

MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENTS
OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN
VIRGINIA

by

Arthur Earl Williams

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
in candidacy for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Agricultural Education

APPROVED:

APPROVED:

Director of Graduate Studies

Head of Department

Dean of Agriculture

Major Professor

Blacksburg, Virginia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
Background and Development of Multiple-teacher Vocational Agriculture Departments.....	5
Purposes of Study.....	8
Limitations.....	8
Definitions of Terms.....	9
Procedure Followed.....	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
III. TABLES AND EXPLANATIONS.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Tables.....	15
Advantages and Disadvantages of Multiple- Teacher Departments.....	64
IV. CONCLUSIONS.....	67
V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	75
VITA.....	76
APPENDIX.....	78

TABLES

	Page
1. Schools, Number of Regular Teachers of Vocational Agriculture and Years Department Has Been Multiple-Teacher	15
2. High Schools, Patronage Area, Enrollment and Number of High School Teachers	17
3. High Schools, Number of Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Vocational Agriculture Classrooms and Square Feet of Shop Space	19
4. Enrollment in All-Day Classes as a Percentage of Total High School Enrollment	21
5. Teacher Load by Schools in Terms of Total Persons Reached Through Organized Instruction	23
6. Teacher Load in Terms of Enrollment in All-Day, Exploratory Agriculture, Part-Time, Evening, Young Farmer, Cannery, and Farm Machinery Repair Classes	25
7. Students from Farm Homes as a Percentage of Total Enrollment by Schools	29
8. Schools, Area Served, Total Travel Allowance, and All-Day Students Enrolled	31
9. Years Experience, and Highest Degree held by Head Teachers and Assistant Teachers in Multiple-Teacher Departments	33
10. Schools, Total Number of High School Teachers and Per Cent of High School Faculty Teaching Vocational Agriculture	36
11. Length of Periods, Number of Periods in School Day, and Number Periods Agriculture Taught Each Day by Schools	38
12. Schools, and Number Classes Taught by Each Agriculture Teacher	40
13. Schools, and Number of Single Period Classes Taught by Each Agriculture Teacher	42

	Page
14. Schools and Number of Double Period Classes Taught by Each Agriculture Teacher	44
15. Part-Time Classes Conducted by Departments Studied, Enrollment and Meetings Held	46
16. Young Farmer Associations, Membership and Number Teachers by Schools	49
17. Evening Classes Conducted by Departments Studied, Enrollment and Number Teachers Conducting Classes	51
18. Farm Machinery Repair Classes Conducted by Departments Studied	54
19. School Community Canneries Supervised by Departments Studied and Enrollment	57
20. Opinions Regarding Administrative Policies, Physical Facilities and Area Served	60
21. Practices Used and Recommended by Multiple-Teacher Departments	62

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Development of Multiple-Teacher Agriculture Departments

During the school session 1952-1953 there were thirty-nine multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in the State of Virginia. The large majority, or thirty-six of these departments are two-teacher, while two are three-teacher departments, and one is a four-teacher department. All of these departments have become multiple-teacher within the past fourteen years.

Blacksburg High School was the first in the State to employ two agriculture teachers. At this time the Blacksburg school, along with the high schools of Auburn and Newport, was being used as a teacher training school, for senior vocational agriculture students enrolled at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Blacksburg was used most extensively for this purpose, and it is probably for this reason, more than any other, that two agriculture teachers were first employed.

Multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture have been an outgrowth of three movements. First, the increased number of rural boys studying vocational agriculture. In some departments this has necessitated the employment of a second teacher in order to efficiently conduct and supervise the training of the all-day students.

A second reason that has made it necessary to add additional instructors in some departments is the expanding program of vocational agriculture. Fifteen years ago a complete program of a department consisted of all-day instruction, a part-time program, and the instruction of adult farmers in an evening class. During the second World War teachers of vocational agriculture made a great contribution by expanding their programs to provide instruction in several other important phases. The operation of school community canneries, the teaching of food production, and conservation classes, and the operation of farm machinery repair classes were so well received by the public that they have become a permanent part of the program. After the war the departments of vocational agriculture accepted the great responsibility of training veterans to become established in farming. Although additional instructors were employed to conduct this program, the responsibility of supervision rested with the regular teachers. As these veterans and other young farmers were settling down to a better rural life, the need for an organization to give initiative and instruction to this group was felt. Today the young farmer associations, found in many communities throughout the State, owe their existence to the local departments of vocational agriculture. This great expansion of the program has been responsible for many of the present day multiple-teacher departments.

The third movement that has resulted in multiple-teacher departments is the consolidation of smaller high schools into a large high school, or one high school, for an entire county. School consolidation is a problem that is being faced by most every rural county in the State, it will create new problems, and will afford many advantages, along with some disadvantages. It definitely will have a great bearing on the development of more multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. As more counties consolidate, the size of departments of vocational agriculture and the areas they serve will be greatly increased. This will mean that more than one agriculture teacher will be needed to conduct a full and efficient program. State requirements for accreditation are becoming more difficult for the small high schools to meet. Requirements as to courses offered and teacher-pupil ratio cannot be met by many small high schools. If the counties are to continue to receive state financial aid, these requirements must be satisfied. In order to satisfy these requirements, many counties are rapidly moving toward consolidation. Only time will tell how many multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture will grow out of this movement.

It would be most difficult to determine the exact reasons that have been responsible for the multiple-teacher departments of today. Seventeen of our multiple-teacher departments are

established in consolidated high schools. Randolph-Henry and Louisa County were the first two schools in the State to consolidate in such a manner as to set-up a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture. Both have been multiple-teacher for a period of thirteen years. Two schools, Broadway and Drewry Mason are in their first year of consolidation. From the beginning of consolidation, thirteen years ago, which resulted in multiple-teacher departments, Virginia schools have consolidated their departments of vocational agriculture at the rate of 1.31 per year. It is the feeling of many that a comprehensive vocational agriculture offering embracing all phases of the program, adult, young farmer, and in school farm boys, will result in the establishment of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in a majority of the departments now established in the State.

Purposes of Study

1. To determine departmental organization procedures being followed in multiple-teacher departments.
2. To determine shop and classroom facilities available in multiple-teacher departments.
3. To determine some effects of consolidation on vocational agriculture.
4. To compile information that might be useful in establishing multiple-teacher departments.

Limitations

This study included thirty-six multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Virginia. At the time the

study was made (1953) there were thirty-nine multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in the State.

Questionnaires were sent to the head teachers of the thirty-nine multiple-teacher departments; thirty-six of these teachers responded. A study of this type should have included all of the multiple-teacher departments in the State, but 92.3 per cent is a relatively high return on questionnaires.

The use of the questionnaire was a definite limitation to the study. More complete and reliable information could have been gained through personal interview. However, the number and widely scattered locations of these multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture made the questionnaire technique desirable.

Definition of Terms

Multiple-teacher departments as used in this study will be considered as any department of vocational agriculture in the State of Virginia, employing two or more full-time vocational agriculture teachers as provided for in the Smith-Hughes Act.

Organized instruction includes all phases of instruction offered by the department of vocational agriculture in an organized class.

Young farmer associations are a group of out of school youth receiving instruction in an organized class under the supervision of the department of vocational agriculture and affiliated with the State association.

Part-time class is a group of out of school youth receiving instruction in an organized class under the supervision of the department of vocational agriculture and not affiliated with any parent organization.

Evening class is a group of adult farmers receiving instruction in an organized class sponsored by the department of vocational agriculture, meeting a minimum of ten class periods.

Farm machinery repair class is a group of farmers receiving instruction in an organized class in the care and maintenance of farm machinery.

School community cannery is a canning center operated by the department of vocational agriculture, where instruction is given on food production and conservation.

Procedure Followed

A study of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in the State of Virginia was selected and a thesis outline on this problem was submitted in June, 1952.

A review of literature revealed that little information was available pertaining to this subject in general, and only one Virginia study on multiple-teacher departments, with no study of the State's multiple-teacher departments having been made.

After a thorough discussion of the topic with the author's graduate committee, and under their advisement, it was decided that a questionnaire should be compiled to gather the needed information. The questionnaire was formulated and a copy sent to

the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture and five head teachers in multiple-teacher departments for suggested revisions. These revisions were considered and a revised questionnaire compiled.

A list of all multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture in Virginia, their head teachers and their addresses were obtained from the State Supervisor. Both Negro and white departments were included. Of the thirty-six schools replying to the questionnaire, six were Negro schools and thirty were white schools. At this date there are thirty-nine multiple-teacher departments in Virginia. This study covers thirty-six, or 92.3 per cent of all multiple-teacher departments in the State.

A sponsoring letter was obtained from Mr. T. V. Downing, Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. The questionnaire, the sponsoring letter, and a letter of explanation were sent to all departments. After waiting three weeks, a follow-up letter was sent to all departments not replying. A second follow-up letter was sent after a period of two weeks to the departments not replying upon second request. In an effort to receive more replies, Mr. T. J. Horne, Head, Agricultural Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, wrote a letter to the few schools not replying. One week was allowed for reply to Mr. Horne's letter. Schools from which a questionnaire was not received by this time were omitted from the study.

The information obtained through the questionnaire was tabulated and studied by the author, then organized as the basis for this study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An investigation revealed only one study was previously made pertaining to multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture. In 1941 G. R. Kinzie ^{1/} made a study of thirty multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture found throughout the United States. The study dealt with the organization and operation of their departments. Mr. Kinzie visited the departments located in the Southeastern part of the United States, and gathered information through observation and personal interview. Information on departments not visited by Mr. Kinzie was gained through a questionnaire.

After all facts were found and tabulated, they were presented as a guide and reference for the establishment of a multiple-teacher department in Charlotte County, Virginia. This department was one of the first multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture resulting from school consolidation in the State.

1/ Gilbert Ray Kinzie, Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture, Unpublished M. S. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute

H. M. Hamlin ^{2/} states, "Increasingly departments of agriculture in the community schools will have more than one teacher This is to be encouraged, but new problems arise when two or more teachers work together in one department". He suggests that experience will indicate some of these problems and some of their solutions.

2/ H. M. Hamlin, Agricultural Education in Community Schools, The Interstate 1949, pp. 353-355

CHAPTER III

TABLES AND EXPLANATIONS

Information contained in this part of the study was obtained by use of the questionnaire. Due to the nature of the material covered in this chapter, it was decided that the use of tables with proper explanations would be the best method of presentation.

The tables include factual information relative to the program being conducted by the various multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture included in the study.

All tables are so arranged that information contained may be easily found for any given school included. The explanations primarily deal with variations and averages. Where applicable the material is compared with State averages, including all vocational agriculture departments in the State of Virginia.

Information found in the tables form the basis for the conclusions and recommendations, which are found in following chapters.

TABLE 1

SCHOOLS, NUMBER OF REGULAR TEACHERS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE
AND YEARS DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN MULTIPLE-TEACHER

School	County	Number Regular Teachers of Vocational Agriculture	Number years Department has been Multiple-Teacher
Andrew Lewis	Roanoke	2	2
Amelia	Amelia	2	6
Appomattox	Appomattox	2	6
Blacksburg	Montgomery	2	14
Broadway	Rockingham	2	1
Buckingham Central	Buckingham	2	8
Chase City	Mecklenburg	2	8
Christiansburg	Montgomery	2	5
Culpeper	Culpeper	2	4
Cumberland	Cumberland	2	9
Dickenson Memorial	Dickenson	2	1
Drewry Mason	Henry	2	1
Floyd	Floyd	2	5
Franklin County	Franklin	2	3
Halifax County	Halifax	2	6
Training	Halifax	2	6
James Sol. Russell	Brunswick	2	3
James Hood	Frederick	3	3
John M. Gandy	Hanover	2	7
Kenbridge	Lunenburg	2	6
Lunenburg County	Lunenburg	2	4
Training	Lunenburg	2	4
Louisa County	Louisa	2	13
Madison	Madison	2	4
Montevideo	Rockingham	2	3
Northampton	Northampton	2	7
North River	Augusta	2	6
Northside Training	Pittsylvania	2	3
Randolph-Henry	Charlotte	4	13
Rural Retreat	Wythe	2	2
R. R. Moton	Prince Edward	2	4
Tazewell	Tazewell	2	5
Victoria	Lunenburg	2	6
Virginia-Carolina	Grayson	2	4
William Campbell	Campbell	2	2
Willis	Floyd	2	2
Wilson Memorial	Augusta	3	5
Wytheville	Wythe	2	6

The study included thirty-six of the thirty-nine multiple-teacher schools in Virginia. Thirty-three of these schools were two-teacher schools, two were three-teacher schools and one a four-teacher school.

The schools had a range of from one to fourteen years as multiple-teacher departments. Three of the schools were in their first year as a multiple-teacher department, while one school, Blacksburg, had been multiple-teacher for fourteen years. Two schools, Louisa County and Randolph-Henry, had been multiple-teacher for thirteen years. Randolph-Henry was a four-teacher department, and Louisa County a two-teacher department.

The average number of teachers per department was 2.11 and the average number years the schools had been multiple-teacher was 5.19.

TABLE 2

HIGH SCHOOLS, PATRONAGAGE AREA, ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

School	Patronage Area in Square Miles	Total High School Enrollment	Number of High School Teachers
Andrew Lewis	200	1375	54
Amelia	371	220	14
Appomattox	300	377	18
Blacksburg	225	579	28
Broadway	496	390	26
Buckingham Central	480	315	19
Chase City	175	245	11
Christiansburg	150	403	23
Culpeper	384	555	27
Cumberland	388	175	12
Dickenson Memorial	144	490	17
Drewry Mason	250	494	24
Floyd	224	290	14
Franklin County	691	815	37
Halifax County Training	881	1060	32
James Sol. Russell	522	601	35
James Wood	471	579	42
John M. Gandy	471	270	12
Kenbridge	200	186	12
Lunenburg County Training	310	340	17
Louisa County	756	440	24
Madison	324	235	14
Montevideo	200	350	19
Northhampton	226	275	13
North River	250	230	12
Northside Training	600	431	26
Randolph-Henry	496	351	25
Rural Retreat	40	148	14
R. R. Moton	357	444	23
Tazewell	160	798	35
Victoria	150	275	16
Virginia-Carolina	256	134	7
William Campbell	250	250	15
Willis	400	268	13
Wilson Memorial	550	1275	55
Wytheville	390	600	31

Of the thirty-six schools replying to the question of square miles served by the school, it was found that these thirty-six schools served a total square mile area of 12,712, giving an average of 353 square miles per school.

The smallest area served by any school was forty, while the largest was 881 square miles, served by Halifax County Training School.

Total high school enrollment in thirty-six schools replying, was 16,263, which was an average of 452 students per school. It was found that the schools studied employed 816 high school teachers, or an average of 22.7 teachers per school. This gave an average of 20.02 students per high school teacher.

Enrollment ranged from 134 at Virginia-Carolina to 1375 at Andrew Lewis, while the number of teachers employed by the various high schools ranged from seven at Virginia-Carolina to fifty-five at Wilson Memorial. Total enrollment at Wilson Memorial was 1275.

TABLE 3

HIGH SCHOOLS, NUMBER OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS,
VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE CLASSROOMS AND SQUARE FEET OF SHOP
SPACE

School	Number Voc- ational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Classrooms	Square Feet of Shop Space
Andrew Lewis	2	1	2800
Amelia	2	1	3240
Appomattox	2	1	3000
Blacksburg	2	2	3600
Broadway	2	2	2880
Buckingham Central	2	1	1800
Chase City	2	1	1775
Christiansburg	2	1	2700
Culpeper	2	1	2970
Cumberland	2	2	1600
Dickenson Memorial	2	1	2100
Drewry Mason	2	2	3200
Floyd	2	1	1800
Franklin County	2	1	2000
Halifax County Training	2	2	3600
James Sol. Russell	2	2	4500
James Wood	3	2	4000
John M. Gandy	2	1	1500
Kenbridge	2	1	3840
Lunenburg County Training	2	1	2400
Louisa County	2	1	2400
Madison	2	1	1568
Montevideo	2	2	3200
Northampton	2	1	1750
North River	2	1	1726
Northside Training	2	1	2618
Randolph-Henry	4	3	5530
Rural Retreat	2	1	5400
R. R. Moton	2	2	2080
Tazewell	2	1	1471
Victoria	2	1	3200
Virginia-Carolina	2	1	1800
William Campbell	2	1	2800
Willis	2	1	655
Wilson Memorial	3	3	6125
Wytheville	2	1	5000

The number of vocational agriculture classrooms in the departments studied were forty-nine, which was an average of 1.36 classrooms per school. The average number of teachers employed per school were 2.11. This seems to reveal that in many cases the present buildings being used were not planned to care for the enrollment usually found in a multiple-teacher department. Twenty-five of the departments had only one classroom, nine had two classrooms and only two had three classrooms.

The average shop space for the departments was 2851 square feet. The smallest shop space was 655 square feet at Willis, which is a two-teacher school with sixty-four high school boys enrolled in vocational agriculture. The largest shop, 6,125 square feet, is at Wilson Memorial, which is a three-teacher school, and has an enrollment in vocational agriculture of 133.

TABLE 4

ENROLLMENT IN ALL-DAY CLASSES AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL HIGH SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

School	Total High School Enrollment	Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture	Per Cent of Total Enrollment in Vocational Agriculture
Andrew Lewis	1375	85	6.2
Amelia	220	44	20.0
Appomattox	377	52	13.8
Blacksburg	579	56	9.6
Broadway	390	56	15.1
Buckingham Central	315	104	33.0
Chase City	245	79	32.2
Christiansburg	403	60	14.9
Culpeper	555	108	19.4
Cumberland	175	53	30.2
Dickenson Memorial	490	77	15.7
Drewry Mason	494	72	14.7
Floyd	290	58	20.0
Franklin County	815	116	14.2
Halifax County Training	1060	126	11.8
James Sol. Russell	601	58	9.6
James Wood	579	125	21.6
John M. Gandy	270	65	24.0
Kenbridge	186	60	32.2
Lunenburg County Training	340	70	20.6
Louisa County	440	71	16.1
Madison	235	79	33.6
Montevideo	350	45	12.8
Northampton	275	17	6.2
North River	230	90	39.1
Northside Training	431	77	17.8
Randolph-Henry	351	130	37.0
Rural Retreat	148	63	42.5
R. R. Moton	444	75	16.9
Tazewell	776	58	7.5
Victoria	275	88	32.0
Virginia-Carolina	134	57	35.0
William Campbell	250	38	15.2
Willis	268	64	23.9
Wilson Memorial	1275	133	10.4
Wytheville	600	100	16.6

The enrollment in all-day classes of vocational agriculture as a percentage of the total high school enrollment, was in a fairly indirect proportion to the high school enrollment. This may be attributed to the fact that a larger enrollment permits a wider offering of subjects for the students; thereby, reducing the number in any given course.

The percentages ranged from 6.2 at Andrew Lewis, with an enrollment of 1375, to 42.5 per cent at Rural Retreat, which had a total enrollment of 148. Both of these schools had two vocational agriculture teachers. The total number of teachers in the two schools were 54 and 14 respectively.

The average enrollment in vocational agriculture in the multiple-teacher departments was 75.3 students. The average per cent of total high school enrollment enrolled in vocational agriculture was 19.9 per cent.

TABLE 5

TEACHER LOAD BY SCHOOLS IN TERMS OF TOTAL PERSONS REACHED
THROUGH ORGANIZED INSTRUCTION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

School	Number of Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Total Enrollment in Organized Instruction	Average Enrollment per Teacher in Organized Instruction
Andrew Lewis	2	743	371.5
Amelia	2	358	179
Appomattox	2	296	148
Blacksburg	2	735	367.5
Broadway	2	632	316
Buckingham Central	2	1290	645
Chase City	2	508	254
Christiansburg	2	599	299.5
Culpeper	2	372	186
Cumberland	2	1349	674.5
Dickenson Memorial	2	190	95
Drewry Mason	2	836	418
Floyd	2	332	166
Franklin County	2	257	128.5
Halifax County			
Training	2	293	146.5
James Sol. Russell	2	312	156
James Wood	3	315	105
John M. Gandy	2	286	143
Kenbridge	2	524	262
Lunenburg County			
Training	2	295	147.5
Louisa County	2	265	132.5
Madison	2	329	164.5
Montevideo	2	845	422.5
Northampton	2	289	144.5
North River	2	634	317
Northside Training	2	205	102.5
Randolph-Henry	4	1042	260.25
Rural Retreat	2	699	349.5
R. R. Moton	2	725	362.5
Tazewell	2	201	100.5
Victoria	2	588	294
Virginia Carolina	2	387	193.5
William Campbell	2	309	154.5
Willis	2	230	115
Wilson Memorial	3	1947	649
Wytheville	2	575	287.5

Enrollment in organized instruction in vocational agriculture included the enrollment in all phases of the instructional program being conducted by the department of vocational agriculture. Since it is easier to reach a greater number of patrons through one phase than another, these figures do not necessarily show the efforts of a department; but rather the numbers reached in its total offering of vocational agriculture. Table six gives a breakdown showing the persons reached through each individual phase of the program.

Of the thirty-six schools included in the study, a total of 19,792 persons were reached through organized instruction, for an average of 550 persons through each department. The smallest number of individuals reached through organized instruction by any department was 190. This school did not conduct a part-time, evening, young farmer, or school community cannery program. The largest number reached was 1,947, which was a three-teacher school. The average number of persons reached per instructor in all multiple-teacher departments was 261. The average number of individuals reached for all vocational agriculture teachers in the State was 267, while the average for single-teacher departments was 273. This shows that the average number of individuals reached per teacher is slightly less in the multiple-teacher departments.

TABLE 6 Continued

School	Number of Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Total Departmental Enrollment							
		All Day	Explo- ratory	Part- Time	Even- ing	Young Farmer	Can- nery	Farm Machinery Repair	
Madison	2	79	..	15	50	..	150	35	
Montevideo	2	45	60	30	30	..	650	30	
Northampton	2	17	32	7	40	..	148	45	
North River	2	90	..	27	25	12	450	30	
Northside Training	2	77	34	22	58	14	
Randolph-Henry	4	130	16	26	26	..	780	64	
Rural Retreat	2	63	..	26	92	18	435	65	
R. R. Moton	2	75	30	24	58	38	464	36	
Tazewell	2	58	..	20	45	18	..	60	
Victoria	2	88	70	26	375	28	
Virginia-Carolina	2	57	68	38	50	38	106	30	
William Campbell	2	38	36	..	35	200	
Willis	2	64	49	21	50	6	..	40	
Wilson Memorial	3	133	..	31	..	45	1700	38	
Wytheville	2	100	20	40	585	30	
Total		2712	1505	732	1397	713	10,602	2142	
Average		75.3	62.8	21.4	50.3	30.9	408	63	

Teacher load in terms of each phase of the program gives a more accurate picture of just what is being done in each department. The Virginia State Plan included the following phases of instruction as composing a complete program of vocational agriculture: all-day, part-time, evening, young farmer, school community cannery, farm machinery repair, and institutional on farm training program. This study does not include the number of persons reached through the institutional on farm training program.

In schools having a twelve year system, most vocational agriculture departments were conducting an exploratory course in agriculture for the eighth grade students. Where this is being done, credit has been given in table six to the persons reached in this phase of the program.

The all-day program is naturally being conducted in each department. Twenty-four departments are conducting exploratory courses, twenty-nine departments have part-time classes, twenty-seven have evening classes, twenty-four have young farmer associations, twenty-six have school community canneries, and thirty-four are conducting farm machinery repair classes.

The total persons reached in each phase of the program were as follows: all-day 2712, exploratory classes 1505, part-time classes 732, evening classes 1357, young farmers 743, school community canneries 10,602, and farm machinery repair classes 2142.

The average enrollment in the different phases of the program for those departments of vocational agriculture and the various phases of a complete program of vocational agriculture are: all-day 75.3, exploratory work 62.8, part-time classes 21.4, evening classes 50.3, young farmer associations 30.9, school community canneries 408, and farm machinery repair classes 63.

TABLE 7

STUDENTS FROM FARM HOMES AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT
BY SCHOOLS

Schools	Total High School Enrollment	Total Enrollment From Farm Homes	Per Cent of Total Enrollment from Farm Homes
Andrew Lewis	1375	700	50.9
Amelia	220	185	84.1
Appomattox	377	114	30.2
Blacksburg	579	254	43.8
Broadway	390	190	48.7
Buckingham Central	315	205	65.3
Chase City	245	122	49.8
Christiansburg	403	94	23.3
Culpeper	555	270	48.6
Cumberland	175	145	82.8
Dickenson Memorial	490	380	77.5
Drewry Mason	494	63	12.7
Floyd	290	240	82.9
Franklin County	815	661	81.1
Halifax County Training	1060	850	80.1
James Sol. Russell	601	566	94.2
James Wood	579	450	77.7
John M. Gandy	270	217	80.3
Kenbridge	186	130	70.0
Lunenburg County Training	340	196	57.6
Louisa County	440	393	89.4
Madison	235	220	93.6
Montevideo	350	100	28.6
Northampton	275	70	25.4
North River	230	195	84.9
Northside Training	431	329	76.4
Randolph-Henry	351	317	90.3
Rural Retreat	148	97	65.5
R. R. Moton	444	278	62.6
Tazewell	776	128	16.5
Victoria	275	140	50.9
Virginia-Carolina	134	134	100.0
William Campbell	250	166	66.4
Willis	268	268	100.0
Wilson Memorial	1275	550	43.2
Wytheville	600	400	66.6

The enrollment from farm homes varies greatly in the departments studied. This seems to be not only dependent on the location of the school, but also its surrounding social and economic structure.

Two schools listed 100 per cent of their enrollment as being from farm homes. These were Willis and Virginia-Carolina. Both of these schools are located in a rural section. They are not close to any town, are are therefore, somewhat removed from industry. Willis has a total enrollment of 268, and Virginia-Carolina of 134. The smallest percentage of students from farm homes was at Drewry Mason, located in Henry County. This percentage was 12.7. Henry County is highly industrialized, and has four towns of fair size, each being heavily industrialized.

The average enrollment from farm homes, in all the schools, was 284. It covered a range of from 70 to 700. The total enrollment from farm homes averaged 63.2 per cent of the high school enrollment. The average enrollment of boys from farm homes in all schools was 110. It covered a range of 35 at Northampton to 325 at Andrew Lewis. The enrollment of boys from farm homes averaged 30.5 per cent of total enrollment.

TABLE 8

SCHOOLS, AREA SERVED, TOTAL TRAVEL ALLOWANCE, AND ALL-DAY STUDENTS ENROLLED

School	Number Vocational Agri- culture Teachers	Total Travel Allowance all Voc- ational Agricul- ture Teachers	Square Mile Area Served	All- Day En- roll- ment
Andrew Lewis	2	900	200	85
Amelia	2	720	...	44
Appomattox	2	500	300	52
Blacksburg	2	600	...	56
Broadway	2	515	496	59
Buckingham Central	2	560	480	104
Chase City	2	500	175	79
Christiansburg	2	600	150	60
Culpeper	2	500	384	108
Cumberland	2	960	388	53
Dickenson Memorial	2	800	104	77
Drewry Mason	2	1000	250	72
Floyd	2	500	224	58
Franklin County	2	550	691	116
Halifax County Training	2	880	881	126
James Sol. Russell	2	800	522	58
James Wood	3	1080	471	125
John M. Gandy	2	1000	471	85
Kenbridge	2	1000	200	60
Lunenburg County Training	2	1000	310	70
Louisa County	2	1200	756	71
Madison	2	425	...	79
Montevideo	2	600	200	45
Northampton	2	600	...	17
North River	2	750	250	90
Northside Training	2	800	600	77
Randolph-Henry	4	1400	490	130
Rural Retreat	2	600	40	63
R. R. Moton	2	770	357	75
Tazewell	2	900	160	58
Victoria	2	500	...	88
Virginia-Carolina	2	600	256	57
William Campbell	2	400	250	38
Willis	2	530	400	64
Wilson Memorial	3	1050	550	133
Wytheville	2	600	390	100

Table 8 lists the comparative figures on total travel allowance, area served, and all-day enrollment in agriculture. It should be noted that analysis of travel reports by the supervisory staff pointed out that only a small percentage of the vocational agriculture teachers' travel is spent on visitation of all-day students. The majority of the travel allowance was used in conducting the other phases of the program, attending meetings, and attention to other matters of business pertaining to the operation of the department.

This study does not indicate that travel allowance is based on either area served or all-day enrollment. The average travel allowance in all departments was \$714.00. The smallest allowance in any department was \$425.00, which was a two-teacher department, and the largest was \$1400.00, which was a four-teacher department. The average travel allowance for each teacher was \$338.00. In one case no allowance was given one teacher, but his duties were primarily those of a shop instructor. The highest allowance given any one teacher was \$600.00.

The average allowance per square mile served in the departments was \$1.94, while the average allowance per student in agriculture was approximately \$9.50.

TABLE 9

YEARS EXPERIENCE, AND HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY HEAD TEACHERS AND ASSISTANT TEACHERS IN MULTIPLE TEACHER DEPARTMENTS

School	Highest Degree Held By:			Years experience of:				
	Head Teacher	1st Assistant	2nd Assistant	3rd Assistant	Head Teacher	1st Assistant	2nd Assistant	3rd Assistant
Andrew Lewis	MS	MS	10	6
Amelia	BS	BS	4	2
Appomattox	BS	None	18	6
Blacksburg	BS	BS	5	4
Broadway	M.Ed.	BS	12	4
Buckingham Central	MS	None	10	8
Chase City	None	BS	34	1
Christiansburg	BS	BS	13	6
Culpeper	BS	None	34	1
Cumberland	BS	BS	7	1
Dickenson Memorial	BS	BS	21	5
Drewry Mason	BS	BS	18	9
Floyd	BS	BS	16	2
Franklin County	AB	AB	11	9
Franklin County Training	BS	BS	5	4
Halifax County Training	BS	BS	15	8
James Col. Russell	BS	BS	10	9
James Wood	BS	BS	BS	...	15	9	3	...
John M. Gandy	BS	Normal	15	3
Kenbridge	BS	BS	10	6
Lunenburg County	BS	MS	3	4
Training	BS	BS	19	14
Louisa County	MS	None	15	5
Madison	MS	BS	17	5
Montevideo	BS	BS	18	10
Northampton	BS	BS	18	10

TABLE 9 Continued

School	Highest Degree Held By:			Years Experience of:				
	Head Teacher	1st Assis- tant	2nd Assis- tant	3rd Assis- tant	Head Teacher	1st Assis- tant	2nd Assis- tant	3rd Assis- tant
	North River	BS	BS	27	4	...
Northside Training	BS	BS	4	4
Randolph-Henry	BS	BS	BS	BS	18	6	3	3
Rural Retreat	BS	BS	11	5
R. R. Moton	BS	BS	7	3
Tazewell	BS	BS	18	3
Victoria	ES	None	12	2
Virginia-Carolina	BS	None	17	3
William Campbell	BS	BS	27	3
Willis	BS	BS	13*	4
Wilson Memorial	*	BS	BS	MS	2	15	13	14
Wytheville	BS	BS	2	12

*Wilson Memorial had no teacher designated as head teacher

Of the thirty-six departments studied, there were thirty-five head teachers, and forty-one assistant teachers. One department, Wilson Memorial did not have any teacher designated as head of the department. In this case all three teachers were considered as assistants.

The study revealed that of the head teachers, four held a M. S. degree, one a M. Ed. degree, twenty-eight a B. S. degree, one an A. B. degree, and one no degree. Of the forty-one assistant teachers, three held a M. S. degree, thirty a B. S. degree, one an A. B. degree, one a Normal certificate, and six held no degrees.

The head teachers had an average teaching experience of 14.2 years, and the assistant teachers an average teaching experience of 5.7 years. Experience of head teachers ranged from two years to thirty-four years, while experience of assistant teachers ranged from one year to fifteen years.

TABLE 10

SCHOOLS, TOTAL NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PER CENT OF HIGH SCHOOL FACULTY TEACHING VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

School	Total Number Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Per Cent of High School Faculty Teaching Vocational Agriculture
Andrew Lewis	54	2	3.7
Amelia	14	2	14.3
Appomattox	18	2	11.1
Blacksburg	28	2	7.1
Broadway	26	2	7.7
Buckingham Central	19	2	10.5
Chase City	11	2	18.1
Christiansburg	23	2	8.6
Julpeper	27	2	7.4
Cumberland	12	2	16.6
Dickenson Memorial	17	2	11.7
Drewry Mason	24	2	8.3
Floyd	14	2	14.3
Franklin County	37	2	5.4
Halifax County			
Training	32	2	6.2
James Sol. Russell	35	2	5.7
James Wood	42	2	7.1
John M. Gandy	12	2	16.6
Kenbridge	12	2	16.6
Lunenburg County			
Training	17	2	11.7
Louisa County	24	2	8.3
Madison	14	2	14.3
Montevideo	19	2	10.5
Northampton	13	2	15.3
North River	12	2	16.6
Northside Training	26	2	7.7
Randolph-Henry	25	4	16.0
Rural Retreat	14	2	14.3
R. R. Moton	23	2	8.6
Tazewell	35	2	5.7
Victoria	16	2	12.5
Virginia-Carolina	7	2	28.5
William Campbell	15	2	13.3
Willis	13	2	15.3
Wilson Memorial	55	3	5.4
Wytheville	31	2	6.4

The total number of high school teachers in all departments studied was 816, giving an average of 22.7 high school teachers per school. The number of high school teachers ranged from seven to fifty-five. The schools had a total of seventy-six vocational agriculture teachers, with an average of 2.11 vocational agriculture teachers per department.

The per cent of high school faculty teaching vocational agriculture averaged 9.31 per cent. The range was from 3.7 to 28.5 per cent.

TABLE 11

LENGTH OF PERIODS, NUMBER OF PERIODS IN SCHOOL DAY, AND
NUMBER PERIODS VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TAUGHT EACH DAY BY
SCHOOLS

School	Length of Period	Number Periods Daily	Number Periods Vocational Agricul- ture Taught Daily
Andrew Lewis	60	6	5
Anelia	55	6	5
Appomattox	55	6	6
Blacksburg	55	6	5
Broadway	55	6	6
Buckingham Central	55	6	6
Chase City	60	6	5
Christiansburg	60	6	6
Culpeper	50	6	6
Cumberland	55	6	5
Dickenson Memorial	55	6	6
Drewry Mason	60	6	5
Floyd	55	7	7
Franklin County	55	6	6
Halifax County Training	50	6	6
James Sol. Russell	55	5	5
James Wood	55	6	6
John M. Gandy	50	6	6
Kenbridge	55	6	6
Lunenburg County Training	55	5	5
Louisa County	60	6	6
Madison	55	6	6
Montevideo	55	6	5
Northampton	55	6	6
North River	55	6	6
Northside Training	50	6	5
Randolph-Henry	55	6	6
Rural Retreat	55	6	5
R. R. Moton	55	6	4
Tazewell	55	6	6
Victoria	55	6	5
Virginia-Carolina	50	6	4
William Campbell	60	6	5
Willis	55	6	5
Wilson Memorial	55	6	4
Wytheville	55	6	6

The average length of periods being used in the schools studied was 55.2 minutes. The most popular length of period was 55 minutes, which was being used in twenty-five schools. Six schools were using 60 minute periods, and five schools were using 50 minute periods.

The majority of the schools, thirty-three, had six periods daily, and one school had seven periods daily. Both of the schools which had five periods daily, and the one school which had seven periods were all conducting fifty-five minute classes. The average periods held daily in all schools was 5.97.

Vocational agriculture was being taught on an average of 5.47 periods daily. One school scheduled vocational agriculture seven periods a day, eighteen schools scheduled vocational agriculture six periods daily, fourteen schools were conducting five vocational agriculture periods daily, and three schools offered vocational agriculture four periods daily.

A further breakdown by number of single and double periods taught is summarized in Tables 13 and 14 respectively.

TABLE 12

SCHOOLS, AND NUMBER CLASSES TAUGHT BY EACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER

School	Number Classes Taught By:			
	Head Teacher	1st Assistant	2nd Assistant	3rd Assistant
Andrew Lewis	4	2
Anelia	6	6
Appomattox	6	6
Blacksburg	5	5
Broadway	4	4
Buckingham Central	6	6
Chase City	3	5
Christiansburg	6	6
Culpeper	5	6
Cumberland	4	4
Dickenson Memorial	5	5
Drewry Mason	5	5
Floyd	5	5
Franklin County	6	6
Halifax County Training	6	5
James Sol. Russell	3	3
James Wood	4	5	5	...
John M. Gandy	5	5
Kenbridge	6	5
Lunenburg County Training	4	4
Louisa County	6	6
Madison	6	6
Montevideo	4	5
Northampton	4	5
North River	4	4
Northside Training	5	4
Randolph-Henry	3	4	5	4
Rural Retreat	4	4
R. R. Moton	3	4
Tazewell	3	4
Victoria	5	5
Virginia-Carolina	3	5
William Campbell	5	4
Willis	5	5
Wilson Memorial	...	4	4	4
Wytheville	4	5

Thirty-five head teachers taught a total of 162 periods for an average of 4.5 periods daily per teacher. Number of periods taught by the head teachers ranged from three to six. Nine head teachers taught six periods daily, ten taught five periods, ten taught four periods, and six taught three periods per day. Most schedules provided a time for the head teacher to be used in office work or for supervision of the department of vocational agriculture.

Forty-one assistant teachers taught a total of 197 periods daily for an average of 4.8 periods each, with the number of periods for any teacher ranging from three to six. Eight of these teachers taught six periods daily, eighteen taught five periods daily, fourteen taught four periods a day, and one taught three periods per day. Time not scheduled in classes for this group of teachers was most usually scheduled for the office and visitation.

TABLE 13

SCHOOLS AND NUMBER OF SINGLE PERIOD CLASSES TAUGHT BY EACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER

School	Number Single Periods Taught By:			
	Head Teacher	1st Assis- tant	2nd Assis- tant	3rd Assis- tant
Andrew Lewis	4	3
Anelia	6	6
Appomattox	0	0
Blacksburg	1	1
Broadway	2	4
Buckingham Central	4	4
Chase City	1	5
Christiansburg	2	2
Culpeper	5	6
Cumberland	0	2
Dickenson Memorial	5	5
Drewry Mason	1	1
Floyd	5	5
Franklin County	0	0
Halifax County Training	2	1
James Sol. Russell	3	1
James Wood	2	3	1	...
John M. Gandy	1	1
Kenbridge	6	5
Lunenburg County Training	2	4
Louisa County	2	2
Madison	2	2
Montevideo	4	5
Northampton	4	5
North River	4	4
Northside Training	1	0
Randolph-Henry	3	2	5	4
Rural Retreat	2	0
R. R. Moton	3	2
Tazewell	3	0
Victoria	5	5
Virginia-Carolina	3	1
William Campbell	5	2
Willis	1	1
Wilson Memorial	...	0	0	2
Wytheville	0	1

Although it is considered desirable to teach vocational agriculture in double periods, this study indicated that a majority of the schools are using single periods for a large part of the vocational agriculture instruction. With the exception of two schools, single periods were used wholly or in part by the vocational agriculture teachers.

In thirty-four of the thirty-six schools replying, either the head teacher, assistant, or both used some single periods. The head teachers averaged teaching 2.97 single periods daily, while the assistant teachers averaged teaching 3.02 single periods daily. The range in number of single periods taught by both the head teachers and assistant teachers was from 0 to 6.

TABLE 14

SCHOOLS AND NUMBER OF DOUBLE PERIOD CLASSES TAUGHT BY EACH VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER

School	Number Double Periods Taught By:			
	Head Teacher	1st Assis- tant	2nd Assis- tant	3rd Assis- tant
Andrew Lewis	0	1
Amelia	0	0
Appomattox	3	3
Blacksburg	2	2
Broadway	1	0
Buckingham Central	1	1
Chase City	1	0
Christiansburg	2	2
Culpeper	0	0
Cumberland	2	1
Dickenson Memorial	0	0
Drewry Mason	2	2
Floyd	0	0
Franklin County	3	3
Halifax County Training	2	2
James Sol. Russell	0	1
James Wood	1	1	2	...
John M. Gandy	2	2
Kenbridge	0	0
Lunenburg County Training	1	0
Louisa County	2	2
Madison	2	2
Montevideo	0	0
Northampton	0	0
North River	0	0
Northside Training	2	2
Randolph-Henry	0	1	0	0
Rural Retreat	1	2
R. R. Moton	0	1
Tazewell	0	2
Victoria	0	0
Virginia-Carolina	0	2
William Campbell	0	1
Willis	2	2
Wilson Memorial	...	2	2	1
Wytheville	2	2

Only two schools, Appomattox and Franklin County taught all of the vocational agriculture offered in double periods. Nine schools had the entire offering of vocational agriculture taught in single periods.

Nineteen head teachers taught double periods, ranging from 1 to 3 per teacher, with an average of 1.79 double periods per head teacher. Twenty-seven assistants taught double periods for an average of 1.74 double periods per day.

The complexity of many of the schedules made it difficult to determine the use of a double period in every case. Two classes of vocational agriculture may be separated by a shop class for these two same groups. In a schedule of this type double periods can be achieved on the days each class is scheduled for shop, which is normally two days per week.

TABLE 15

PART-TIME CLASSES CONDUCTED BY DEPARTMENTS STUDIED, ENROLLMENT AND MEETINGS HELD

School	Number Vocational Agricultural Teachers	Number Vocational Agricultural Teachers Conducting Part-Time Classes	Number Part-Time Classes	Number Meetings Held	Enrollment in Part-Time Classes
Andrew Lewis	2	1	1	12	38
Amelia	2	1	1	12	37
Appomattox	2	1	1	15	12
Blacksburg	2	2	2	24	44
Broadway	2
Buckingham					
Central	2	1	1	12	40
Chase City	2	1	1	14	19
Christiansburg	2	1	1	12	15
Culpeper	2	1	1	12	20
Cumberland	2
Dickenson					
Memorial	2
Drewry Mason	2	2	2	24	16
Floyd	2	2	2	24	30
Franklin County	2
Halifax County					
Training	2	2	3	60	27
James Sol. Russell	2	2	2	24	42
James Wood	3	2	2	24	28
John M. Gandy	2	1	1	19	24
Kenbridge	2	1	1	12	17
Lunenburg County					
Training	2	1	1	12	20
Louisa County	2	1	1	15	30
Madison	2	1	1	12	15
Montevideo	2	1	1	12	30
Northampton	2	1	1	10	7
North River	2	1	1	12	27
Northside					
Training	2	1	1	12	22
Randolph-Henry	4	1	1	24	26
Rural Retreat	2	2	2	36	26
R. R. Moton	2	2	2	20	24

TABLE 15 Continued

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conducting Part-Time Classes	Number Part-Time Classes	Number Meetings Held	Enrollment in Part-Time Classes
Tazewell	2	2	2	12	20
Victoria	2	1	1	12	26
Virginia-Carolina	2	2	2	24	38
William Campbell	2
Willis	2	1	1	12	21
Wilson Memorial	3	2	2	24	31
Wytheville	2

Of the total of seventy-six teachers employed by the schools, forty-one were conducting forty-two part-time classes. One teacher was conducting two classes. This was an average of .55 classes per teacher, or 1.17 classes per department. One department was conducting three classes, ten departments were conducting two classes, nineteen departments had one class, and five departments had no part-time class. To apply the averages to the number of teachers in the departments and the number of departments actually conducting part-time classes, we get an average of .64 classes per teacher and 1.37 classes per department.

A total of 549 part-time class meetings were held for an average of 13.0 meetings per class. Total enrollment in the part-time classes was 772 or an average of 18.3 members per class.

All vocational agriculture departments in the State conducted 160 part-time classes with a total enrollment of 2,762, for an average of 17.3 persons per class. Single teacher departments conducted 118 part-time classes which had an average enrollment of 16.8 per class. Enrollment in part-time classes was slightly higher in the multiple-teacher departments.

TABLE 16

YOUNG FARMER ASSOCIATIONS, MEMBERSHIP AND NUMBER TEACHERS BY SCHOOLS

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Young Farmer Associations Supervised by Department	Total Membership in Young Farmer Associations Supervised by Department
Andrew Lewis	2	1	38
Amelia	2	1	45
Appomattox	2	1	12
Blacksburg	2	2	32
Broadway	2	1	33
Buckingham Central	2	1	40
Chase City	2	1	20
Christiansburg	2
Culpeper	2	1	14
Cumberland	2
Dickenson Memorial	2
Drewry Mason	2	2	28
Floyd	2	2	60
Franklin County	2
Halifax County
Training	2	1	21
James Sol. Russell	2	2	84
James Wood	3	2	52
John M. Gandy	2	1	24
Kenbridge	2	1	17
Lunenburg County			
Training	2
Louisa County	2	1	18
Madison	2
Montevideo	2
Northampton	2
North River	2	1	12
Northside Training	2	1	14
Randolph-Henry	4
Rural Retreat	2	1	18
R. R. Moton	2	2	38
Tazewell	2	1	18
Victoria	2
Virginia-Carolina	2	2	38
William Campbell	2
Willis	2	1	12
Wilson Memorial	3	2	45
Wytheville	2	1	40

Young farmer organizations are a phase of the vocational agriculture program that has been started in recent years. The number of associations that have started in the past few years are very encouraging.

Of the thirty-six departments studied, twenty-five had young farmer associations, with a total membership of 773. The smallest membership in any association was twelve, three departments had this number. The largest membership in any one department of vocational agriculture was eighty-four young farmers. In this department this total membership was divided into two associations.

Eight departments had two young farmer associations, seventeen departments had one association, and eleven departments had no associations. The average association per department of vocational agriculture in the multiple-teacher departments was .92.

Average young farmer membership in multiple-teacher departments was 24.4.

Average membership per teacher in all multiple-teacher departments was 10.2.

TABLE 17
EVENING CLASSES CONDUCTED BY DEPARTMENTS STUDIED, ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER TEACHERS
CONDUCTING CLASSES

School	Number Vo- cational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vo- cational Agriculture Teachers Conducting Evening Classes	Number Evening Classes Conduct- ed by Depart- ment	Number Meet- ings Held	Enroll- ment in Evening Classes
Andrew Lewis	2	2	2	17	30
Amelia	2
Appomattox	2	2	1	10	30
Blacksburg	2	2	2	20	28
Broadway	2	1	1	10	20
Buckingham Central	2
Chase City	2
Christiansburg	2	1	2	12	71
Culpeper	2
Cumberland	2	1	2	28	110
Dickenson Memorial	2
Drewry Mason	2	2	2	24	108
Floyd	2	2	2	36	45
Franklin County	2	2	4	20	90
Halifax County Training	2	2	3	39	50
James Sol. Russell	2	2	3	24	68
James Wood	2
John M. Gandy	2	2	2	36	72
Kenbridge	2
Lunenburg County Training	2	1	1	12	20
Louisa County	2	1	1	14	36
Madison	2	2	2	20	50
Montevideo	2	1	1	10	30

TABLE 17 Continued

School	Number Vo- cational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vo- cational Agriculture Teachers Conducting Evening Classes	Number Evening Classes Conduct- ed by Depart- ment	Number Meet- ings Held	Enroll- ment in Evening Classes
Northampton	2	1	1	10	40
North River	2	1	1	12	25
Northside Training	2	2	2	24	58
Randolph-Henry	4	2	2	24	26
Rural Retreat	2	2	4	24	92
R. R. Moton	2	2	2	20	58
Tazewell	2	2	2	16	45
Victoria	2
Virginia-Carolina	2	2	2	24	50
William Campbell	2	2	2	20	35
Willis	2	2	2	20	50
Wilson Memorial	2
Wytheville	2	1	1	12	20

Twenty-seven departments out of the thirty-six were conducting fifty-two evening classes. These fifty-two classes were being taught by forty-five teachers. Eight teachers were conducting two classes each, and in one case two teachers were cooperating in conducting one class. Of the departments conducting evening classes, there was an average of 1.92 classes per school, but on a basis of all departments studied, there was an average of 1.44 classes per school. The average is lowered due to the fact that nine departments were not conducting any evening classes.

The fifty-two evening classes had a total enrollment of 1357, which was an average of 26.1 members per class. This compares favorably with the entire state average of 25.6 membership per class. A total of 540 class meetings were held or an average of 10.4 meetings per class. Number of meetings per class ranged from five to eighteen while enrollment per class ranged from thirteen to fifty-five.

State requirements for an evening class is a minimum of ten meetings. In this group of departments, twelve of the fifty-two evening classes met less than the required meetings per class. However, these twelve classes have been included in the averages.

TABLE 18
FARM MACHINERY REPAIR CLASSES CONDUCTED BY DEPARTMENTS STUDIED

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conducting Farm Machinery Repair Class	Number Farm Machinery Repair Classes Conducted by Department	Number Classes Held	Enrollment in Farm Machinery Repair Classes
Andrew Lewis	2	2	2	30	120
Amelia	2	2	2	16	110
Appomattox	2	2	1	48	130
Blacksburg	2	1	1	12	25
Broadway	2	2	5	60	66
Buckingham Central	2	1	1	40	83
Chase City	2	2	1	24	40
Christiansburg	2	2	2	72	85
Culpeper	2	1	1	15	20
Cumberland	2	2	3	96	130
Dickenson Memorial	2	1	1	12	45
Drewry Mason	2	2	3	48	147
Floyd	2	2	2	80	60
Franklin County	2	2	2	48	51
Halifax County Training	2	1	2	8	34
James Sol. Russell	2
James Wood	2	3	3	44	60
John M. Gandy	2	1	1	20	25
Kenbridge	2	1	1	35	50
Lunenburg County Training	2	1	1	18	40
Louisa County	2	2	2	30	70
Madison	2	1	1	12	55
Montevideo	2	2	1	10	30

TABLE 18 Continued

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conducting Farm Machinery Repair Class	Number Farm Machinery Repair Classes Conducted by Department	Number Classes Held	Enrollment in Farm Machinery Repair Classes
Northampton	2	1	1	24	45
North River	2	2	2	30	120
Northside Training	2
Randolph-Henry	4	1	1	15	64
Rural Retreat	2	1	1	24	65
R. R. Moton	2	2	2	28	36
Tazewell	2	2	2	40	60
Victoria	2	1	1	36	28
Virginia-Carolina	2	2	2	24	30
William Campbell	2	2	3	53	200
Willis	2	2	2	40	40
Wilson Memorial	3	2	2	24	38
Wytheville	2	1	1	40	30

Thirty-four departments out of the thirty-six were conducting fifty-eight farm machinery repair classes. Fifty-four teachers were conducting these fifty-eight classes, which was an average of 1.07 classes per teacher. Since there were 76 teachers in the departments replying, this gives an average of .76 classes per teacher, for all departments. The average number of classes for each department is 1.61. Twenty-two teachers were not conducting any farm machinery repair classes, forty-four were conducting one class, five were teaching two classes, one was conducting three classes, and in two cases two teachers were conducting a class together.

There was a total of 1144 farm machinery repair meetings held, which is an average of 19.8 meetings per class. These classes reached a total of 2142 persons, giving an average enrollment per class of 37.1.

TABLE 19

SCHOOL COMMUNITY CANNERIES SUPERVISED BY DEPARTMENTS STUDIED,
AND ENROLLMENT

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers Supervising Canneries	Number Canneries Supervised by Department	Total Enrollment in Canneries
Andrew Lewis	2	1	1	432
Amelia	2	1	1	100
Appomattox	2	1	1	...
Blacksburg	2	1	1	490
Broadway	2	2	2	250
Buckingham				
Central	2	1	2	973
Chase City	2	2	1	350
Christiansburg	2	1	1	308
Culpeper	2
Cumberland	2	2	3	1000
Dickenson				
Memorial	2
Drewry Mason	2	1	2	377
Floyd	2
Franklin County	2
Halifax County				
Training	2
James Sol.				
Russell	2	2	2	60
James Wood	3	1	1	50
John M. Gandy	2	1	1	100
Kenbridge	2	1	2	368
Lunenburg County				
Training	2	1	1	101
Louisa County	2
Madison	2	2	2	150
Montevideo	2	2	2	650
Northampton	2	1	1	148
North River	2	2	2	450
Northside				
Training	2
Randolph-Henry	4	4	4	780
Rural Retreat	2	1	1	435
R. R. Moton	2	2	1	464

TABLE 19 Continued

School	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers	Number Vocational Agriculture Teachers Supervising Canneries	Number Canneries Supervised by Department	Total Enrollment in Canneries
Tazewell	2
Victoria	2	1	2	375
Virginia-Carolina	2	2	2	106
William Campbell	2	2	3	...
Willis	2
Wilson Memorial	3	2	4	1700
Wytheville	2	1	1	385

In the thirty-six departments studied, forty-one teachers supervised forty-seven school community canneries. Nine departments had no school community canneries, while twenty-seven departments had one or more school community canneries under its supervision. Thirteen departments supervised one school community cannery, ten departments supervised two school community canneries, two departments supervised three school community canneries and two departments supervised four school community canneries.

The average number of school community canneries under supervision of the departments studied was 1.30. Placed on a basis of those departments actually supervising school community canneries, the average is 1.91 school community canneries per school.

Instruction in food production and conservation reached a total of 10,602 persons for an average of 393 through each school community cannery.

TABLE 20

OPINIONS REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE METHODS, PERSONAL PROBLEMS, AND AREA SERVED

QUESTION	Number Replies		
	Yes	No	Total
1. Do you think the area served by your school is too large for the most efficient instruction in all phases of the vocational agriculture program?	7	29	36
2. Do you consider the present number of teachers sufficient to provide adequate instruction?	22	14	36
3. Is a high degree of cooperation between teachers necessary under your present organization for instruction?	35	0	35
4. Is it difficult under your present system of organization to get the cooperation desired between all teachers?	3	32	35
5. Is the supervision of farm practice as adequate and as closely followed as might be done in a one-teacher department?	26	9	35
6. Are classrooms adequately equipped with tables and chairs?	36	0	36
7. Is adequate storage provided for teaching materials?	26	10	36
8. Can classrooms be darkened sufficiently to use films during day-light?	30	6	36
9. Is the office adequately heated?	26	10	36
10. Are adequate filing cabinets provided?	34	2	36
11. Is storage space for lumber adequate?	24	12	36

The seven schools answering "yes" to question 1, served an average of 510 square miles, while the twenty-nine schools answering "no" served an average area of 272 square miles. The fourteen answering "no" to question 2, reached an average of 628 persons through organized instruction, while the 22 answering "yes" reached an average of 498 persons.

All schools replying agreed that a high degree of cooperation between teachers was necessary, but only three found it hard to get the cooperation desired.

In most cases physical facilities provided were ample. The schools not having adequate facilities were in the relatively new multiple-teacher departments.

Nine schools thought that adequate supervision of farm practices was more difficult in a multiple-teacher department. Some reasons given for this were: area too large, not acquainted with all boys, do not have all boys in class, and doing things other than providing instruction did not leave enough time.

TABLE 21

PRACTICES USED AND RECOMMENDED BY MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENTS

	Being Used	Not Being Used	Recommended	Not Recommended	Not Recommended	Total Responses
1. All teachers, including veterans' teachers, of vocational agriculture in this department meet during the summer and with each participating, the "Program of Work" for the year is planned	34	1	23	...	1	35
2. The head teacher plans the "Program of Work" and assigns parts to each teacher in the department	3	24	...	23	9	27
3. During the year no staff meetings are held and each teacher works independently	1	23	...	30	12	24
4. The head teacher seldom calls meetings of his staff	7	19	3	21	10	26
5. The head teacher schedules a meeting of his staff at least once each week to report progress and coordinate the work of the department of vocational agriculture	18	12	18	8	6	30
6. Meetings of the staff are held daily to report progress and to coordinate the work of the department	11	17	7	19	8	28
7. The head teacher has assigned responsibilities to each member of his staff relative to assisting with organizing and maintaining facilities and teaching materials in the department	28	5	21	3	3	33

TABLE 21 Continued

	Be- ing Used	Not Being Used	Recom- mended	Not Recom- mended	Not Res- pon- ding	Total Res- ponses
8. Each teacher, except veterans' teachers, participates in each phase of the program of vocational agriculture	28	2	19	4	6	30
9. Each prospective freshman for vocational agriculture is visited on his home farm before the school session begins and a written record made of his facilities for a farming program as well as the desires of the boy and his parents, relative to enrolling in vocational agriculture	15	16	29	1	5	31

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES
OF MULTIPLE-TEACHER DEPARTMENTS

A poll of head teachers was made to determine some of the more common advantages and disadvantages of multiple-teacher departments. Advantages listed were as follows:

1. More adequate offering.
2. More adequate and improved facilities.
3. Opportunity to use the experiences and specialities of a greater number of teachers.
4. Opportunity for working together on mutual problems.
5. Classes large enough that mixed grades are avoided.
6. Shop facilities used more.
7. More adequate facilities can be justified.
8. Enable departments to reach more people in community.
9. Makes it possible for one teacher to leave for short period of time.
10. Students have benefit of more than one teacher.
11. Can have a good public relations program.
12. Easier for beginning teachers.

Disadvantages listed were as follows:

1. Lack of sufficiently trained teachers.
2. On the farm supervision more difficult.
3. Area is too large.
4. Less opportunity for leadership development in F. F. A.
5. Students not too well acquainted.
6. Teaching material and equipment more easily misplaced.

7. Success depends upon the cooperation of more individuals.
8. Difficult to schedule field trips, F. F. A. activities, etc.
9. More travel is required.
10. Difficult to keep parents interested in boy's program.
11. Adequate classrooms not provided.
12. Chance for misunderstanding among teachers.
13. Conflicts in use of teaching aids at times.
14. Lack of space and equipment.
15. Too much responsibility may be shifted from one teacher to another.

The advantages and disadvantages above were all listed one or more times by the head teachers responding. The three most important advantages based on teacher responses were as follows:

1. Opportunity to use the experience and specialties of a greater number of teachers.
2. Opportunity for working together on mutual problems.
3. Enable departments to reach more people in community.

Other advantages listed were given a fewer number of times, indicating that fewer teachers considered them as important advantages of a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture.

To the question, Is cooperation between teachers difficult to obtain?, thirty-four of the teachers answered "no", while two teachers answered "yes". In listing disadvantages of a multiple-teacher department the two listed most frequently were:

1. Chance for misunderstanding among teachers.
2. Too much responsibility may be shifted from one teacher to another.

Although the present multiple-teacher departments were not experiencing any difficulty in obtaining teacher cooperation, many teachers felt that this could be a big problem.

Two other disadvantages:

1. On the farm supervision more difficult.
2. Students not too well acquainted, were mentioned frequently.

Head teachers not having qualified assistants mentioned this as a disadvantage.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

1. Multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture were increasing in number. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that Virginia rural schools were consolidating at a rapid rate. The fact that all multiple-teacher departments have developed in the past 14 years indicates a definite trend to this type of department.
2. High school enrollment and the size of the area served by the school does not have a direct bearing on the number of vocational agriculture teachers in a department. Two teachers served an area as small as 40 square miles, while the same number of teachers in another school served an area of 881 square miles. High school enrollment in the two-teacher schools varied from 134 to 1375.
3. Many buildings that were being used by multiple-teacher departments were not planned for this type of department, as indicated by the large number of buildings having only one classroom. Shop space in many cases was not adequate to care for a large enrollment, and the one classroom was not adequate to allow for a flexible scheduling of classes.
4. The majority of multiple-teacher departments were the two-teacher type, in which the second teacher was added when the program became too large for one teacher.
5. The number enrolled in vocational agriculture tended to be in inverse proportion to total high school enrollment.
6. Most classes in vocational agriculture were taught in single periods of 55 minutes each.
7. Only one shop was provided for any department, while some shops were too small to provide adequate instruction for large enrollments. This would probably indicate that some multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture seemingly developed without adequate planning for necessary facilities.

8. Most schools were using a vocational agriculture schedule which provided seven periods per week instruction, with two of the periods devoted to shop work. Each vocational agriculture student received 72 hours shop instruction per school year.
9. Pupil teacher ratio in multiple-teacher departments remained approximately the same, although the range from 8.5 to 63 boys per teacher was rather large.
10. All schools were offering four years of vocational agriculture, but a combination of freshman, sophomore and junior, senior classes is rather prevalent.
11. In most cases the head teacher has more teaching experience than the assistant teachers. Head teachers had an average of 14.2 years of teaching experience as compared to 5.7 years for assistant teachers.
12. A higher percentage of head teachers held a Masters Degree. This study indicated that 17.1 per cent of the head teachers held a Masters Degree, while only 9.8 per cent of assistant teachers held a Masters Degree. Only one, or 2.8 per cent, of head teachers held no degree, while 17.1 per cent of assistant teachers held no degree. This indicated that in general a higher degree of training is required of head teachers. It also indicated that many unqualified teachers were employed as assistant teachers.
13. The study indicated that only 19.4 per cent of the multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture were participating in all phases of the program, excluding exploratory courses.
14. Total persons reached through organized instruction does not increase in direct proportion with the area served.
15. The greatest number of persons were being reached through the community cannery program, which was followed by the other phases in the order of: all-day classes, farm machinery repair classes, exploratory courses, evening classes, young farmer associations, and part-time classes.
16. If we use enrollment as a criterion for measurement, then greater emphasis was being placed on evening classes than on part-time classes as indicated by the comparative enrollments of 1357 for evening classes and 732 for part-time classes. Combined enrollment of part-time and young farmers, which was 1475, indicated a near equal effort was being exerted to reach the out of school and adult groups.

17. Travel allowance was not based on vocational agriculture enrollment as indicated by the wide range in travel allowance, which was from \$5.28 to \$35.25 per student.
18. A smaller percentage of total faculty taught vocational agriculture in schools with large enrollments.
19. The head teacher taught fewer periods than the assistant teachers. This study revealed head teachers taught an average of 4.5 periods daily, as compared with 4.8 periods daily for assistant teachers.
20. Young farmer associations were becoming a very important phase of the vocational agriculture program as indicated by the number of schools that were sponsoring these associations.
21. Farm machinery repair classes were popular with the patrons, as indicated from the fact that thirty-four of thirty-six departments were conducting such classes.
22. School community canneries were being used very extensively, as indicated by the large enrollment.
23. The majority of teachers reported that cooperation between teachers was not a difficult task in multiple-teacher departments.
24. Teacher responses indicated that approximately 40 per cent of the multiple-teacher departments were not adequately staffed to provide sufficient instruction.
25. In most cases each teacher participated in each phase of the vocational agriculture program.
26. The visitation of prospective vocational agriculture students was a very desirable practice, but was being used by less than one-half of the departments.
27. Teacher responses indicated that it was more difficult to give adequate supervision to the supervised farming programs in multiple-teacher departments.

CHAPTER V
RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has not shown that any definite type of organization for instruction in a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture is being followed. Most schools are following the plan of all teachers participating in all phases of the program, the minor adaptations to suit individual needs. When all teachers are qualified to take a part in the complete program, this seems to be the most desirable. In the few departments that have unqualified teachers this was pointed out as a disadvantage unless it provided for participation in all phases by all teachers.

Since we accept as a fact that double periods are more advantageous in the teaching of vocational agriculture, it appears that more thought and effort should be given to achieving this type of schedule. This would provide ample time for field trips, demonstrations, etc., which are important to good teaching. In the larger schools it becomes even more necessary that an efficient and set pattern of administrative policies be followed. This results in less attention to individuals and special groups. In small schools satisfactory arrangements can usually be made for off campus instruction, but in larger schools this is practically impossible unless ample time is provided in a definite schedule. It is the feeling of the author that use of double periods would be

of greater importance in a multiple-teacher department than in a single teacher department.

It is very obvious that scheduling of classes cannot be at its best when ample classrooms are not available. The author would strongly recommend that a classroom for each vocational agriculture teacher be provided in the case of two-teacher schools. Where the department has more than two teachers, certainly a minimum of two classrooms would be needed. It would be unwise to attempt to equip duplicate shops for multiple-teacher departments. Since enrollment is usually large in these departments a concerted effort should be exerted to provide ample space and equipment in a single shop. In this study shop space per student enrolled in vocational agriculture varied from 17.2 to 85.8 square feet. Insufficient shop space naturally results in scheduling difficulties.

As pointed out by many teachers, it is difficult in multiple-teacher departments to get members together for F. F. A. Chapter and committee meetings. Since students live over such a large area, it perhaps would not be advisable to resort to out-of-school time for these activities. It appears that the following may be a workable solution to this problem. A time could be scheduled weekly, monthly, or as often as necessary, by the administrative staff, to be used for purposes of this type. This time would then be available and could be used for chapter and committee meetings. Since larger schools offer more extra-curricula activities to consume the students' time,

problems of getting students together for meetings will still exist. Perhaps the only solution to this would be a mutual "give and take" proposition with other teachers. The importance of good personal relationship with other teachers in the school cannot be over-emphasized, and will certainly make difficulties of this type easier to solve.

In order for a vocational agriculture teacher to be of service to his students, he must have a knowledge of the home farm situation. Since one teacher may not have all the students in class, he does not attempt to visit the complete enrollment. One teacher may be able to make progress with a student when others have failed. If at all possible each teacher should visit all members of the vocational agriculture department. This would make an exchange of ideas between the teachers more worthwhile, and perhaps render a greater service to all students involved. It could also result in closer cooperation between teachers, which is paramount to an efficient organization.

If a policy of all teachers visiting all students is followed a more complete set of student records must be maintained. A cumulative record kept in the students file would be of great advantage. Any information pertaining to the students supervised farming program could be entered on this record by any teacher visiting him. This would mean that adequate information for a successful farm visit would be available to all teachers.

As enrollment in high school increases, the percentage of students from farm homes enrolled in vocational agriculture has a tendency to decrease. This is, without a doubt, due to the wider subject matter offering of a larger school. Where the offering of a school is limited some students enroll in vocational agriculture when they would be better placed in other courses. In our larger schools the reverse to this situation is very likely to occur. Therefore, it appears that vocational agriculture teachers could well afford to work rather closely with the guidance counselor to channel students into the most desirable courses. The result of this wide offering of courses will likely be that some boys will remain on the farm that have never had high school vocational agriculture training.

This study has not shown that any set rules or policies can be made for the efficient organization and operation of a multiple-teacher department. It will always be the responsibility of the local teachers and school administrators to recognize the merits and demerits of any organization, and to make necessary adjustments which will result in the efficient operation of the department.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his appreciation to the Agriculture Education Staff at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Through the inspiration, guidance, and wise counsel of Professor Horne this study was conceived and carried to completion.

The author is especially indebted to the teachers of Vocational Agriculture who supplied data for the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hamlin, H. M., Agriculture Education in Community Schools.
The Interstate 1949, pp. 353-355.
- Kinzle, Gilbert Ray, Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture, Unpublished M. S. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in each blank in this questionnaire with information appropriate for your department of vocational agriculture.

Section 1. General Information

Name of School _____ Post Office _____

Vocational Agriculture District in which school is located

Names of teachers of vocational agriculture: (Also give address if not same as school's address.)

Head Teacher _____

Teacher No. 2 _____

Teacher No. 3 _____

Teacher No. 4 _____

Teacher of Veterans' Class No. 1 _____

Teacher of Veterans' Class No. 2 _____

Teacher of Veterans' Class No. 3 _____

	:Head :Teacher	:Teacher: :No. 2	:Teacher: :No. 3	:Teacher: :No. 4
1. Years experience teaching Voc. Agriculture.	:	:	:	:
2. Number years taught in present position.	:	:	:	:
3. Degree or degrees each teach- er holds.	:	:	:	:
4. Annual travel allowance for Voc. Agriculture.	:	:	:	:
5. Number of miles teacher lives from school	:	:	:	:

6. How many years have the present number of teachers been employed? _____
7. How many years has this been a multiple-teacher department? _____
8. How many teachers, other than agriculture teachers, are in high school? _____
9. The approximate area in square miles served by the school is _____ square miles.
10. The amount of secretarial help provided (part-time or full time) _____.
11. Do you think the area served by your school is too large for the most efficient instruction in vocational agriculture? _____
12. Do you consider the present number of teachers of vocational agriculture sufficient to provide adequate instruction in all phases of the vocational agriculture program? _____

Section II. Factors Determining the Policies for Establishment of Multiple-Teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture

1. How many boys are enrolled in your high school? _____
2. How many of these boys are from farm homes? _____
3. How many girls are enrolled in your high school? _____
4. How many of these girls are from farm homes? _____

	:Head :Teacher	:Teacher: :No. 2	:Teacher: :No. 3	:Teacher: :No. 4
5. Indicate number of classes of pre-high school, or exploratory agriculture being taught by	:	:	:	:
6. What is each teacher's enrollment in pre-high school, or exploratory agriculture.	:	:	:	:
7. What is each teacher's enrollment in all-day classes in vocational agriculture.	:	:	:	:
8. Indicate the number of young farmer (part-time) classes for which each teacher is responsible.	:	:	:	:
9. Indicate each teacher's enrollment in young farmer (part-time) classes.	:	:	:	:

	:Head :Teacher	:Teacher: :No. 2	:Teacher: :No. 3	:Teacher: :No. 4
10. What is the average number of meetings conducted during the year per young farmer (part-time) class? . . .	:	:	:	:
11. For how many young farmer associations is each teacher responsible?	:	:	:	:
12. How many meetings are conducted during the year per young farmer association .	:	:	:	:
13. What is the total membership in young farmer associations conducted by this department?	:	:	:	:
14. Indicate the number of adult farmer (evening) classes for which each teacher is responsible?	:	:	:	:
15. Indicate each teacher's enrollment in adult farmer (evening) classes.	:	:	:	:
16. How many meetings are conducted during the year for each adult farmer (evening) class?	:	:	:	:
17. Indicate the number of farm machinery repair classes for which each teacher is responsible.	:	:	:	:
18. Indicate each teacher's enrollment in farm machinery repair classes	:	:	:	:
19. How many meetings of a farm machinery repair class are conducted by each teacher per year.	:	:	:	:
20. Indicate the number of food processing plants (canneries) supervised by each teacher	:	:	:	:
21. What is each teacher's enrollment in food production and conservation classes?	:	:	:	:
22. What is the average number of food production and conservation class meetings conducted?	:	:	:	:
23. Are there any young farmer organizations in your department under the supervision of a veterans' teacher _____ (yes or no)	:	:	:	:

24. If answer is yes to question 23, give number of such groups _____.

Section III. Departmental Staff and Organization Procedures Being Followed in Multiple-teacher Departments of Vocational Agriculture

1. Please indicate below the daily schedule of teachers of vocational agriculture. Indicate grade by Roman Numerals, such as "Agri. I", and subdivisions by letters, such as "Agri. 1A".

Periods	: Length in:	Classes of	:Classes of:	Classes of:	Classes of
	: Minutes	:Head Teacher:	Teacher 2	: Teacher 3	:teacher 4-
First	:	:	:	:	:
Second	:	:	:	:	:
Third	:	:	:	:	:
Fourth	:	:	:	:	:
Fifth	:	:	:	:	:
Sixth	:	:	:	:	:

Please indicate by a check mark whether you use and recommend each of the following practices or procedures:

(Please read entire block before you start checking.)

	:Being:	Not	:recom-:	recom-
	:used	:being	:mended:	mended
	:used	:used	:mended	:mended
1. All teachers, including veterans' teachers, of Voc. Agriculture in this department meet during the Summer and with each participating, the "Program of Work" for the year is planned. . . .	:	:	:	:
2. The head teacher plans the "Program of Work" and assigns parts to each teacher in the department	:	:	:	:
3. During the year no staff meetings are held and each teacher works independently.	:	:	:	:
4. The head teacher seldom calls meetings of his staff.	:	:	:	:

	:Being: :used :	:Not :being :used	:Recom- :mended :	:Not :recom- :mended
5. The head teacher schedules a meeting of his staff at least once each week to report progress and coordinate the work of the department of voc. agriculture	:	:	:	:
6. Meetings of the staff are held daily to report progress and to coordinate the work of the dept.	:	:	:	:
7. The head teacher has assigned responsibilities to each member of his staff relative to assisting with organizing and maintaining facilities and teaching materials in the dept.	:	:	:	:
8. Each teacher, except veterans' teachers, participates in each phase of the program of vocational agriculture	:	:	:	:
9. Each prospective freshman for Voc. agriculture is visited on his home farm before the school session begins and a written record made of his facilities for a farming program as well as the desires of the boy and his parents relative to enrolling in Vocational agriculture.	:	:	:	:
10. What change, if any, might be made to provide more efficient instruction for any group? _____				
11. On how many days during the academic year does each student enrolled in vocational agriculture have a shop class? _____ days				
12. What are some of the difficulties (solved or unsolved) that you have encountered with your present organization for instruction in vocational agriculture: _____				

13. Is a high degree of cooperation between teachers in this department necessary under your present organization for instruction?

(Circle your answer) Yes No

14. Is it difficult under your present system of organization, to get the cooperation desired between all teachers?

(Circle your answer) Yes No

15. Is the supervision of farm practice as adequate and as closely followed as might be done in a one teacher department?

(Circle your answer) Yes No

16. If the answer to question 15 is "no", please give reasons.

Section IV. Facilities Available in Multiple-Teacher Departments

1. How many classrooms are used for vocational agriculture classes? _____

2. Are classrooms equipped with tables and chairs? _____ (yes or no)

3. How many square feet of floor space are in the shop? _____ Sq. Ft.

4. Is adequate storage provided for teaching materials? _____ (yes-no)

5. Can classroom be darkened sufficient to use films during day-light? _____ (Yes-No)

6. Is the office adequately heated? _____ (Yes-No)

7. Are adequate filing cabinets provided? _____ (Yes-No)

8. Is storage space for lumber adequate? _____ (Yes-No)

Section V. Miscellaneous

1. What do you feel are some of the most important advantages of a multiple-teacher department of vocational agriculture?

2. What do you feel are some of the most important disadvantages of multiple-teacher departments of vocational agriculture?

Stuart, Virginia
December 8, 1952

To Vocational Agriculture Instructors in Multiple-Teacher
Agriculture Departments in Virginia

Dear Mr.

As a basis of my thesis required for the M. S. Degree in Agricultural Education, I am making a study of Multiple-teacher Agriculture Departments in Virginia. The purpose of this study is to determine the present organization practices being followed in these departments.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which contains questions pertaining to the present organization. This same form is being sent to each head teacher in multiple-teacher departments in Virginia. It is hoped that the answers to this questionnaire will provide a workable basis for future organization of multiple-teacher departments.

As you will see from the enclosed letter, Mr. T. V. Downing, Assistant State Supervisor of Agriculture Education, has approved this study as being of value to Virginia.

I shall appreciate your cooperation in answering these questions with respect to your department, and returning the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

A summary of the study will be sent to any teacher requesting it.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur E. Williams

Enc. Questionnaire
Envelope
Letter from Mr. Downing

To Teachers of Vocational Agriculture in Virginia

Gentlemen:

Mr. Arthur E. Williams, Teacher of Vocational Agriculture at Stuart, Virginia, is interested in getting certain information which we feel will be of vital interest to our program in Vocational Agriculture. We would like to urge, therefore, that you do everything possible to supply Mr. Williams with the information requested. Studies such as these mean a lot to the progress of our program.

Sincerely,

T. V. Downing
Assistant State Supervisor
Vocational Agriculture