ed. D., Executive Director, California Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 3, 1978.