

ILLEGIBLE DOCUMENT

**THE FOLLOWING
DOCUMENT(S) IS OF
POOR LEGIBILITY IN
THE ORIGINAL**

**THIS IS THE BEST
COPY AVAILABLE**

AN EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM IN
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

DALE GENE UNRUH

B.S., Kansas State University, 1980

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1981

Approved by:


Major Professor

SPEC
COLL
LD
2668
R4
1981
U57
C. 2



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To those persons who aided in the completion of this study, the writer would like to extend genuine appreciation and thanks.

To Dr. Richard Welton, his major advisor, for his continuous assistance, advice, and words of inspiration during this study.

To Dr. Ralph Field, Departmental Head, Adult and Occupational Education; Dr. Paul Stevenson, Associate Professor, Agricultural Engineering; Dr. James Albracht, Associate Professor, Adult and Occupational Education; and Dr. Richard Welton, Associate Professor, Adult and Occupational Education; for serving on the graduate committee.

To Dr. John Parmley, Associate Professor, Adult and Occupational Education, for assistance and words of encouragement when needed most.

To Nita Johnston, Linda Yarrow, and Susan Wells for their invaluable assistance in typing questionnaires, tables, and final report.

To the undergraduates and graduates of Agricultural Education at Kansas State University for completion and return of the questionnaires.

To the writer's parents and family for their support and love throughout the years and during the time of this study.

To other staff and faculty for their assistance and patience during the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study.	2
Objectives	3
Definition of Terms.	3
Limitations of the Study	5
II. METHODOLOGY.	6
Population	6
Instrumentation.	7
Collection of Data	7
Analysis of Data	11
III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
Coursework	14
Advisement	18
Extra Curricular Activities.	20
Summary.	22
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA.	23
Demographic Data	23
Extra Curricular Activities.	25
Advisement	30
Coursework	33
Graduate Demographic Data.	42
Student Teaching	46
Total Curriculum	53
Summary.	55
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	59
Summary of Study	59
Purpose.	59
Objectives	59

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
<u>V.--Continued</u>	
Major Findings	60
Recommendations.	64
Recommendations for Further Study.	67
APPENDICES	68
A.	69
B.	77
C.	89
D.	93
E.	103
F.	109
G.	112
H.	115
I.	119
J.	122
K.	126
L.	128
M.	131
N.	134
O.	137
P.	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage Response to Questionnaire from Undergraduates and Graduates.	10
2. Grade Level of Agricultural Education Students	24
3. Sex of Agricultural Education Undergraduate Students and Graduates.	24
4. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Opinions Concerning Extra Curricular Activities at Kansas State University Most Helpful in Teacher Preparation	26
5. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Suggestions to Make Agricultural Education Club More Effective	28
6. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Suggestions to Make Alpha Tau Alpha More Effective	30
7. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Opinions Regarding Agricultural Education Advisement.	31
8. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Opinions on Improving Advisement in Agricultural Education	32
9. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Effectiveness Rating of Required Kansas State University Coursework in Preparing to Become a Teacher.	34
10. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Effectiveness Rating of Elective Kansas State University Agricultural Science Coursework in Preparing to Become a Teacher.	37
11. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Effectiveness Rating of Elective Kansas State University Agricultural Education Coursework in Preparing to Become a Teacher.	38
12. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Effectiveness Rating of Elective Kansas State University Agricultural Engineering Coursework in Preparing to Become a Teacher.	39
13. Number of Years Taught by Graduates.	43
14. Present Occupations of Graduates Not Presently Teaching. . .	44

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
15. Number of Years Graduates Who Taught Remained in First Teaching Position.	45
16. Number of Different Teaching Positions Held by Graduates . .	45
17. Graduates' Involvement in Activities During Student Teaching	47
18. Rating of University Supervisors, Cooperating Teacher, and Cooperating Center Attributes.	48
19. Areas Needing Additional Emphasis or Taught During Student Teaching	49
20. Suggestions by Graduates for Improving Student Teaching. . .	50
21. Strengths of Block Semester as Expressed by Graduates. . . .	52
22. Weaknesses of Block Semester as Expressed by Graduates . . .	53
23. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Opinions Regarding Satisfaction with Agricultural Education Curriculum.	54
24. Undergraduates' and Graduates' Opinions Concerning Improvement of Agricultural Education Curriculum	54

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural Education graduates from Kansas State University enter a demanding occupation. They are expected to begin teaching animal sciences, agronomy, agricultural mechanics, farm management and record keeping, horticulture, entomology and in some instances, agricultural sales and services. Agriculture today is in a constant state of change. Tomorrow's Kansas farm operators are graduating from vocational agriculture programs throughout the state now. Vocational agriculture teachers have the responsibility of preparing these graduates for this constantly changing livelihood. As a result of changes in modern agriculture, the demand on vocational agriculture teachers also changes.¹ In order to meet this challenge, the curriculum preparing vocational agriculture teachers must be geared to meet contemporary demands of agriculture.

There are several methods to determine whether a curriculum is doing an adequate job. One method is the use of evaluations. Effective evaluation in agricultural education must be done periodically to correct any possible deficiencies. According to Wieggers,² functions of evaluation include: determining educational needs, clarifying teaching and learning objectives, selecting learning experiences and activities, and determining progress or growth. Evaluation of the undergraduate curriculum in agricultural

¹Eldon R. Reynolds, "An Evaluation of the Pre-Service Program in Agricultural Education at Colorado State University (Master's Report, Colorado State University, 1970), pp. 1-2.

²George W. Wieggers, "Evaluate to Improve," Agricultural Education Magazine, May, 1957, pp. 244-245.

education at Kansas State University came about as a joint project of Dr. Richard Welton and the investigator. It was felt necessary due to the reasons stated above and others. It is the purpose of this study to facilitate this evaluation.

Significance of the Problem

The agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University prepares teachers to teach in the 166 vocational agriculture programs of the Kansas public high schools. Due to the many areas of instruction in vocational agriculture, the agricultural education curriculum must do an effective job of preparing its students during the four years they are on campus. Wilson,³ in a 1958 report at Ohio State University, indicates that some university departments are so concerned about teaching that they forget to ask their students and graduates if agricultural education is doing an adequate job. The curriculum at Kansas State University appears to be at that point since complete evaluations have not been conducted in recent years.

The findings of this study could lead to curriculum improvement which would improve teacher preparation. In the long run, this could result in more teachers graduating in agricultural education and possibly, more beginning teachers staying in the field longer. This would aid in relieving the teacher shortage and improve the quality of instruction in Kansas vocational agriculture programs.

³Richard H. Wilson, ed., A University Department Evaluates its Curriculum. . . An Evaluation of the Curriculum in Agricultural Education at the Ohio State University (Columbus: Ohio Department of Education, 1958), p. 1.

Objectives

Evaluation and improvement of the agricultural education curriculum were the primary purposes of this study. This study was proposed with the following objectives:

1. To determine how agricultural education undergraduates and graduates perceive the effectiveness of the Agricultural Education curriculum.
2. To obtain suggestions for improvement in the Agricultural Education curriculum from the undergraduates and graduates.
3. To obtain opinions of agricultural education undergraduates and graduates pertaining to specific courses, both required courses and elective courses in the College of Agriculture.
4. To make recommendations for changes in the curriculum on basis of the data analysis.

Definition of Terms

Terms to be used throughout the study are defined as:

1. Agricultural Education--Refers to coursework, activities, and experiences in the preparation of undergraduate students to certify to teach vocational agriculture.
2. Agricultural science elective course--Any course offered by Kansas State University in the College of Agriculture.
3. Evaluation--The process of making value judgements on the basis of information gathered about the agricultural education program.
4. Former teacher--Refers to a graduate of the Kansas State University

agricultural education curriculum who was employed as a teacher of agriculture at the secondary or post-secondary level, but is now employed in another occupation.

5. General elective course--Any course offered at Kansas State University that fulfills a social science, humanities, and biological science requirement.
6. Graduate--Refers to a person who has graduated from the undergraduate curriculum in Agricultural Education at Kansas State University and is presently employed in an occupation other than student.
7. Non-teacher--Refers to a graduate of the Kansas State University Agricultural Education curriculum who is not presently employed as a teacher of agriculture at the secondary or post-secondary level.
8. Teacher--Refers to a graduate of the Kansas State University Agricultural Education curriculum who is employed as a teacher of agriculture at the secondary or post-secondary level.
9. Undergraduate--Refers to a person who is presently enrolled in the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University or a graduate student who has not been employed in any occupation other than student.
10. Vocational agriculture--The systematic instruction in agriculture that is offered in secondary schools in order to provide students adequate skills and knowledge for employment in agriculture. This is offered for less than college credit.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were:

1. The undergraduate questionnaires were administered in four sessions on campus. Thus, allowing possible discussions between students about courses, instructors or programs.
2. Due to an oversight of the researcher, the course, Program Planning in Vocational Education was omitted from the required course rating list. A follow-up letter containing a rating scale for this course was mailed to the respondents to allow them the opportunity for rating this course.
3. During copying and collating of the instrument, several questionnaires had pages missing, thus keeping some people from rating some aspects of the curriculum.
4. The graduate response rate was lower than expected.
5. Students who transferred from junior colleges were not treated separately from the rest of the population.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of an educational curriculum is essential if there is to be a continuation of adequate teacher preparation. The Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University is no exception to this statement. It is the purpose of this study to evaluate this curriculum. The study was conducted during the spring semester of the 1980-1981 school year. The present enrollment in agricultural education graduates of the past four years were involved in the evaluation. This chapter will explain the methods used in the study under the following format: population, instrumentation, collection of data, and analysis of data.

Population

In selecting the population for this study, it was thought necessary to use the following criteria: 1) the participants should be either currently enrolled in the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University or graduated from the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University within the past four years (1976-1980); 2) the population size should be large enough to fairly represent the consensus of feelings of agricultural education majors or graduates; and 3) the participants should be selected and utilized in compliance with the guidelines on rights of human subjects as set forth by the College of Education at Kansas State University. To meet criteria cited above, it was decided to use all students currently enrolled in the program and all graduates of the past four years (1976-1980).

The names of students currently enrolled in agricultural education were obtained from student files in the Department of Adult and Occupational Education. Names of graduates were also obtained through departmental records. The undergraduate population numbered 98. There were 128 persons in the graduate population. All were asked to take approximately forty-five minutes to complete a questionnaire for their part in the study.

Instrumentation

The development of the survey instrument began with discussions with the researcher's major professor, Dr. Richard Welton and a thorough review of the literature. Past research was studied for the types of questions and forms used on instrumentation. These findings were then revised and adapted to the situations present at Kansas State University. One study which provided most valuable aid was a document edited by Wilson.⁴

Several studies were found by utilizing the ERIC document reproduction system which contained similar instruments, giving more ideas for development. After considerable discussion and review, draft instrument was distributed to Dr. James Albracht and Dr. John Parmley, of the Agricultural Education staff for their suggestions and ideas. The researcher spent some time with the staff at this point to get ideas. A final instrument for the undergraduates (Appendix A) and graduates (Appendix B) was then developed. Due to time limitations, a pilot study of the instrument was not conducted.

Collection of Data

The Kansas State University College of Education has a committee on

⁴Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation. (1958).

the rights of human subjects which oversees research conducted within the college. Before the instrument could be administered, a copy of the methodology and a checklist (Appendix C) was submitted for review and approval. This study took the necessary precautions to inform the individuals involved of the standards set forth in the provisions. Approval from the committee chairman, Dr. Robert Scott, was received on April 21, 1981 (Appendix C).

Group meetings were set up for the undergraduates to complete the questionnaire. Group meetings were used rather than mailing the questionnaire because it was thought that the response rate would be higher using this method. Four meetings were scheduled on three days at three different time periods at the same location as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Time Period</u>
April 30, 1981	Eisenhower Hall, Room 126	1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.
May 4, 1981	Eisenhower Hall, Room 126	3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
May 4, 1981	Eisenhower Hall, Room 126	7:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.
May 5, 1981	Eisenhower Hall, Room 126	7:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

A letter was mailed to the undergraduates on April 24, 1981 requesting their help and informing them of the meeting dates, time and location (Appendix D).

A cover letter (Appendix D) was attached to the questionnaire explaining the study. The questionnaire was administered during these meetings by the researcher with 26 undergraduates attending. Those undergraduates not attending were telephoned on May 6, 1981 to set up more suitable meeting times. Another 29 undergraduates responded in this manner. The questionnaire was administered to 12 undergraduates before the beginning of the Seminar

in Agricultural Education class on May 7, 1981. The 16 student teachers completing the professional semester filled out the questionnaire upon their return to campus on May 14, 1981. A follow-up letter (Appendix D) was mailed on May 21, 1981 to the undergraduates not responding. The second follow-up letter (Appendix D), with another copy of the questionnaire was sent to the nine remaining undergraduates on May 28, 1981. This yielded three questionnaires before June 15, 1981, which was determined by the investigator as the cut-off date for receiving questionnaires. Table 1 reports the number of questionnaires received from undergraduates.

The graduate questionnaire was handled in somewhat of a different manner. After deciding to include all graduates of the past four years, it was necessary to determine their address. The "1980-81 Directory of Secondary, Post-Secondary and Adult Agricultural Education,"⁵ in Kansas, was used to identify the address of those graduates who were teaching. The non-teaching graduates were located in various ways. Departmental records were used to obtain addresses of the parents, who were sent a search letter (Appendix E) on April 14, 1981, asking for the graduates' present address. The response from this was extremely helpful; however, several graduates were not located. The invaluable help of Professor Emeritus Howard Bradley, and the Kansas State University Alumni Association aided in locating the remaining graduates.

With the mailing list complete, a cover letter (Appendix E) was attached to the graduate questionnaire and was mailed on May 6, 1981. The graduates were requested to return the questionnaire by May 20, 1981. On May 21, 1981

⁵Kansas State Department of Education, "1980-81 Directory of Secondary, Post-Secondary and Adult Education," 1980.

the first follow-up letter (Appendix E) was sent to those not responding. A second follow-up letter (Appendix E), with another copy of the questionnaire, was sent the remaining non-respondents on May 28, 1981. June 15, 1981 was established as the last day to receive questionnaires from graduates. Table 1 reports the number of graduate questionnaires received.

TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE
FROM UNDERGRADUATES AND GRADUATES

Student Category	Number of Students Contacted	Number of Returns	Per Cent Useable Returns
Undergraduate	98	92	93
Graduate ^a	128	67	52
Teachers	(67)	(37)	(55)
Former teachers	(61) ^b	(7)	(11)
Non-teachers		(23)	(34)
TOTALS	226	159	70

^aGraduates' occupational status, number of returns, and percentages are shown in parentheses.

^bThe investigator was unable to distinguish between former teachers and non-teachers within the total population.

Due to an oversight of the investigator, the class, Program Planning in Vocational Education, was omitted from the required course rating list. On June 23, 1981, a third follow-up letter (Appendix E) was mailed to those graduates and graduating seniors responding to the original questionnaire.

Analysis of Data

The undergraduate instrument was divided into four separate areas as follows: background, extra curricular, advisement, and course evaluations. Student background was removed from the graduate instrument. Extra curricular activities, advisement, and course evaluation were retained. Two areas were added to the graduate instrument dealing with current employment status and student teaching. Both forms contained checklist type questions, five-point Likert scales, and open-ended questions.

The checklist type questions were tallied with frequency counts. Percentages were also calculated for each item.

Likert scale questions were utilized to determine mean weighted scores for both the undergraduate and graduate populations. The respondents were asked to rate various items on a scale of one to five, with one being high and five being low. In order to report results in a manner for easier interpretation, the researcher reversed the scale and increased its values. The conversion is as follows: 1 = 10, 2 = 8, 3 = 6, 4 = 4, 5 = 2. For each question the number of responses in each category were multiplied by the value of that category. The numbers that resulted were added together and divided by the number responding to the question to obtain a mean weighted score. An example of this method is shown below for the question to undergraduates on, "How would you rate the quality of faculty advisement in agricultural education?"

<u>Value</u>	<u>Weighted Scale</u>		<u>Number Responding</u>	
1 - very good	10	x	34	= 340
2 - good	8	x	32	= 256
3 - neutral	6	x	14	= 84
4 - poor	4	x	9	= 36
5 - very poor	2	x	2	= 4
NR - Non-response	0	x	1	= 0
			<u>92</u>	= <u>720</u>

The mean weighted score was calculated by dividing 720 by 92 or a value of 7.83. The same procedure was followed for all Likert scale questions with one exception. When figuring mean weighted scores for courses rated, the non-responses were not figured into the calculation, thus only the number of persons actually rating the course were used to figure a mean value. The researcher reported on those mean weighted scores of courses rated by ten or more percent of the undergraduate and graduate populations. This was done to give a more accurate view of the courses.

Open-ended question responses were divided into categories of response for each question. These categories were used to obtain the number of responses in that area and determine the percentage of people responding to that area. After these calculations were made, the responses were listed under the categories with the frequency of each response calculated. Most of these questions were in the area of suggestions for improvement or opinions on strengths and weaknesses.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITEPATURE

Opinions expressed about quality of education and input from students have resulted in many agricultural education departments evaluating their curriculums. These evaluations are not just an activity of the present. Numerous departments had the foresight to have ongoing evaluations beginning several years ago. Weigers⁶ suggests that effective evaluation is an essential part of agricultural education and without it, the program will begin to lose effectiveness in teacher preparation. Since teacher preparation is the main goal of any teacher education program, care should be taken as to its effectiveness. Many groups of individuals may be included in an evaluation of this type. Various studies completed throughout the country involve undergraduates, graduates (both teaching and non-teaching), faculty, school administrators, related agencies and even parents and spouses of students. Some of the purposes of evaluation⁷ include: determining educational need, clarifying teaching and learning objectives, selecting learning experiences, and determining progress. It is hoped that one of the outcomes of any program reviews would be improvement of the program. Mannebach⁸ points out that such improvement will occur if those people responsible for and involved with the program

⁶Weigers, "Evaluate," p. 244.

⁷Weigers, "Evaluate," p. 244.

⁸Alfred J. Mannebach, "Program Evaluation--Questions and Strategies," Agricultural Education Magazine, August 1971, p. 42.

carry out the assessment. Effectiveness of the program would be increased as a direct result of any change that is introduced.

Identifying strengths and weaknesses within the agricultural education curriculums was a goal of evaluations conducted. In order to prepare an evaluation of the Kansas State University Agricultural Education curriculum it was necessary to search the related literature for a background in the area. Three distinct areas of relevance were identified in the review:

1. Coursework;
2. Advisement;
3. Extra curricular activities.

Coursework

The divisions of coursework that were covered by various studies include required and elective classes, and student teaching experiences. In a study of agricultural pre-service teacher programs across the country, Benton⁹ reports that these institutions are still providing a solid base on production agriculture coursework. There seems to be an increasing demand for more preparation in agricultural sciences dealing with practical subject matter rather than theory. Agricultural curriculums need to be altered, according to Bruce,¹⁰ to include technical agriculture courses relating to farming and other areas of agriculture. Undergraduates and

⁹Ralph A. Benton, "Trends in Agricultural Education--Ten Years Later," Agricultural Education Magazine, August 1971, p. 31.

¹⁰Herbert Bruce, "Innovations in Preparing Teachers of Agriculture," Agricultural Education Magazine, May 1972, p. 291.

graduates alike, at the University of Minnesota, indicated a need for more practical, hands-on agricultural courses as reported by Field.¹¹ A study by Reynolds¹² in 1970 revealed that Colorado State University graduates indicated that technical agriculture courses were most valuable in their preparation. Numerous course titles were denoted as most helpful throughout the study. A study completed at Oklahoma State University by Hendrickson¹³ shows that 5 percent of their non-teaching graduates desired instruction in all areas of agriculture except for the animal sciences. However, at Ohio State University, Wilson¹⁴ indicated that undergraduates and graduates rated the majority of technical agriculture courses above average and would not recommend any more emphasis be placed upon that area. Arthur¹⁵ reported that junior college transfer students at Oklahoma State University pointed out that the university courses in agriculture were doing a better job of preparing them for their occupation.

¹¹William E. Field, "A Review of the Undergraduate Program in Agricultural Education at the University of Minnesota" (ED.D dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1977), pp. 250-251.

¹²Elden R. Reynolds, "An Evaluation of the Pre-Service Program in Agricultural Education at Colorado State University" (Master's Report, Colorado State University, 1970), p. 96.

¹³Billy Forrester Hendrickson, "The Perceptions of the Pre-Service Agricultural Education Program at Oklahoma State University as Perceived by Those Who Chose a Non-Teaching Occupation" (Master's Report, Oklahoma State University, 1976), p. 42.

¹⁴Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, pp. 15, 37, 50.

¹⁵Arthur, Nolan Lee, "An Assessment of Selected Aspects of Academic Preparation as Perceived by a Group of Transfer Students Graduating from Oklahoma State University" (ED.D dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975), p. 25.

In a 1968 Rhode Island Study, Prull,¹⁶ found that students singled out the area of agricultural mechanization. They felt that it was necessary for these classes to be revised to the needs of the education major to better aid in teacher preparation. Agriculture is not unique in this observed need for more work in the major area. Ptacek¹⁷ completed a study in 1972, in Utah dealing with consumer homemaking education. The study indicates that Utah undergraduates and graduates are recommending the introduction of more home economics courses into the curriculum to better prepare teachers.

Required coursework also includes classes in mathematics, biological sciences, social sciences, and humanities. These courses were usually reported with lower ratings than the agricultural courses or other electives. Reynolds¹⁸ findings showed that graduates see introductory type offerings as the least helpful parts of their preparation. They suggest removing some of these courses and adding more hours of technical agriculture. Ohio State University undergraduates, as investigated by Wilson,¹⁹ rated natural sciences and social science as average classes. However, 43 percent of these students indicated desire to remove classes such as mathematics and economics from the requirements. Most studies completed

¹⁶Richard W. Prull and Philip S. Vay, "A Description and Evaluation of Vocational Teacher Training Programs in the State of Rhode Island" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 025 650, 1968), p. 7.

¹⁷Cormer Ptacek, "An Evaluation of the Teacher Training Program for Consumer Homemaking Education in Utah" (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 176 761, 1972), pp. 13-15, 20.

¹⁸Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 96.

¹⁹Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, pp. 15-16.

concluded that students realize the need for general education type classes, but would like to see a small reduction in the number and an increase in elective hours.

Student teaching, participating experiences and inservice work showed up as areas of suggestions and praise throughout various studies. Prull²⁰ reported that Rhode Island students realized the need for practical experiences and the worth of student teaching experiences. The students were indicating a need for greater emphasis and time to be placed in this area. A major area of concern about student teaching is that of time. Undergraduates and graduates were found to believe that student teaching should be lengthened completed by Harris,²¹ Reynolds,²² Field,²³ and Ryan.²⁴ It would stand to reason that if students are requesting to lengthen the time spent on something then it must be a good experience. This is just the case in more than one study. In fact, Reynolds²⁵ observed that first year teachers graduating from Colorado State University rated student teaching as the most valuable coursework of the entire undergraduate

²⁰Prull, "Evaluation Rhode Island," p. 7.

²¹John Mark Harris, "An Evaluation of the Pre-Service Program for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture at Oklahoma State University" (Master's Report, Oklahoma State University, 1973), p. 22.

²²Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 97.

²³Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 62,66.

²⁴Kevin Ryan, et al., "'My Teacher Education Program? Well. . .'" First Year Teachers Reflect and React," Peabody Journal of Education 56 (July 1979): 269.

²⁵Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 96.

program. Wilson ²⁶ and Field ²⁷ found similar results in their studies. In addition to student teaching, West Virginia University has a practical experience option for its undergraduates. McGhee ²⁸ reports that this experience involves working one summer with a qualified vocational agriculture instructor. This experience has had a positive effect on graduates and more persons are remaining in teaching as a result. Ryan ²⁹ indicated concern on the part of teachers that student teaching still is not a totally realistic view of the total teaching picture. This is due to the fact that the cooperating teacher is responsible for all actions. Also, there is little resemblance between student teaching and the teacher's first position. It was stated that there was a realization that little could be done to correct these deficiencies. In light of all the material on coursework, the study by Benton ³⁰ indicates that as a whole teacher educators in agriculture are attempting to keep teacher preparation curricula up-to-date with changes in agriculture education.

Advisement

Advising students is yet another facet within a teacher training program. Advisors must work with a number of students on planning future goals and aspirations. The time involved with this aspect of the job is

²⁶Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, pp. 27, 39.

²⁷Field, "Review University of Minnesota," p. 155.

²⁸O. Claude McGhee, "The Impact of Participating Experiences for Agricultural Education Majors," Agricultural Education Magazine, October 1971, p. 107.

²⁹Ryan et al., "My Teacher Education," p. 269.

³⁰Benton, "Trends," p. 31.

tremendous. Several studies included the advisement area of the curriculum evaluation. Arthur ³¹ pointed out that transfer students felt that Oklahoma State University advisors were doing an above average job of counseling. It was mentioned that they felt the junior college advisors needed to be aided in helping transfer students in setting up courses. Colorado State University graduates rated the guidance in agricultural education as most adequate, according to Reynolds, ³² but the same services provided on the university level not helpful. Field ³³ reported that 55 percent of first year teachers and 75 percent of undergraduates indicated that advisors were responsive to individual needs and problems. They also rated the quality of advising in the range of good to excellent. Only 80 percent of the graduates felt that having one advisor was important, but 100 percent of the undergraduates expressed the need for an advisor.

Not all research returned totally favorable results on advising. Counseling students requires many hours of time and is easily overlooked or rushed through. Prull ³⁴ indicates that students at the University of Rhode Island disclosed the need for faculty and advisors to treat the students with a little more respect and dignity. A need was described to open better communications to improve the learning atmosphere. The students suggested adding another staff member to alleviate some of the problems. The Ohio State University study by Wilson ³⁵ reported that

³¹Arthur, "Assessment Oklahoma State University," p. 24.

³²Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 98.

³³Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 87-91, 130-134.

³⁴Prull, "Evaluation Rhode Island," p. 8.

³⁵Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, p. 22.

56 percent of the undergraduates had specific comments concerning the student advising. Some comments that were repeated include: advisors should ask students to meet for conferences and more advisors and freshmen should be counselled earlier. No changes or no comments made up the other 44 percent of responses. Ptacek ³⁶ maintained that students indicated a need for advisors in Utah to take individual needs and strengths into account during enrollment advising. This would eliminate persons ending up in classes they are strong in or are not in their field of interest. Students and graduates seem to have indicated the need for more personalized counseling and guidance with the advisor taking an interest in the individual and showing it.

Extra Curricular Activities

An area that has potential to aid in teacher training, but is sometimes not accounted or overlooked is that of extra curricular activities. These activities are outside the structured classroom and may or may not be associated with the university. Extra curricular activities include: clubs or organizations, sports, churches and service type activities. Every person perceives the value of these activities in a different light. Field ³⁷ viewed organizations as a means of reducing student apathy. Undergraduates at the University of Minnesota see the clubs associated with agricultural education as teaching tools in a relaxed atmosphere. They suggested using the clubs as a means of teaching some practical types

³⁶Ptacek, "Evaluation Utah," p. 14.

³⁷Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 136-146.

of skills not normally taught in university courses. It was suggested to use the clubs to involve students that lacked vocational agriculture-FFA background with the types of activities included in teaching vocational agriculture. They recommended field trip visits to vocational agriculture departments, fairs, National FFA Convention, and contests. Friendships were promoted also, in that, it was mentioned that these same students should go home with other students with farm background for a weekend, to get a feeling for living on the farm.

Wilson³⁸ found 77 percent of the agricultural education majors were involved with the professional organization for these students, 49 percent listed religious activities, 44 percent were members of fraternities, and 28 percent were participating in University 4-H. They viewed these activities as very helpful in leadership training, meeting people, and providing additional training in the teaching profession. The graduates rated student activities of considerable value.

Departmental activities were listed as the most valuable in the study by Arthur³⁹ at Oklahoma State University. The students indicated that campus activities in general contributed greatly to their education. Specifically clubs and organizations were reported with the highest value for the students.

Reynolds⁴⁰ discovered, at Colorado State University, something on the notable side. A larger percentage of non-teaching graduates were

³⁸Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, pp. 23, 45.

³⁹Arthur, "Assessment Oklahoma State University," p. 20.

⁴⁰Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 98.

involved in student activities than teaching graduates. Some of the activities in which they participated in were: Livestock Club and intramural sports. This seems to indicate that non-teachers were a little more active or involved on campus.

Summary

The information on the preceeding pages represents a review of related literature in the area of curriculum evaluation. This investigation has found several definite points:

1. Undergraduates and graduates rank technical agriculture or major area courses as very useful in their preparation.
2. There was an expressed need for the most part to increase the number of technical agriculture classes in agricultural education programs.
3. General education type courses were viewed as least helpful in training to become a teacher.
4. Advising within agricultural education departments was shown to be important and useful.
5. Extra curricular activities while in the undergraduates' program were found to be helpful in teacher preparation.

These findings provide a basis from which to view the Agricultural Education undergraduate curriculum at Kansas State University and its components.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the results of an evaluation completed by undergraduates and graduates of the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University. The evaluation involved 92 undergraduate students and 67 graduates.

Selected demographic data was collected in addition to respondents' opinions concerning the undergraduate training program in agricultural education. Information will be presented and discussed in the following order:

1. Demographic data;
2. Extra curricular activities;
3. Advisement;
4. Coursework;
5. Graduate demographic data;
6. Student teaching;
7. Total curriculum.

Demographic Data

Table 2 presents grade levels of the undergraduates involved in the study. The data presented in the table discloses that 22 percent of the respondents were freshmen and sophomores. Nearly 70 percent of those participating were juniors and seniors, with another 14 percent being fifth year or graduate students.

An interesting addition is the arrival of women on the agricultural

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH THE ORIGINAL
PRINTING BEING
SKEWED
DIFFERENTLY FROM
THE TOP OF THE
PAGE TO THE
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED
FROM THE
CUSTOMER.**

TABLE 2
GRADE LEVEL OF UNDERGRADUATE
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

Grade Level	Number	Per Cent
Freshman	7	8
Sophomore	13	14
Junior	31	34
Senior	28	30
Fifth-year student or graduate student	13	14
TOTALS	92	100

education scene at Kansas State. Table 3 reports that 15 percent of the

TABLE 3
SEX OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AND GRADUATES

Sex	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Female	12	15	2	3
Male	80	85	65	97
TOTALS	92	100	67	100

undergraduate population responding were female. This compares with a female enrollment of 27 percent in the College of Agriculture, as reported by the Kansas State University Registrar's Office for the Spring 1981

semester. Further inspection of the table reveals that three percent of the graduate participants were also female.

Extra curricular Activities

Various activities, both on-campus and off-campus, outside of course-work, aid in the preparation of teachers in agriculture. Information presented in Table 4 shows the activities listed by undergraduates and graduates, categorized as follows: campus activities, campus organizations, judging teams, living groups, off-campus activities, and off-campus groups. Frequencies are reported for each activity. The Agricultural Education Club was most frequently indicated as helpful, with one undergraduate and four graduates expressing the opinion that it should be required. Although this number is smaller than that reported by Wilson,⁴¹ there is agreement about the aid in teacher preparation rendered by agricultural education related organizations. Alpha Tau Alpha, the agricultural education honorary organization, was the next most frequently named useful activity, followed by Collegiate FFA. Two undergraduates and two graduates recommend that Collegiate FFA be required as part of the curriculum. Arthur⁴² reported that Oklahoma State University students indicated that departmental activities were the most valuable extra curricular experiences available to teacher trainees. In addition, clubs or organizations were found to be of the highest value of these activities. Several types of agricultural clubs or activities followed departmental activities on the list. They included: Block and Bridle, any judging team, any agricultural club or

⁴¹Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, pp. 23, 45.

⁴²Arthur, "Assessment Oklahoma State University," p. 20.

TABLE 4

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES
AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
MOST HELPFUL IN TEACHER PREPARATION

Category of Activity	Frequency ^a	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
<u>Campus Activities:</u>		
Any Campus Activity	4	1
Helping with State FFA Contests and Convention	3	2
Intramurals	1	3
Little American Royal	1	3
Other ^b	2	1
<u>Campus Organizations:</u>		
Agricultural Education Club	26(1R) ^c	21(4R)
Alpha Tau Alpha	14	12
Collegiate FFA	9(2R)	8(2R)
Block and Bridle	6	4
Any Agricultural Club or Organization	6	2
Ag Student Council	4	2
Other ^d	7	8
<u>Judging Teams:</u>		
Any team	6(1R)	2
Meats Judging Team	0	2
<u>Living Groups:</u>		
Fraternity	3	3
Residence Hall	1	1
<u>Off-Campus Activities:</u>		
Friendship Tutoring/Teacher Aide	4(1R)	1
Student Teaching Experiences	2	1

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Category of Activity	Frequency ^a	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
<u>Off-Campus Groups:</u>		
Christian Youth Groups	2	0
TOTALS	97(5R)	77(6R)

^aFrequency count totals more than N because undergraduates and graduates could list more than one activity.

^bOther campus activities listed included: Agricultural Science Day, Agriculture Yearbook Editor, and Band.

^cThe frequency count in parenthesis represents the total number indicated by respondents that should be required for that activity.

^dOther organizations listed include: Alpha Zeta, Ag Ambassadors, Collegiate 4-H, Dairy Science Club, Horticulture Club, Interfraternity Council, KSU Soccer Club, Rodeo Club, ROTC, and Student Governing Association.

organization, Ag Student Council, and working with State FFA contests and Convention. Reynolds ⁴³ indicates that Colorado State University graduates indicated involvement in activities such as, Livestock Club, as helpful. However, it is interesting to note that he found more non-teaching graduates participated in these activities than teaching graduates. In this study the only comparison that can be made is that more undergraduates listed involvement in these activities than did the graduates.

One non-agricultural related activity reported that had several responses was that of tutoring or teacher aide work in the public schools. One student indicated that this activity should be required of agricultural education undergraduates due to the experience gained from the activity.

⁴³Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 98.

Although the Agricultural Education Club was the most frequently named activity helpful in preparation for teaching, improvement can be made.

TABLE 5
UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' SUGGESTIONS TO MAKE
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CLUB MORE EFFECTIVE

Category of Suggestion	Per Cent ^a	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
Programs	28	21
Activities	23	12
Promotion	11	6
FFA	9	15
Membership	7	0
Advisors	3	0
Miscellaneous	3	4

^aPercentages total less than 100 because of several non-responses to the question.

Table 5 presents data on suggested improvements that can make the Agricultural Education Club more effective. These improvements are shown by category. "Program" improvement was suggested by 28 percent of the undergraduates and 21 percent of the graduates. This was the most frequently mentioned category by both groups. The category of "activities" was the next most mentioned (23 percent) by undergraduates. In the study conducted by Field,⁴⁴ the University of Minnesota undergraduates commented that

⁴⁴Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 136-146.

club activities could be useful teaching tools if planned and organized better. However, Kansas State University graduates did not share the same opinion in this case. The next most frequently listed category for the graduates was that of "FFA." Inspection of Table 5 reveals that 15 percent of the graduates listed "FFA." This difference may be the result of the teaching experience which indicates to them the need for more FFA background during college preparation. The undergraduate recommendations continue with 11 percent indicating improvement in "promotion," nine percent wanting more work with the "FFA," and seven percent expressing the desire to work with "membership." Specific responses with frequencies for each response, according to the categories reported in Table 5 are shown in Appendix F.

Table 6 reveals much of the same information about Alpha Tau Alpha that Table 5 reported on Agricultural Education Club to make it more effective. Undergraduates and graduates indicated the need for more work on "programs" as indicated by responses of 15 and 19 percent, respectively. "Activities" were second with the undergraduates with 14 percent recommending improvement in this area. The graduates agreed with undergraduates, in this case, by nine percent seeing the need for work or "activities," but again they also revealed the necessity of more involvement in the category of "FFA." Eight percent acknowledged improvement in this area was important. Specific responses, with frequencies for each response, according to the categories reported in Table 6 are shown in Appendix G.

TABLE 6
 UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' SUGGESTIONS
 TO MAKE ALPHA TAU ALPHA MORE EFFECTIVE

Category of Suggestion	Per Cent ^a	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
Programs	15	19
Activities	14	9
Membership and entrance requirements	8	3
Promotion	5	3
FFA	1	8
Advisors	1	0
Miscellaneous	1	2

^a Percentages total less than 100 because of several non-responses to the question.

Advisement

Respondents were asked to answer several questions concerning advisement in agricultural education. Table 7 summarizes data on advisement. Review of the table will reveal that both undergraduates and graduates rate the attributes of advisement in the same order, with graduates giving a little higher rating for each advisement attribute than undergraduates. Quality of advisement received a mean weighted score of 7.83 by undergraduates and 8.27 by graduates. Graduates indicated a mean weighted score of 8.12 for availability of advisors while undergraduates averaged at 7.76. An important part of advisement is that of informing of the curriculum

TABLE 7
 UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS
 REGARDING AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION ADVISEMENT

Attribute of Advisement	Mean Weighted Score	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
Quality of advisement	7.83	8.27
Availability of advisors	7.76	8.12
Informed of program of study and requirements	7.35	8.00

requirements. Undergraduates established a score of 7.35 for this attribute with graduates being higher again at 8.00. The higher ratings by graduates may be due to their teaching experience showing them the true value of advisement received while at Kansas State University.

The findings reported in Table 7 seem to agree with past evaluation studies that included the advisement aspect. Arthur ⁴⁵ indicated that transfer students at Oklahoma State University revealed that advisors were doing an above average job. Graduates in agricultural education at Colorado State University, in a study by Reynolds, ⁴⁶ were reported to have indicated that they received most adequate advisement in the department. Field, ⁴⁷ reported that University of Minnesota graduates and undergraduates rated the quality of advising high, also.

⁴⁵Arthur, "Assessment Oklahoma State University," p. 24.

⁴⁶Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 98.

⁴⁷Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 87-91.

Improvements needed in agricultural education advisement are shown in Table 8. Even though graduates rated "quality of advisement" the highest

TABLE 8

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS ON
IMPROVING ADVISEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Category of Improvement	Per Cent ^a	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
Advisement other than pre-enrolling	47	13
Quality of advisor	30	16
Availability of advisor	13	7
Time spent with advisor	11	1
Utilizing other students in advising	9	3
Number of advisors	3	4
Miscellaneous	15	15

^aPercentages total more than 100 because undergraduates and graduates could list more than one improvement.

attribute in the preceeding table, 16 percent still indicated the need for improvement in this category. "Advisement during times other than pre-enrolling" followed with 13 percent. Undergraduates perceived these two areas differently, in that, 47 percent disclosed the desire for more "advisement during times other than pre-enrolling" and 30 percent reporting the necessity of improvement in "quality of advisement." "Availability of advisors" was indicated by 13 percent of undergraduates and seven percent of graduates as needing improvement. The undergraduates also saw

the need for more "time to be spent with the advisors" with 11 percent of the respondents reporting, while one percent of graduates indicated this area. An interesting suggestion on advisement was that nine percent of undergraduates and three percent of graduates suggested "utilizing other students to aid in advising." This would take some of the load off the professors and also give students a different view of courses. The "number of advisors" improvement category received little acknowledgement by either undergraduates or graduates. Specific responses within each category, including frequencies, are reported in Appendix H.

The study conducted by Wilson ⁴⁸ is related to the findings cited above, in that, 56 percent of Ohio State University undergraduates had specific comments about advising. Ptacek ⁴⁹ reported that home economics students in Utah commented that advisors needed to take individual needs into account during enrollment advising.

Coursework

Table 9 presents data concerning effectiveness ratings of required coursework in the agricultural education program. Inspection of this table reveals that undergraduates rate Farm Power the highest with a mean weighted score of 9.19. Graduates rated Soils above Farm Power with scores of 8.83 and 8.53, respectively. Teaching Participation in Secondary Schools (student teaching) rated high with both undergraduates and graduates (8.87 and 8.39, respectively). Four of five professional semester courses

⁴⁸Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, p. 22.

⁴⁹Ptacek, "Evaluation Utah," p. 14.

TABLE 9

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' EFFECTIVENESS RATING OF REQUIRED
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY COURSE^a WORK IN PREPARING TO BECOME A TEACHER

Required Course	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	MWS ^b	Number	MWS
Farm Power	69	9.19	65	8.53
Teaching Participation in Secondary Schools	23	8.87	51	8.39
Soils	44	8.46	51	8.83
Agricultural Mechanics Methods	40	8.40	64	7.97
Agricultural Mechanics Practices	70	8.35	64	7.66
Crop Science	40	8.20	27	8.45
Methods of Teaching Agriculture	34	7.94	66	7.67
Principles of Agricultural Economics	66	7.82	47	6.90
Oral Communications IA	57	7.62	32	7.32
Plant Science	32	7.57	30	7.67
Agricultural Mechanics Operations	34	7.47	59	7.36
Program Planning in Vocational Education	55 ^c	7.04		
Educational Psychology I	79	6.99	54	6.26
Educational Psychology II	60	6.57	62	5.78
Agricultural Orientation	49	6.29	27	5.63
Agricultural Journalism	61	6.13	55	6.66
English Composition I	54	6.08	32	5.88
Economics I	54	6.04	40	6.55
English Composition II	61	5.94	36	5.78
General Chemistry	49	5.92	30	6.40
Principles of Biology	60	5.84	34	6.29
Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education	59	5.77	63	5.91
Organismic Biology	56	5.72	34	4.65
General Psychology	57	5.23	43	5.17

TABLE 9 (cont.)

Required Course	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	MWS	Number	MWS
College Algebra	60	5.14	30	6.74
Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry	52	4.58	44	5.91

^aCourses rated by nine or more undergraduates and seven or more graduates.

^bMean weighted score.

^cDue to an oversight of the researcher, undergraduates and graduates ratings could not be separated.

are rated in the top ten courses by graduates with three in the top ten for the undergraduates. The required technical agriculture courses for the most part are rated very high with the exception of Agricultural Orientation and Agricultural Journalism which were rated somewhat lower at 6.29 and 6.13, respectively, by the undergraduates. The required general education courses tended to be rated much lower than other courses. Undergraduates rated Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry the lowest with a rating of 4.58. Graduates, on the other hand, rated Organismic Biology lowest with a mean weighted score of 4.65. It can be seen by observing Table 9 that undergraduates and graduates followed a similar pattern on rating courses with a few variations.

Reynolds ⁵⁰ reported findings similar to those reported in Table 9 from Colorado State University graduates. He found that these graduates felt that technical agriculture courses were most valuable in their teacher

⁵⁰Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 96.

preparation curriculum. Reynolds ⁵¹ also indicated that graduates view exploratory or introductory classes as the least helpful in their preparation for becoming a teacher, which parallels the present study.

The information presented in Table 10 represents the undergraduates' and graduates' ratings of various agricultural science elective classes. Principles of Livestock Selection received the highest rating by undergraduates, with a 9.56 mean weighted score. Principles of Livestock Feeding received a 9.07 score by the graduates, which was the highest rated course for them. Farm and Ranch Management was the second highest rated course by undergraduates, with a rating of 9.11. Further review of Table 10 shows that all of the elective agricultural science courses received above a 6.45 rating which on the scale being utilized would put them on the above average side. This finding tends to support Benton's ⁵² statement that Agricultural Education curriculums are still providing a good background in production agriculture.

Agricultural Education coursework ratings are reported in Table 11. Review of the table indicates that Agricultural Education Colloquium was rated highest of 7.16, followed by Seminar in Agricultural Education of 6.97, according to the undergraduates. The graduates rated these courses a little lower on the scale and in a slightly different order. Seminar in Agricultural Education rated highest on the graduate list, rated at 6.89. Teaching Adult Classes in Agriculture, with a rating of 6.26, was next. Wilson ⁵³ reported that Ohio State University undergraduates

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Benton, "Trends," p. 31.

⁵³Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, p. 19.

TABLE 10

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' EFFECTIVENESS RATING
OF ELECTIVE KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL
SCIENCE COURSE^a WORK IN PREPARING TO BECOME TEACHER

Agricultural Science Elective Course	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	MWS ^b	Number	MWS
Principles of Livestock Selection	9	9.56	—	—
Sheep Science	—	—	8	8.25
Farm and Ranch Management	9	9.11	—	—
Principles of Animal Science	37	8.71	21	8.86
Swine Science	12	8.67	15	8.94
Beef Science	19	8.63	22	7.82
Meat Processing	19	8.63	15	8.54
Principles of Livestock Feeding	16	8.63	16	9.07
Livestock and Meat Evaluation	10	8.60	—	—
Elements of Meat	21	8.29	15	8.80
Animal Science and Industry	21	7.91	—	—
Poultry Science	14	7.71	13	8.16
Range Management	—	—	7	8.57
Fundamentals of Nutrition	14	7.56	14	7.86
Dairy Science	19	7.16	20	7.90
Agricultural Law and Economics	9	6.67	—	—
Farm Management	9	6.45	10	7.40
Crop and Seed Quality	—	—	8	8.50
Other courses ^c	119	—	96	—

^aCourses rated by nine or more undergraduates and seven or more graduates.

^bMean weighted score

^cCourses rated by less than the required number represented a broad cross-section of College of Agriculture.

TABLE 11
 UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' EFFECTIVENESS RATING
 OF ELECTIVE KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL
 EDUCATION COURSE^a WORK IN PREPARING TO BECOME TEACHER

Elective Course	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	MWS ^b	Number	MWS
Agricultural Education Colloquium	71	7.16	49	6.25
Seminar in Agricultural Education	54	6.97	45	6.89
Teaching Adult Classes in Agriculture	21	6.57	47	6.26
Other courses ^c	8	—	6	—

^aCourses rated by nine or more undergraduates and seven or more graduates.

^bMean weighted score

^cCourses rated by less than the required number were: Agriculture Related Occupations, Orientation to Education, Principles of Teaching Adults in Extension, Introduction to Instructional Media, Master's Research, Problems in Adult and Occupational Education and Agricultural Education for Beginning Teachers.

indicated a slightly higher rating for similar agricultural education courses. However, agricultural education courses at Oklahoma State University, as investigated by Arthur,⁵⁴ were viewed as not applicable by 30 percent of the transfer students.

Undergraduate and graduate ratings of elective agricultural engineering coursework are shown in Table 12. Graduates rated these courses in reverse of the undergraduates and valued them with a higher rating. This might indicate that when the courses are completed the value is not truly

⁵⁴Arthur, "Assessment Oklahoma State University," p. 50.

TABLE 12

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' EFFECTIVENESS RATING
OF ELECTIVE KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL
ENGINEERING COURSE^a WORK IN PREPARING TO BECOME TEACHER

Agricultural Engineering Elective Course	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	MWS ^b	Number	MWS
Agricultural Machinery Construction	17	7.53	38	7.74
Farm Electrification and Soil Conservation	19	7.48	30	8.34
Farm Building Construction	24	7.42	36	8.89
Other courses ^c	12	—	18	—

^aCourses rated by nine or more undergraduates and seven or more graduates.

^bMean Weighted score

^cCourses rated by less than the required number were: Advanced Farm Mechanics, Agricultural Machinery Management, Conservation Surveying and Planning, Planning and Management of Agricultural Buildings, Farmstead Utilities, Crop Harvesting and Handling Systems, Farm Animal-Waste Management, Advanced Farm Power, Problems in Agricultural Mechanization and Tillage-Planting Machinery.

appreciated until there is a chance to apply the knowledge in a teaching or working experience. Agricultural Machinery Construction was rated 7.53 by undergraduates and 7.74 by the graduates. Farm Electrification and Soil Conservation and Farm Building Construction were also rated in the above average range by both groups. This data follows the same pattern as other studies which indicated agricultural related courses receiving high ratings. However, the study conducted by Prull⁵⁵ indicated that

⁵⁵Prull, "Evaluation Rhode Island," p. 7.

agricultural mechanization classes needed to be altered to serve the needs of education students better.

Undergraduates and graduates were asked to reply to several open-ended questions. One of these questions dealt with the removal of required courses from the Agricultural Education curriculum and reasons for removing. Appendix I reports all courses and comments listed. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry was the course with the highest response rate for removal by undergraduates. Some of the reasons indicated were: useless, worthless, impractical, irrelevant and not related to agriculture. The graduates listed Organismic Biology with the greatest frequency for removal. Various comments received about this course included: replace with agriculture related course, useless, worthless, not agriculture related and impractical. A course that more directly touches the agricultural education curriculum that undergraduates and graduates indicated frequently was Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education. Reasons for removal included: worthless, time consuming, busy work and replace with agriculture classes. However, some students felt the need to retain the class but suggested modifications. Two comments along this line were: add as a part of block (professional semester), and combine with Agricultural Education Colloquium. Agricultural Education Colloquium, Educational Psychology I and II, Agricultural Journalism, and Agricultural Orientation were also indicated as courses that should be removed. Reviewing Appendix H reveals comments and suggestions about various courses. However, there seems to be one theme that continues to develop throughout. This deals with remarks that the course in question is not agriculture related or needs to be replaced with a technical agriculture class or agricultural

science elective hours.

With respondents indicating the need to replace required courses with technical agriculture classes, it is useful to examine what courses they would like to see as replacements. An open-ended question asked for specific courses to be added to the required list of classes and why the course should be added. This list, including comments and frequencies, is shown in Appendix J. Anatomy and Physiology was listed most frequently by both undergraduates and graduates. The reasons listed for adding included: good agricultural background, relates to agriculture--replace Organismic Biology, and we need more technical animal science. Farm and Ranch Management followed closely on the list for reasons such as: records, economics is important, good background class and practical. Another course indicated frequently was Principles of Animal Science. Reasons listed for including this course were: need basics, good livestock background and applicable. Principles of Livestock Feeding and Fundamentals of Nutrition were suggested several times. Close inspection of Appendix I shows that the underlying theme of the reasons for adding these courses were to get a background in agriculture, aid in teaching the subject in high school, and needed in modern agriculture.

The open-ended question concerning adding courses to the professional education requirements received a low frequency of comments. These comments are reported in Appendix K. Adult education classes, Advising Youth Organizations, Agricultural Education Seminar and practicum courses were some of the classes mentioned. There was only one or two persons listing each of these comments.

Appendix L presents information on courses that are avoided by

agricultural education students. Agricultural Journalism was listed most often. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry followed closely for reasons such as: difficulty, not related, poor class and instructor. Soils, which was rated very high in Table 9, was also listed. The reasons it was perceived in this manner were due to a bad image and difficulty. Many courses were listed, however the frequency of response was rather low. Other classes listed include: Educational Psychology I and II, Chemistry, Economics I, History of American Agriculture, Organismic Biology and Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education. Review of Appendix L will reveal additional classes and comments made about the courses. These findings coincide with Wilson's ⁵⁶ results, differing mainly in course titles. It was found that basic courses outside of agriculture were the main courses avoided by undergraduates.

Graduate Demographic Data

Table 13 presents data pertaining to the number of years taught by graduates listed by "teacher" and "former teacher." Review of this table reveals that 35 percent of the teachers and 43 percent of former teachers have taught for one year. Another 35 percent of the teachers have taught for two years with 29 percent of former teachers in this category. This differs from Ohio State University graduates, as reported by Wilson. ⁵⁷ Teachers and former teachers with one year of experience were 15.9 percent and 24.4 percent, respectively, of the population. Another 15 percent of the teachers and 30.2 percent of former teachers had two years of

⁵⁶Wilson, Ohio State University Evaluation, p. 17.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 32.

TABLE 13
NUMBER OF YEARS TAUGHT BY GRADUATES

Number of years	Teacher		Former Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
One	13	35	3	43
One and one-half	0	0	1	14
Two	13	35	2	29
Three	6	16	0	0
Three and one-half	1	3	0	0
Four	4	11	1	14
TOTALS	37	100	7	100

teaching experience.

Occupations of graduates who are not presently teaching can be obtained from Table 14. The information presented in this table indicates that most non-teaching graduates are directly involved with actual production agriculture. Others have occupations that are indirectly related to agriculture either as technical help or service type of positions.

Data collected from teachers and former teachers is summarized in Table 15 and shows that 49 percent of teachers and 43 percent of former teachers remained in their first teaching position one year. They follow similar patterns with 27 percent of teachers and 29 percent of former teachers remained two years at the original position. At three years the pattern changes, as no former teacher remained at the first position, but 13 percent of the teachers had stayed there for three years. At the

TABLE 14
PRESENT OCCUPATION OF GRADUATES NOT PRESENTLY TEACHING

Occupation	Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Farm or ranch manager or owner	3	43	9	41
Technical	0	0	3	14
Government official	1	14	0	0
Manager	0	0	1	4
Semi-skilled worker	0	0	1	4
Clerical worker	0	0	1	4
Salesman	1	14	0	0
Workman or laborer	1	14	0	0
Professional	1	14	3	14
Other ^a	0	0	4	18
TOTALS	7	100	22	100

^aOther occupations included: homemaker, student, and teaching English as a second language.

four year experience level, it was found that eight percent of teachers and 14 percent of former teachers had taught at their original teaching position this length of time.

Table 16 presents information about the number of teaching positions held by the graduates. It was found that 100 percent of former teachers stayed at one teaching position before leaving the profession, while 81 percent of the teachers have held only one teaching position. Another

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF YEARS GRADUATES WHO TAUGHT
REMAINED IN FIRST TEACHING POSITION

Number of years	Teacher		Former Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
One	18	49	3	43
One and one-half	1	3	1	14
Two	10	27	2	29
Three	5	13	0	0
Four	3	8	1	14
TOTALS	37	100	7	100

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT TEACHING POSITIONS HELD BY GRADUATES

Number of Positions	Teacher		Former Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
One	30	81	7	100
Two	6	16	0	0
Three	1	3	0	0
Four	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	37	100	7	100

16 percent of the teachers have been at two different locations and 3 percent have taught at three schools.

Student Teaching

Graduate involvement in student teaching activities can be obtained by reviewing Table 17. Involvement in developing tests, developing lesson plans, using various instructional media, evaluating students and assisting at FFA contests all rated high by teachers, former teachers and non-teachers alike. Activities that were rated as medium involvement were: supervising experience programs, advising the FFA chapter, and participating in a community project. Many activities were indicated to have had low involvements. The activities included in this category include: reviewing VE-20 and VE-50 forms, working with advisory committee, review of summer program, and reviewing budget procedures. All three classifications of graduates tended to rate these activities involvement in similar manners with some variations in the order. Former teachers and teachers were the most closely related groups. Former teachers and non-teachers tended to indicate higher involvement in all activities than did teachers.

Table 18 presents the ratings of university supervisors, cooperating teacher, and cooperating center attributes. The three groups all rated effectiveness of cooperating teacher at the top of the attributes. Teachers then rated the cooperation between university supervisors and cooperating teacher next at 8.27, followed by a rating of 8.17 for the effectiveness of university supervisors. Quality of cooperating centers was at the bottom of teachers rating of attributes, with a 7.78, however, it was second on the former teachers and non-teachers lists. Non-teachers and former teachers

GRADUATES' INVOLVEMENT IN ACTIVITIES DURING STUDENT TEACHING

Activity	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	MWS ^a	Number	MWS	Number	MWS
Developing tests	36	8.06	7	8.86	21	7.90
Developing lesson plans	37	8.00	7	8.57	23	7.60
Using various instructional media (films, tapes, overhead, etc.)	37	8.00	7	7.71	21	8.10
Evaluating students (grades)	37	7.73	7	8.57	21	7.81
Assisting at FFA contests	36	7.50	7	7.29	21	7.43
Developing weekly plans	37	7.35	7	7.43	21	6.95
Assisting with FFA contest preparation	36	7.22	7	7.14	21	7.33
Using various teaching methods (games, recitation, discussion, etc.)	37	6.95	7	8.29	21	7.52
Supervising experience programs	35	6.86	7	6.86	21	5.71
Meeting and working with key school personnel and people in community	37	6.65	7	7.43	20	6.00
Meeting with students' parents	36	6.44	7	7.43	21	5.33
Aiding in guidance of students	36	6.06	7	7.14	21	6.76
Experience with record book in classroom and on SOEP visits	36	6.06	7	6.29	21	6.10
Advising the FFA chapter	36	5.61	7	7.71	2	5.52
Participating in non-instructional activities (homeroom, lunchroom, hall duty, etc.)	36	5.28	7	5.14	21	6.19
Participating in a community project (BOAC, calender sales, etc.)	35	5.03	7	5.14	21	5.81
Review summer programs	34	4.53	7	4.29	21	5.33
Participating in mock job inter- views	36	4.33	7	4.29	21	4.00
Working with advisory committee	35	4.29	7	4.00	21	4.19
Reviewing VE-20 and VE-50 forms	36	4.06	7	4.00	18	4.33

TABLE 17 (cont.)

Activity	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	MWS	Number	MWS	Number	MWS
Reviewing FFA award applications (BOAC, National Chapter, etc.)	35	3.94	7	4.57	20	4.20
Participating in an adult education program	35	3.83	7	6.00	20	4.40
Reviewing budget procedure	35	3.26	7	4.00	21	4.29
Other activities ^b	3	—	0	0	6	—

^aMean weighted score

^bOther activities listed include: aid students in project purchasing, FFA banquet, FFA supervised farm sale, school evaluation, teaching without cooperating teacher, visiting other agriculture programs, and visiting with other teachers.

TABLE 18

RATING OF UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS,
COOPERATING TEACHER, AND COOPERATING CENTER ATTRIBUTES

Attribute	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	MWS ^a	Number	MWS	Number	MWS
Effectiveness of cooperating teacher	36	8.28	7	9.43	22	8.73
Cooperation between university supervisors and cooperating teacher	37	8.27	7	8.00	22	7.64
Effectiveness of university supervisors	36	8.17	7	7.71	22	7.45
Quality of cooperating centers (physical facilities, staff, etc.)	36	7.78	7	8.57	22	8.09
Other ^b	0	0	0	0	1	—

^aMean weighted score

^bOther attribute listed was: open mindedness of university supervisors.

rated the remaining two attributes in the same order, cooperation between university supervisors and cooperating teachers and then effectiveness of university supervisors. A complete review of Table 18 shows the actual ratings of each attribute by each group.

Areas needing additional emphasis during student teaching are presented in Table 19. Opinions of teachers and former teachers follow much the

TABLE 19

AREAS NEEDING ADDITIONAL EMPHASIS
OR TAUGHT DURING STUDENT TEACHING

Instructional Area	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent ^a	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Record book	27	73	5	71	10	43
FFA	19	51	4	57	7	30
Student management	19	51	4	57	17	74
Supervised Occupational Experience Programs	16	43	2	29	5	22
Classroom teaching	15	41	3	43	7	30
Public relations	10	27	1	14	5	22
Young Farmers and/or Adult Farmers	9	24	1	14	5	22
School relations	7	19	2	29	6	26
Forms	6	16	0	0	0	0
Physical facilities	6	16	1	14	3	13
Community relations	5	14	2	28	6	26
Other ^b	7	0	2	0	3	0

^aPercentages total more than 100 because graduates could list more than one area.

^bOther instructional areas needing additional emphasis listed were: budgets, contests, control of total program, curriculum, more experience and scheduling activities of cooperating teacher.

same order. Record book work is listed by 73 percent of the teachers and 71 percent of the former teachers as an area needing additional emphasis. Teachers and former teachers indicated a need for additional emphasis in FFA and student management. Both groups responded over 50 percent for each instructional area. Non-teachers indicate a strong need (74 percent) in student management instruction. This could be one of the major reasons for these graduates never teaching. Areas rated low include physical facilities and community relations.

Information presented in Table 20 shows the suggestions for improvement

TABLE 20

SUGGESTIONS BY GRADUATES FOR IMPROVING STUDENT TEACHING

Category of Suggestion	Teacher ^a		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Courses and content	12	32	2	29	13	57
Student teaching	3	8	6	86	6	26
Length of student teaching	3	8	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	18	48	8	115	19	83

^aPercentages total more or less than 100 because graduates were allowed to list more than one suggestion; however, there were also several non-responses to the question.

of student teaching by graduates. "Courses and content" was the top category of suggestion with 32 percent of teachers and 57 percent of non-teachers responding in this manner. Former teachers listed it second with 29 percent commenting in the area. Responses in this category included: talk about

amount of time spent with the program and role of the instructor, discipline of students, course dealing with contests, longer methods class, and more record book training. The "student teaching" category had eight percent of teachers, 86 percent of former teachers, and 26 percent of non-teachers indicating improvements in this category. Some of the suggestions found in the area were: give a student a chance to be at more than one school, make sure they do recommended activities, master teachers should stress motivation and administrator relations and work more on the housing situation during block. Teachers were the only group reporting any suggestions in the category of "length of student teaching"--with eight percent indicating an improvement needed in this category. Comments about length included: increase to one year, increase to 10 or 12 weeks, and work in field longer. These comments are in line with findings of past studies by Harris,⁵⁸ Reynolds,⁵⁹ Field,⁶⁰ and Ryan⁶¹ who all reported student and graduate opinions leaning toward more time being spent out in the public school student teaching. Specific responses and frequencies within each category may be found in Appendix M.

An analysis of the strengths of block semester as viewed by graduates is presented in Table 21. Teachers and former teachers indicated that the "courses" taken during the professional semester were a strong point, with 32 percent of teachers and 114 percent of the former teachers making comments in this category. Examples of comments in this area include:

⁵⁸ Harris, "Evaluation Oklahoma State University," p. 22.

⁵⁹ Reynolds, "Evaluation Colorado State University," p. 97.

⁶⁰ Field, "Review University of Minnesota," pp. 62,66.

⁶¹ Ryan, "'My Teacher Education,'" p. 269.

TABLE 21

STRENGTHS OF BLOCK SEMESTER AS EXPRESSED BY GRADUATES

Category of Strengths	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent ^a	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Courses	12	32	8	114	0	0
Student teaching	12	32	2	29	6	26
Course content	7	19	2	29	8	35
Comradery	5	14	3	43	10	43
Other	2	5	0	0	5	21
TOTALS	38	102	15	215	29	125

^aPercentages total more than 100 because graduates were allowed to list more than one strength.

agricultural mechanization instruction, busy schedule, methods class is good practice and methods class-video taping. "Comradery" was reported quite frequently by former teachers and non-teachers. "Student teaching" received around 30 percent of the comments from all three groups as a strength of the block semester. Strengths within this portion of block were reported as: student teaching in general, working with FFA, working with parents and people in the community, and teaching all of the classes. Specific responses by groups, within each category may be obtained by reviewing Appendix N.

Table 22 reports the categories of weakness of the block semester as expressed by graduates. "Courses and content" weaknesses received the highest frequency in all three groups of graduates. Opinions in this

TABLE 22

WEAKNESSES OF BLOCK SEMESTER AS EXPRESSED BY GRADUATES

Category of Weakness	Teacher		Former Teacher		Non-Teacher	
	Number	Per Cent ^a	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Courses and Content	18	49	3	43	19	83
Student Teaching	10	27	0	0	5	22
Other	1	3	0	0	2	9
TOTALS	29	79	3	43	26	114

^aPercentages total more or less than 100 because the graduates were allowed to list more than one weakness; however, there were also several non-responses to the question.

category which were most frequently indicated included the following: more work and discipline and motivation, more written work and tests, more FFA, record book, and supervised occupational experience program work, and require more lesson plans for future plans. All comments, with frequencies, received from graduates concerning the weaknesses of block semester can be reviewed in Appendix O.

Total Curriculum

Information presented in Table 23 shows the undergraduates' and graduates' opinions regarding satisfaction with the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University. Undergraduates and graduates rated curriculum the same, with a mean weighted score of 6.93.

Review of Table 24 reveals categories of improvement for the Agricultural Education curriculum as indicated by undergraduates and graduates.

TABLE 23

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS REGARDING
SATISFACTION WITH AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

Level	Number	MWS ^a
Undergraduate	92	6.93
Graduate	67	6.93

^aMean weighted score

TABLE 24

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS CONCERNING
IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

Category of Improvement	Per Cent ^a	
	Undergraduate (N=92)	Graduate (N=67)
Courses	50	29
Advising	16	6
Course content	8	9
Student teaching	8	6
FFA	2	4
Relation to vocational agriculture teaching	0	7
Miscellaneous	4	4

^aPercentages total less than 100 because of several non-responses to the question.

The most response from both groups (undergraduates 50 percent and graduates 29 percent) was received in the area of "courses." Comments suggested most frequently included: less biology and chemistry, more agricultural

science hours; more practical courses and more animal science courses. The graduates noted one area of improvement that undergraduates did not perceive. This may be due to their teaching experience. The category is "relation to vocational agriculture teaching." Seven percent of the graduates indicated needed improvements in this category. Some response under this heading are: courses on dealing with administration, curriculum suggestions, list of reference materials available, and a one or two hour course on what it takes to teach. Sixteen percent of undergraduates responded in the category of "advising." Comments such as: communicating with junior college on transferring, do more to promote the curriculum, inform about requirements earlier, and inform students of all job opportunities were listed most often in the area. Other areas of improvement by category were "course content," student teaching," and "FFA." A complete listing of specific comments and suggestions is found in Appendix P.

Summary

Nearly 70 percent of undergraduates were either juniors or seniors. Fifteen percent of the undergraduate population were female.

The most important extra curricular activities for both undergraduates and graduates were involvement in campus activities and organizations, judging teams, living groups, and off-campus activities. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha most frequently appeared as the activity in which most agricultural education majors were involved. The area requiring the most emphasis to improve these two organizations, was the category of "programs."

Quality of advisement was the highest rated advisement attribute

as indicated by both undergraduates (7.83) and graduates (8.27). Informing students of curriculum requirements rated lowest (7.35 and 8.00) among the attributes of advising by both groups. Even though rated the highest advisement attribute, quality of advisement was indicated as the area requiring the most improvement in advising.

Farm Power received the highest rating (9.19) from undergraduates in the area of required coursework. Graduates rated Soils (8.83) highest.

Undergraduates rated Principles of Livestock Selection (9.56) the highest of elective agricultural sciences classes. Graduates indicated the highest rating for Principles of Livestock feeding (9.07). As a whole, graduates tended to rate all courses somewhat lower than the undergraduates. Graduates rated Seminar in Agricultural Education (6.89) at the highest and Agricultural Education Colloquium (7.16) was rated the highest by undergraduates, of the Agricultural Education electives. Agricultural Machinery Construction was rated the highest (7.53) of agricultural engineering classes by undergraduates. However, graduates indicated the Farm Building Construction (8.89) was the top of the agricultural engineering electives.

Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry was most frequently mentioned for removal from the curriculum by undergraduates. Graduates, on the other hand, indicated most often removal Organismic Biology from the required courses in the program. The comments which repeatedly appeared as reasons for removal of classes from the curriculum dealt with the idea to get more agriculture related courses or technical agricultural science elective hours. Anatomy and Physiology was mentioned most often as the one course to add to the required courses, by both groups participating

in the study. Reasons for adding courses most often centered around an agricultural theme. Very few respondents indicated to add any courses to the professional education class requirements. Agricultural Journalism was indicated the most as the class avoided by agricultural education majors with Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry being reported numerous times.

It was found that of the respondents, 35 percent of the teachers and 43 percent of the former teachers had taught for one year. Present occupations of the majority of non-teachers and former teachers were directly involved with production agriculture. It was also disclosed that 49 percent of teachers and 43 percent of former teachers remained in their first teaching position for one year. Only one teaching position was held by 81 percent of the teachers and 100 percent of the former teachers held one position before leaving the field.

High involvement during student teaching in developing tests (8.06), developing lesson plans (8.00), using various instructional media (8.00), evaluating students (7.73), and assisting at FFA contests (7.50) was indicated by teaching graduates. Effectiveness of the cooperating teacher was the highest rated effectiveness attribute of the people involved with student teaching from all three groups of graduates. Teachers and former teachers agreed that record books, FFA, and student management needed additional emphasis in the professional semester. Non-teachers indicated the highest need for emphasis in the area of student management. "Courses and content" received the most suggestions for improvement during the professional semester from the graduates. Teachers and former teachers indicated the "courses" category most often as a strength of the block

semester. Non-teachers perceived the "comradery" category as the strongest point during the professional semester. "Courses and content" category was most often cited by all graduates as an area of weakness during the block semester.

Undergraduates indicated the same degree of satisfaction (6.93) with the Agricultural Education curriculum as did graduates (6.93). Undergraduates and graduates responded most often in the category of "courses" as an area needing improvement within the agricultural education program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the study. The objectives of the study are reviewed along with the major findings. Recommendations are presented on the basis of the major findings. Also included in this chapter are the investigator's recommendations for additional study.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to evaluate the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University.

Objectives

Four specific objectives were identified as guidelines to accomplish the purpose of the study:

1. To determine how agricultural education undergraduates and graduates perceive the effectiveness of the Agricultural Education curriculum.
2. To obtain suggestions for changes in the Agricultural Education curriculum from undergraduates and graduates.
3. To obtain opinions of agricultural education undergraduates and graduates pertaining to specific courses, both required curriculum and elective courses in the College of Agriculture.
4. To make recommendations for changes in the curriculum on the basis of the data analysis.

Major Findings

This study was conducted to determine how undergraduates and graduates perceived their teacher preparation in the Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University. A total of 92 (93 percent) undergraduates completed questionnaires on campus, while 67 (52 percent), of the past four years of graduates responded to mailed questionnaires. The investigator hand tabulated and summarized the data received.

The following items are the major findings of this study:

1. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha were the two organizations indicated most frequently by undergraduates and graduates as helpful in teacher preparation.
2. The category of "programs" received the most suggestions for making the Agricultural Education Club more effective in teacher preparation, with 29 percent of the undergraduates and 21 percent of the graduates indicating this area. Graduates (15 percent) also suggested the area of "FFA" as an improvement for the club.
3. The category of "programs" received the most suggestions for making Alpha Tau Alpha more effective in teacher preparation, with 15 percent of undergraduates and 19 percent of graduates indicating this area. Graduates (8 percent) also suggested the area of "FFA" as an improvement for the club.
4. Undergraduates and graduates rated quality of advisement above all other attributes of advisement in agricultural education (7.83 and 8.27, mean weighted score, respectively).
5. "Advisement during times other than enrolling" was suggested by 47 percent of undergraduates as the area needing the most

improvement in advising. "Quality of advisor" was indicated by 16 percent of graduates needing the most improvement in advising.

6. Undergraduates rated Farm Power, with a mean weighted score of 9.19, as the highest class on the required course list. Soils received a mean weighted score of 8.83 to be the highest rated class on the required course list as perceived by the graduates. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry was rated lowest by undergraduates with a score of 4.58, while graduates rated Organismic Biology, with a 4.65, lowest on the required course list.
7. Agricultural science elective courses which received the highest ratings were, Principles of Livestock by undergraduates with a score of 9.56 and Principles of Livestock Feeding by graduates with a score of 9.07.
8. Agricultural Education Colloquium was rated with a score of 7.16 by the undergraduates, as the highest class in agricultural education electives. Graduates rated Seminar in Agricultural Education as the top class in the same area with a 6.89 mean weighted score.
9. Undergraduates rated Agricultural Machinery Construction, a class in agricultural engineering elective, with a mean weighted score of 7.53. Graduates rated all elective courses in agricultural engineering higher than undergraduates and indicated Farm Building Construction to be the highest rated class in this area with a 8.89 mean weighted score.

10. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry was most frequently indicated by undergraduates as a course to remove from the required course list. Organismic Biology was reported most often by graduates for removal. Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education was also frequently noted by undergraduates as a course for removal. The main reason indicated for removal of any course dealt with replacing with a technical agriculture course.
11. Anatomy and Physiology and Farm and Ranch Management were listed most often by undergraduates as classes they would like to see added to the curriculum. Graduates most frequently named Principles of Animal Science as a prospect for the curriculum. The majority of reasons for adding courses dealt with the agriculture background the courses offer the students.
12. Agricultural Journalism and Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry were most frequently named as classes avoided by agricultural education students.
13. Thirty-five percent of the teaching graduates have been teaching one year, while 43 percent of the former teachers taught only one year. Of the teachers, 49 percent have stayed at their first teaching position for one year and 43 percent of the former teachers remained one year at that position. Eighty-one percent of the teachers indicated they have held only one teaching position with 100 percent of the former teachers holding one position before leaving the profession.
14. Most former teachers and non-teachers identified agricultural related occupations as their present employment. Farming was

indicated by 43 percent of former teachers and 41 percent of non-teachers.

15. Developing tests was indicated as an area of high involvement during student teaching by teachers and former teachers with mean weighted scores of 8.06 and 8.86, respectively. Non-teachers area of highest involvement was using various instructional media with a score of 8.10. Areas with the lowest involvement were: reviewing budget procedures, for teacher and former teachers with scores of 3.26 and 4.00, respectively, and participating in mock job interviews, with a score of 4.00 from non-teachers.
16. Effectiveness of the cooperating teacher was the highest rated attribute concerning cooperating teachers, cooperating centers and university supervisors. Teachers rated cooperating teacher effectiveness with a score of 8.28, former teachers with a score of 9.43, and non-teachers with a score of 8.73.
17. The record book was singled out as the area needing more emphasis by 73 percent of teachers and 71 percent former teachers. FFA and student management were indicated frequently with 51 percent of teachers and 57 percent of former teachers suggesting each area. Student management was listed by 74 percent of non-teachers as the first area needing more emphasis.
18. "Courses and content" category was reported by 32 percent of teachers and 57 percent of non-teachers with suggestions for improving student teaching. Eighty-six percent of former teachers indicated the area of "student teaching" as needing improvement.
19. Thirty-two percent of teachers indicated that the categories of

"courses" and "student teaching" were the strengths of the block semester. Former teachers disclosed that "courses" were the strength of block semester and 43 percent of non-teachers reported that "comradery" was the strength of the block semester.

20. All three groups of graduates made comments in the "courses and comment" area as the place where weaknesses lie in the block semester. Forty-nine percent of teachers, 43 percent of former teachers, and 83 percent of non-teachers reported in this area.
21. Undergraduates and graduates rated their overall satisfaction in the Agricultural Education curriculum the same, with a mean weighted score of 6.93.
22. Undergraduates and graduates made comments most frequently in the category of "courses" for improvement of the agricultural education. Fifty percent of undergraduates and 29 percent of graduates indicated this area.

Recommendations

On the basis of the major findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha executive committees should place more emphasis on programs for meetings. Possible program topics that would be helpful are:
 - a. Experienced teachers as speakers;
 - b. Beginning teachers as speakers;
 - c. Student teachers, past block student, or graduate students as speakers;
 - d. Programs related to vocational agriculture teaching and problems.

2. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha executive committees should consider planning activities for their members that would aid them in developing a better understanding of teaching vocational agriculture, such as:
 - a. Visiting vocational agriculture departments throughout the state;
 - b. Sponsoring a trip to the National FFA Convention;
 - c. Organizing or helping with district or state FFA contests;
 - d. Sponsoring practical experiences (castrating, docking, public speaking, leadership workshops).
3. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha executive committees should develop a list of upperclassmen and graduate students' names, addresses and telephone numbers to be made available to the advisors. The purpose of this list would be to provide advisors possible assistance in advising.
4. The Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha executive committees should plan a meeting or activity prior to pre-enrollment involving upperclassmen and graduate students to answer questions from other students about enrollment, courses, and other concerns.
5. The advisors in the Agricultural Education curriculum should continue to maintain a strong advising program. Annual reviews of advising effectiveness should be conducted.
6. The advisors in the Agricultural Education curriculum should attempt to see all advisees at least once per semester, other than pre-enrolling, to discuss present and future plans.
7. The advisors in the Agricultural Education curriculum should

keep a list of agricultural science electives with ratings, which resulted from this study, available for undergraduates.

8. The advisors in the Agricultural Education curriculum should highly recommend the following agricultural science electives to undergraduates: Anatomy and Physiology, Farm and Ranch Management, Principles of Animal Science, and Fundamentals of Nutrition.
9. Considerations should be given to offering alternative chemistry courses for Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry, such as, Elementary Organic Chemistry or offer Chemistry I and Chemistry II in lieu of General Chemistry and Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry.
10. Consideration should be given to providing an option for Organismic Biology. Anatomy and Physiology may be a more desirable course for production-oriented students. For other students, Organismic Biology may be a useful course.
11. Record books, FFA, and student management should be emphasized more during the professional semester.
12. Consideration should be given to conducting a periodic evaluation of the curriculum involving seniors and first-year teachers to maintain the quality of education necessary for vocational agriculture teachers.
13. An Agricultural Education curriculum advisory committee should review the recommendations set forth in this study and prepare recommendations for curriculum revision based on this study.

Recommendations for Further Studies

Additional studies are viewed as necessary by the writer to completely evaluate the total Agricultural Education curriculum. Possibilities for further study include: 1) how high school administrators with vocational agriculture programs view their vocational agriculture instructors' college preparation; 2) how members of the Agriculture Education staff in the department of Adult and Occupational Education evaluate the curriculum; 3) how community college transfer students evaluate their community college preparation and transfer to Kansas State University; 4) how effective the curriculum is in preparing graduates for an occupation other than teaching; 5) evaluate the agricultural education graduate program; 6) conduct further statistical analysis on the results of this study; and 7) follow-up on this study asking specifically what courses should be offered as required and how many elective hours should be added or removed.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FORM A

Kansas State University
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Agricultural Education
Undergraduate Evaluation Questionnaire

(please print)

Name _____ Sex ☐ M ☐ F
Address _____
City _____ State _____
Zip Code _____

Instructions for Completion

The items in this questionnaire are designed to gather information from agricultural education majors about the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University. To complete the survey, place an X in the space provided beside your response or write out your response on the lines provided. All information taken from this questionnaire will be reported only in grouped data. The information provided will be held in strict confidence. Copies of the results will be available upon request.

Please return to: Dale Unruh, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
General Classroom Building, Room 342
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

FORM A

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
UNDERGRADUATE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIREBackground:

1. Current Status:

- ☐ a. Freshman
- ☐ b. Sophomore
- ☐ c. Junior
- ☐ d. Senior
- ☐ e. Fifth year student or graduate student
- ☐ f. Other (specify) _____

Extra Curricular:

- 2. Which extra curricular activities at Kansas State University do you feel helped the most in your preparation for becoming a teacher?
Should any of them be required? (If yes, specify which ones.)

- 3. Do you have any suggestions to make the Kansas State University Agricultural Education Club more useful in your preparation for becoming a teacher?

- 4. Do you have any suggestions to make the Kansas State University Alpha Delta Chapter of Alpha Tau Alpha more useful in your preparation for becoming a teacher?

Advisement:

5. How well are/were you informed of the program of study and requirements in agricultural education? (Circle one of the following --- 1 being very familiar - 5 being not familiar with)
- 1 2 3 4 5
6. How would you rate the quality of faculty advisement in agricultural education? (circle one of the following --- 1 being very good - 5 being very poor)
- 1 2 3 4 5
7. How would you rate the availability of agricultural education advisement? (circle one of the following --- 1 being very good - 5 being very poor)
- 1 2 3 4 5
8. How can advising of students be improved in agricultural education? (Please specify)

Course Evaluation:

9. Rate the REQUIRED course work in agricultural education as to effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. A number of courses you may have taken are shown below. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you have completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	<u>Above</u> <u>Average</u>			<u>Below</u> <u>Average</u>	
Agricultural Orientation	1	2	3	4	5
Crop Science	1	2	3	4	5
English Composition II	1	2	3	4	5
Principles of Biology	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Journalism	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry	1	2	3	4	5
Educational Psychology II	1	2	3	4	5
Oral Communications IA	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Practices	1	2	3	4	5
Principles of Agricultural Economics	1	2	3	4	5
Methods of Teaching of Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Methods	1	2	3	4	5
General Psychology	1	2	3	4	5
Plant Science	1	2	3	4	5
English Composition I	1	2	3	4	5
College Algebra	1	2	3	4	5
General Chemistry	1	2	3	4	5
Organismic Biology	1	2	3	4	5
Educational Psychology I	1	2	3	4	5
Economics I	1	2	3	4	5
Soils	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Power	1	2	3	4	5
Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Participation in Secondary Schools	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Operations	1	2	3	4	5

10. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Education as to Agricultural effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, please indicate the other courses you have taken in Education. (Please rate each course you have completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.) Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University.

	Above Average			Below Average	
Agricultural Education Colloquium	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Adult Classes in Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Seminar in Agricultural Education	1	2	3	4	5
Other courses - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other courses - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other courses - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5

11. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Science that you have completed, as to their effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, indicate the courses you have taken. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you have completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	Above Average			Below Average	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

12. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Engineering that you have completed, as to their effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, please indicate the courses you have taken. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you have completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	Above Average			Below Average	
Agricultural Machinery Construction	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Building Construction	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Electrification and Soil Conservation	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - Please specify	1	2	3	4	5

13. Should any REQUIRED course (s) in the agricultural education program of study be removed? Why?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Removing</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

14. Should any ELECTIVE courses (technical agriculture, agricultural engineering, literature, social studies, general) be added to the required list? Why?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. Should any courses be included in the professional education requirements?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

16. Are there any courses that are avoided by agricultural education students?
If you know the reason, please specify.

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

17. I am/was satisfied with the agricultural education curriculum. (circle one of the following --- 1 being strongly agree - 5 being strongly disagree)

1 2 3 4 5

18. What other suggestions do you have for improving the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University?

Thank you for your help in gathering this information.

APPENDIX B

FORM A

Kansas State University
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Agricultural Education
Graduate Evaluation Questionnaire

(please print)

Name _____ Sex M F
Address _____
City _____ State _____
Zip Code _____

Instructions for Completion

The items in this questionnaire are designed to gather information from agricultural education majors about the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University. To complete the survey, place an X in the space provided beside your response or write out your response on the lines provided. All information taken from this questionnaire will be reported only in grouped data. The information provided will be held in strict confidence. Copies of the results will be available upon request.

Please return to: Dale Unruh, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
General Classroom Building, Room 342
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

FORM A

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
CURRICULUM EVALUATION
QUESTIONNAIRE

Extra Curricular:

1. Which extra curricular activities at Kansas State University do you feel helped the most in your preparation for becoming a teacher? Should any of them be required? (If yes, specify which ones.)

2. Do you have any suggestions to make the Kansas State University Agricultural Education Club more useful in preparing you for becoming a teacher?

3. Do you have any suggestions to make the Kansas State University Alpha Delta Chapter of Alpha Tau Alpha more useful in preparing you for becoming a teacher?

Advisement:

4. How well were you informed of the program of study and requirements in agricultural education? (circle one of the following --- 1 being very familiar - 5 being not familiar)

1 2 3 4 5

5. How would you rate the quality of faculty advisement in agricultural education? (circle one of the following --- 1 being very good - 5 being very poor)

1 2 3 4 5

6. How would you rate the availability of agricultural education advisement? (circle one of the following --- 1 being very good - 5 being very poor)

1 2 3 4 5

7. How can advising of students be improved in agricultural education? (please specify)

Course Evaluation:

8. Rate the REQUIRED course work in agricultural education as to effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. A number of courses you may have taken are shown below. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	<u>Above Average</u>			<u>Below Average</u>	
Agricultural Orientation	1	2	3	4	5
Crop Science	1	2	3	4	5
English Composition II	1	2	3	4	5
Principles of Biology	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Journalism	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry	1	2	3	4	5
Educational Psychology II	1	2	3	4	5
Oral Communications IA	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Practices	1	2	3	4	5
Principles of Agricultural Economics	1	2	3	4	5
Methods of Teaching of Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Methods	1	2	3	4	5
General Psychology	1	2	3	4	5
Plant Science	1	2	3	4	5
English Composition I	1	2	3	4	5
College Algebra	1	2	3	4	5
General Chemistry	1	2	3	4	5
Organismic Biology	1	2	3	4	5
Educational Psychology I	1	2	3	4	5
Economics I	1	2	3	4	5
Soils	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Power	1	2	3	4	5
Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Participation in Secondary Schools	1	2	3	4	5
Agricultural Mechanics Operations	1	2	3	4	5

9. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Education as to effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, please indicate the other courses you completed. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	Above Average			Below Average	
Agricultural Education Colloquium	1	2	3	4	5
Teaching Adult Classes in Agriculture	1	2	3	4	5
Seminar in Agricultural Education	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5

10. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Science that you completed, as to their effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, indicate the courses you took. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	Above Average			Below Average	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

11. Rate your ELECTIVE course work in Agricultural Engineering that you completed, as to their effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. In the space provided, please indicate the courses you completed. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you completed. Rate the course, Not the instructor.)

	Above Average			Below Average	
Agricultural Machinery Construction	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Building Construction	1	2	3	4	5
Farm Electrification and Soil Conser- vation	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5
Other course - please specify	1	2	3	4	5

12. Should any REQUIRED course(s) in the agricultural education program of study be removed? Why?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Removing</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. Should any ELECTIVE courses (technical agriculture, agricultural engineering, literature, social studies, general) be added to the required list? Why?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

14. Should any courses be included in the professional education requirements?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. Are there any courses that were avoided by agricultural education students? If you know the reason, please specify?

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

16. I was satisfied with the agricultural education curriculum.
(circle one of the following --- 1 being strongly agree - 5
being strongly disagree)

1 2 3 4 5

17. What other suggestions do you have for improving the agricultural education curriculum at Kansas State University?

	<u>High</u>		<u>Med</u>		<u>Low</u>
g. Developing tests	1	2	3	4	5
h. Supervising experience programs	1	2	3	4	5
i. Experience with record book in classroom and on SOEP visits	1	2	3	4	5
j. Aiding in guidance of students	1	2	3	4	5
k. Meeting with students' parents	1	2	3	4	5
l. Advising the FFA chapter	1	2	3	4	5
m. Assisting with FFA contest preparations	1	2	3	4	5
n. Assisting at FFA contests	1	2	3	4	5
o. Reviewing FFA award applications, (BOAC, National Chapter, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
p. Reviewing VE-20 and VE-50 Forms	1	2	3	4	5
q. Participating in a community project (BOAC, Calender sales, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
r. Reviewing budget procedures	1	2	3	4	5
s. Working with advisory committee	1	2	3	4	5
t. Participating in mock job interviews	1	2	3	4	5
u. Participating in non-instructional activities (homeroom, lunchroom, hall duty, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
v. Reviewing summer programs	1	2	3	4	5
w. Participating in an adult education program	1	2	3	4	5
x. Other (please state and evaluate)	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

6. Circle the number at the right best describing your university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and cooperating center.

	<u>High</u>		<u>Med</u>		<u>Low</u>
a. Effectiveness of university supervisors	1	2	3	4	5
b. Effectiveness of cooperating teacher	1	2	3	4	5
c. Quality of cooperating centers (physical facilities, staff, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

- | | <u>High</u> | <u>Med</u> | <u>Low</u> |
|--|-------------|------------|------------|
| d. Cooperation between university supervisors and cooperating teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
| e. Other (please state and evaluate) | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
| _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
| _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
| _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
7. What areas need to be stressed more or taught more during student teaching? (check as many as are needed)
- | | |
|---|--|
| _____ a. FFA | _____ i. School relations |
| _____ b. Record book | _____ j. Supervised Occupational Experience Programs |
| _____ c. Classroom teaching | _____ k. _____ |
| _____ d. Community relations | Other (Please Specify) |
| _____ e. Student management | _____ l. _____ |
| _____ f. Public relations | Other (Please Specify) |
| _____ g. Young farmers and/or adult farmers | _____ m. _____ |
| _____ h. Physical facilities | Other (Please Specify) |
8. Other suggestions you have for improving student teaching to better prepare graduates for teaching vocational agriculture.
- a. _____
- _____
- b. _____
- _____
- c. _____
- _____
- _____

Block Classes:

9. In your opinion, what are the strengths of the block semester?
- a. _____
- _____
- _____

- b. _____

- c. _____

10. In your opinion, what are the weaknesses of the block semester?

- a. _____

- b. _____

- c. _____

APPENDIX C

Procedure:

As part of the continuing process of upgrading the agricultural education curriculum, it has been decided that it is necessary to evaluate the curriculum by way of the students and graduates of the curriculum. To facilitate this evaluation, an instrument will be developed and then reviewed by a panel of instructors and assistants in the agricultural education department. The instrument will be tested for reliability.

The data will be obtained from the following populations:

1. The entire on-campus enrollment in agricultural education, freshman through senior.
2. The past four years of agricultural education graduates.

The subjects on campus will have the instrument administered to them in one of several group meetings. The instructions will be given orally as well as having a written copy attached to the instrument. They will be informed that their participation is voluntary and that their name will not be associated with any reported data.

The instrument will be sent to the past graduates with a cover letter with instructions and also explaining that their compliance in the project is voluntary and their name will not be associated with any of the reported data.

All subjects will have access to copies of the project results upon request.



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holtz Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Major:

It is the sincere wish of the Agricultural Education staff at Kansas State University to continue to meet the needs of the students in agricultural education. To facilitate this and as part of my masters research project, you have been asked to participate in an evaluation of the Agricultural Education curriculum. Your participation is vitally important to the project, but it is strictly voluntary.

You will find a questionnaire on the following pages. Please take your time and answer the questions honestly. Please give us your true opinions as to the quality of instruction being offered by Kansas State University. The data from this survey will be reported as group data only, and your name will not be associated with your questionnaire in any way.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask Dr. Welton or myself. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

Richard F. Welton
Associate Professor in
Agricultural Education

DU/ly
Enclosures

Kansas State University
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Agricultural Education
Curriculum Evaluation Questionnaire

FORM A
(please print)

Name _____ Sex ☐ M ☐ F
Address _____
City _____ State _____
Zip Code _____

Instructions for Completion

The items in this questionnaire are designed to gather information from agricultural education majors about the agricultural education curriculum. To complete the survey, place an X in the space provided beside your response or write out your response on the lines provided. All information taken from this questionnaire will be reported only in grouped data. The information provided will be held in strict confidence. Copies of the results available upon request.

Please return to: Dale Unruh, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Department of Adult and Occupational Education
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Graduate:

The Agricultural Education staff at Kansas State University is trying to meet the needs of agricultural education students in every way possible. One method of doing this is to evaluate the curriculum. I realize that this is a very busy time of the year for all, but I am asking you to complete the following questionnaire evaluating the curriculum. Your participation is vitally important to the staff and myself, however, it is strictly voluntary.

Please answer the questions on the following pages as honestly as possible. The data from the research will be reported as group data only. Your name will not be associated with your questionnaire in any way.

To facilitate the return of the questionnaire, you will find a self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed. We would like to have the questionnaire returned by May 10, 1981, if possible. If you have any questions, feel free to call Dr. Welton or myself any time at (913) 532-5535.

Your contribution is vitally important to the success of this project and the betterment of the curriculum. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

Richard F. Welton
Associate Professor
Agricultural Education

DU/lj
Enclosures

FORM B

1. How many years have you been a teacher of vocational agriculture? _____
(number of years)
2. If you are not presently teaching vocational agriculture, please state your occupation and the number of years in your present job.

(occupation) (number of years)
3. If you are or have been involved in teaching, how many years did you remain in your first teaching position? _____
(number of years)
4. How many different teaching positions have you held? _____
(number)
5. Now that you have graduated and are working, what suggestions do you have for improving the agricultural education curriculum to better prepare graduates for teaching?

Student Teaching Evaluation:

6. Circle the number that best describes your involvement during student teaching with each activity shown below:

	<u>High</u>		<u>Med</u>		<u>Low</u>
a. Meeting and working with key school personnel and people in community	1	2	3	4	5
b. Developing lesson plans	1	2	3	4	5
c. Developing weekly plans	1	2	3	4	5
d. Using various instructional media (films, tapes, overheads, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
e. Using various teaching methods (games, recitation, discussion, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
f. Evaluating students (grades)	1	2	3	4	5

RIGHTS OF HUMAN SUBJECTS CHECKLIST

If you have determined that an individual is at risk in accord with common sense and sound professional judgment applied to the circumstances of the proposed activity, you should answer the following.

All faculty and students in the College of Education who are engaged in research, demonstration, or development activities involving human subjects (or using data previously gathered on human subjects) must complete this form. All investigators involved, including the "responsible party (a faculty member)" must sign and date this copy. Submit to Chairperson, College of Education Rights of Human Subjects Committee a month prior to beginning the project along with all measuring instruments and the methodology section including informed consent procedures. You will be notified in 15 days of the COE comments but must wait until the university committee has given approval (about a month during a regular academic year (more time needed over semester breaks)).

	YES	NO
1. Have you read the COE guidelines on the Rights of Human Subjects?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
2. Do you explain procedures (in writing or orally) in terms which can reasonably be assumed understandable to subjects (including, and especially, when subject's primary language is not standard English)?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
3. Does your treatment include the use or implied use of drugs or electric shock?	<u>*</u>	<u>✓</u>
4. Does your treatment include the use of money (including paying subjects to participate)?	<u>*</u>	<u>✓</u>
5. Do you explicitly inform subjects of their right to refuse to participate?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
6. Do you explicitly inform subjects of rights to withdraw from participation at any time?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
7. Do you explicitly offer to answer subject inquiries about your study prior to their participation?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
8. Will you assure subjects of anonymity or explicitly inform subjects their responses are not anonymous to the investigator but are held confidential?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
9. Have you provided adequate safeguards for the data?	<u>✓</u>	<u>*</u>
10. Could any of your procedures reasonably be construed as anxiety provoking?	<u>*</u>	<u>✓</u>
If yes, is professional help standing by?	<u>—</u>	<u>*</u>
11. Could any of your procedures reasonably be construed to be socially unacceptable or involve activities or questions which might reasonably be construed by subjects as offensive?	<u>*</u>	<u>✓</u>

- | | YES | NO |
|---|----------|----------|
| 12. Could any of your procedures or questions reasonably be construed as an invasion of an individual's privacy? | <u>*</u> | <u>✓</u> |
| 13. Do you intend to use students from your own classes as subjects? | <u>*</u> | <u>✓</u> |
| 14. Do your procedures involve any deception of subjects? | <u>*</u> | <u>✓</u> |
| 15. Do you offer to debrief subjects at the end of your investigation? | <u>✓</u> | <u>*</u> |
| 16. Do you obtain informed consent from subjects or the parents or guardians of subjects, or persons responsible for safeguarding data? | <u>✓</u> | <u>*</u> |
| 17. Has informed consent been obtained from all responsible individuals, including advisors, thesis committees, superintendents, principals, or division heads? | <u>✓</u> | <u>*</u> |
| 18. Are you going to involve subjects off-campus? | <u>✓</u> | <u>—</u> |
| 19. Do you agree to follow the COE guideline on Rights of Human Subjects? | <u>✓</u> | <u>*</u> |

ANY RESPONSE (CHECK) OVER AN ASTERISK () INDICATES YOU SHOULD CONTACT THE CHAIRPERSON, COE RIGHTS OF HUMAN SUBJECTS, TO DETERMINE THE SAFEGUARDS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL BEFORE COMMITTEE REVIEW OF YOUR PROPOSAL.

Richard K. Wilton
RESPONSIBLE PARTY (FACULTY MEMBER)

4-13-81
DATE

345 General Classroom Building
ADDRESS

Bob Nunn
OTHER RESEARCHER(S)

4-13-81
DATE RECEIVED

342 General Classroom Building
ADDRESS

DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF RESEARCH: An Evaluation of the Agricultural Education Curriculum at Kansas State University,

Do not write below this line: for committee use only		
App.	Disap.	Stipulations:

Dear Applicant:

The University Rights of Human Subjects Committee has reviewed your proposal entitled " An Evaluation of the Undergraduate Curriculum Agricultural Education at Kansas State University."

Principal Investigator(s) Amurh

Faculty Advisor Wilton

☐ This proposal has not been approved. Please contact the College of Education Rights of Human Subjects Chairperson for further information.

☒ This proposal has been approved. You may move ahead.

Date 4/29

Signed

Robert Scott
Chairman, COE Human Subjects Committee

APPENDIX D



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holtz Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Major:

It is the sincere wish of the Agricultural Education staff at Kansas State University to continue to meet the needs of the students in agricultural education. To facilitate this and as part of my master's research project, you have been asked to participate in an evaluation of the Agricultural Education curriculum. Your participation is vitally important to the project, but it is strictly voluntary.

You will find a questionnaire on the following pages. Please take your time and answer the questions honestly. Please give us your true opinions as to the quality of instruction being offered by Kansas State University. The data from this survey will be reported as group data, only, and your name will not be associated with your questionnaire in any way.

If you have any questions, please feel free to ask Dr. Welton or myself. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

Richard F. Welton
Associate Professor in
Agricultural Education

DU/lj
Enclosures



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

April 24, 1981

Dear Agricultural Education Major:

The Agricultural Education staff at Kansas State University is continually striving to upgrade the quality of instruction in the Agricultural Education curriculum. My masters research topic and part of this continuing process is to evaluate the agricultural education curriculum. The staff feel that you as a student are in the best position to do the evaluating. We vitally need your participation in this project.

Your participation consists of completing a questionnaire that will require approximately one-half hour of your time. I have set up several meeting times for your convenience and would ask you to attend one of the meetings to complete the questionnaire. The meetings will be held in room #126 at Eisenhower Hall during the following times:

1. Thursday, April 30 at 1:30 p.m.
2. Monday, May 4 at 3:30 p.m.
3. Monday, May 4 at 7:00 p.m.
4. Tuesday, May 5 at 7:00 p.m.

Please try to make it to one of the above sessions. If it is not possible to attend any of the sessions, please leave a message for me during the day at 532-5904 or 532-6423 or at 776-0407 in the evenings and I will set up a separate meeting time.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this project. Please come prepared to be totally honest with us about your courses, advisors and the curriculum in general. Again, your participation is vitally important to the project.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

DU/11



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

May 21, 1981

Dear Agricultural Education Major:

All agricultural education majors at Kansas State University were given the opportunity to complete a questionnaire on evaluation of the agricultural education curriculum within the past three weeks of classes. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the questionnaires have been returned. Yours as yet has not been received.

This study involves all agricultural education majors and the past four years of graduates in agricultural education. It is of the most importance that the highest response possible from the people involved for a viable evaluation to occur. I would like to urge you to please take time to fill out this form and send it in as soon as possible. My address is:

Dale Unruh, GTA
GCB #342
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

DU/lj



**Department of Adult
and Occupational Education**

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Major:

The Agricultural Education staff is still in the process of evaluating the curriculum at Kansas State University. We still are below a ninety percent (90%) return rate. Yours as yet has not been returned.

It is vitally important that I receive this survey to complete the evaluation. I realize that the last few weeks have been hectic with finals and then moving home, and it is possible to misplace the questionnaire. I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire for you to complete. Please fill it out and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope that is enclosed by June 10, 1981.

Thank you for your time and cooperation and have a good summer.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dale Unruh".

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teacher Assistant
Agricultural Education

DU:tky

APPENDIX E



**Department of Adult
and Occupational Education**

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear

The Agricultural Education Staff is continually striving to improve the quality of instructors at Kansas State University in agricultural education. To aid in this venture and as part of my Masters research, we are going to evaluate the agricultural education curriculum by means of a questionnaire sent to the past four years of graduates in agricultural education.

Our staff records contain only home addresses for many of our graduates, and it is difficult to keep up with present addresses. I am requesting that you put your son's/daughter's present address on the enclosed addressed, stamped postcard, and return it to me as soon as possible. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dale Unruh".

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education



**Department of Adult
and Occupational Education**

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Graduate:

The Agricultural Education staff at Kansas State University is trying to meet the needs of agricultural education students in every way possible. One method of doing this is to evaluate the curriculum. I realize that this is a very busy time of the year for all, but I am asking you to complete the following questionnaire evaluating the curriculum. Your participation is vitally important to the staff and myself, however, it is strictly voluntary.

Please answer the questions on the following pages as honestly as possible. The data from the research will be reported as group data only. Your name will not be associated with your questionnaire in any way.

To facilitate the return of the questionnaire, you will find a self-addressed, stamped envelop enclosed. We would like to have the questionnaire returned by May 20, 1981 if possible. If you have any questions, feel free to call Dr. Welton or myself any time at (913) 532-5904 or 5905.

Your contribution is vitally important to the success of this project and the betterment of the curriculum. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Uhrh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

Richard F. Welton
Associate Professor
Agricultural Education

DU/lj
Enclosures



Department of Adult
and Occupational Education

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

May 21, 1981

Dear Agricultural Education Graduate:

Agricultural Education graduates from the past four years (1976 - 1980) were sent a questionnaire concerning the evaluation of the undergraduate agricultural education curriculum approximately two weeks ago. Forty percent (40%) of the questionnaires have been returned. Yours as yet has not been received.

Since this study involves so many graduates and several years, all the information is needed. I would like to urge you to please take the time to fill out this form and send it in as soon as possible.

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

DU/lj



**Department of Adult
and Occupational Education**

College of Education
Holtan Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

Dear Agricultural Education Graduate:

Agricultural Education graduates from the past four years (1976-1980) were sent a questionnaire concerning the evaluation of the undergraduate curriculum at Kansas State University. Your cooperation is vitally needed for the successful completion of the project. This project could lead to improvements in the curriculum that will aid future graduates.

I realize that the questionnaire takes some time to complete, however, I am asking you to complete it and return it to me as soon as possible.

In case you have misplaced your questionnaire, I am enclosing another copy of it for your completion. If you have already completed and mailed in your questionnaire by the time this arrives, please disregard. If you have not, please complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your time and cooperation, and I hope you enjoy your summer.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dale Unruh".

Dale Unruh
Graduate Teaching Assistant
Agricultural Education

DU: (ky)



**Department of Adult
and Occupational Education**

College of Education
Holton Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
913-532-5535

June 22, 1981

To: Participants in Agricultural Education Undergraduate
Curriculum Evaluation

From: Dick Welton and Dale Unruh, Agricultural Education

Re: Evaluation of Program planning

Thank you for your participation in our undergraduate curriculum evaluation. We have received tremendous response from our undergraduates and graduates in this project. As we now begin to summarize the data received, we have noted an omission on the questionnaire. On your evaluation of required course work in agricultural education, we find that we did not include program planning in vocational agriculture. Will you please take a few seconds to evaluate this class. In the space below we are providing the information so that you will be able to evaluate program planning. Once you have evaluated the course, will you remove the lower part of this letter and return it as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Once again, thank you for your great support.

Best wishes for a pleasant summer.

DW:mcs

Enclosure

(Cut here and return in the enclosed envelope.)

Course Evaluation:

8. Rate the REQUIRED course work in agricultural education as to effectiveness in preparing you for becoming a teacher. A number of courses you may have taken are shown below. Please rate only those courses taken at Kansas State University. (Please rate each course you completed. Rate the course, NOT the instructor.)

	Above Average		Below Average		
	1	2	3	4	5
Program Planning in Vocational Education					

APPENDIX F

CATEGORIES OF UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES'
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CLUB

A. Programs:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Experienced teachers as speakers	10	4
Programs related to vocational agriculture teaching	4	6
Improve quality of programs	3	2
Programs on the curriculum (requirements, graduate school, etc.)	3	0
Graduate students and block students as speakers	2	0
More programs	2	0
Combine Agricultural Education Club and ATA meetings	1	0
Programs on job opportunities	1	0
Beginning teachers as speakers	0	2

B. Activities:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Increase number and quality	12	0
Field trips to vocational agriculture departments	3	2
More practical experiences for students (castrating, docking, public speaking, leadership workshops)	3	2
Involve more recreational activities	1	1
Exchange with other universities	1	0
Get involved in College of Agriculture more	1	0
Big brother program	0	1
More involvement with College of Education	1	1
Sponsor a teaching methods contest	0	1

C. Promotion:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Publish meeting dates, times, places	3	0
Promote club more	2	2
Recruitment	2	1
Better communications	1	1
More organized	1	0
Use a newsletter	1	0

D. FFA:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Keep FFA contact (programs, forms)	5	7
Organize or help with FFA contests and State FFA convention	3	3

E. Membership:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Increase numbers	4	0
Increase involvement	2	0

F. Advisors:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Better advising	1	0
More supervision	1	0

G. Miscellaneous:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undreggraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Members in contact with curriculum committee	1	1
Not really club purpose	1	1
Members get out of it what they put into it	0	1

APPENDIX G

CATEGORIES OF UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES'
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING ALPHA TAU ALPHA

A. Programs:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Experienced teachers as speakers	3	2
Improve quality of programs	3	4
Meetings with student teachers	2	1
Programs on the curriculum	2	1
Programs relating to vocational agriculture teaching	1	4
Combine with Agricultural Education Club programs	1	1
Guest speakers from other ATA chapters	1	0
Resource people as speakers	1	0

B. Activities:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Field trips to vocational agriculture departments	2	1
Increase number and quality	2	1
More practical experiences (castrating, docking, public speaking, leadership workshops)	2	1
Combine several Agricultural Education Club and ATA activities	2	0
More service projects	2	0
More professional activities related to vocational agriculture	1	1
Big brother program	1	0
Exchange with other universities	1	0
More recreation	0	1
Sponsor a teaching methods contest	0	1

C. Membership and entrance requirements:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Keep professional (suits and dresses)	2	1
Increase involvement	2	0
Make more exclusive (higher Grade Point Average)	1	1
Encourage seniors to join	1	0
Remove initiation and paddles	1	0

D. Promotion:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Publish meeting dates, times, places	2	1
Credit for attendance	2	0
Promote club to upperclassmen	1	0
Improve member recruitment	0	1

E. FFA:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Keep FFA contact	0	5
Organize or help with FFA contests and convention	1	0

F. Advisors:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
More supervision	1	0

G. Miscellaneous:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Can't see necessity of it	1	0
Members get out of it what they put into it	0	1

APPENDIX H

CATEGORIES OF UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING IMPROVEMENT OF ADVISEMENT IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

A. Advisement other than pre-enrolling:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Require one meeting per semester other than pre-enrolling	11	0
Work with students sooner on program of study	8	0
Inform about class or curriculum options/electives	7	5
Do not herd into unwanted classes	7	1
Inform students of employment options including non-teaching	4	2
Work with students on future plans	4	1
Inform about teaching responsibilities	1	0
Stay current on students scholastically	1	0

B. Quality of Advisors:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Doing a good job ^a	13	6
Need to be better acquainted with classes	9	2
Need to get better acquainted with advisees	1	1
Better than other departments ^a	1	1
Get new advisors	1	1
Treat students fairly	1	0
Best advising on campus ^a	1	0

C. Availability of advisors:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Be more available	7	3
More office hours	2	1
Post office hours and schedules	3	0
Put up advisee appointment sheet	0	1

D. Time spent with advisor:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
More time allowed	7	1
Work more with students	2	0
Spend more time explaining requirements	1	0

E. Utilizing other students in advising:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Use graduate students to aid advising (have available or list with names and phone numbers)	4	1
Use upperclassmen for advising (have available or list with names and phone numbers)	4	1
Have others available while advisors are supervising student teachers	1	0

F. Number of advisors:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
More advisors	3	3

G. Miscellaneous:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Have list of electives in Agriculture and General Education available	3	0
Assign to one advisor	2	0
Advise toward more practical courses	1	1
Have social function at first of semester to meet all advisees	1	0
Inform about experience hours necessary for certification	1	0
Inform students to keep track of credit hours	1	0
Introduce to all advisors	1	0
Set up appointments for specialty certificate students with advisor in specialty area	1	0
Stress high grades	1	0
Unfair to Dr. Parmley to have all transfer students his first year	1	0

APPENDIX I

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS CONCERNING
REMOVING REQUIRED COURSES FROM AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Removal</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
1. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry	Useless, worthless	8	1
	Impractical	3	1
	Irrelevant	2	0
	Not related to agriculture	2	0
	Get most of same material in other courses	1	0
	Material not covered well	1	0
	Need new teacher	1	0
	Too much chemistry	1	0
2. Organic Biology	Replace with agriculture related course	6	3
	Useless, worthless	5	4
	Not agriculture related	4	3
	Impractical	1	2
	One Biology course is enough	1	0
3. Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education	Worthless, time consuming	11	4
	Busy work	3	0
	Add as a part of block	1	0
	Combine with Agricultural Education Colloquium	1	0
	Take out Home Economics	1	0
	Replace with agriculture classes	0	1
4. Agricultural Education Colloquium	Useless	2	0
	Busy work	1	1
	Too basic	1	0
	Useless if had FFA background	1	0
	Replace with agriculture class	0	1
5. Educational Psychology I and II	Grade school situations (not secondary)	2	0
	Same material as in General Psychology	1	1
	Busy work	1	0
	Basic common sense taught	0	1
	Not vocational related	0	1
	Replace with agriculture classes	0	1
	Too much psychology	0	1
	Worthless	0	1
6. Agricultural Journalism	Busywork, no benefit	2	2
	Replace with newswriting shortcourse	2	0
	English Composition I and II gives enough writing	1	0
	Useless	0	1
7. Agricultural Orientation	Worthless	2	1
	Did not help due to previous agriculture experience	1	1
	Not effective	1	0

<u>Responses</u>	Frequency	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Up to individual to ask questions	1	0
More uniform advising between advisors	0	3
Be specific with students (point out good and bad teaching traits early)	0	2
Be more realistic about teaching	0	1
Get Kansas State University faculty out into vocational agriculture departments	0	1
Remind students of important dates: application for teacher education, application for student teaching, application for certification	0	1
Students with vocational agriculture background should be allowed to get out of certain classes	0	1

^aThe respondents were asked to cite areas of improvement in advisement; however, several felt that no improvement was needed and it was thought necessary to report those comments.

Course	Reason for Removal	Frequency	
		Undergraduate	Graduate
8. Social Science electives	Allow more agricultural science	2	0
	Doesn't apply	2	0
	Learn very little	1	0
9. General Chem- istry	Busy work	1	0
	Replace with Chemistry I	1	0
	Useless	1	0
10. Economics I	Agricultural Economics is enough	2	1
11. Methods of Teaching Agri- culture	Busy work needs to be eliminated	1	1
	Combine with Program Planning of Vocational Education	1	0
12. General Psy- chology	Little gained, time consuming	1	0
	Not relevant	1	0
13. Program Plan- ning of Voca- tional Educa- tion	Busy work needs to be eliminated	1	0
	Combine with Methods of Teaching Agriculture	1	0
14. English Compo- sition II	Too much English	1	0
15. Farm Power	Should be optional	1	0
16. Physical Edu- cation	Should be elective	1	0
17. Soils	Too much information for Agricultural Education	1	0
18. Agricultural Economics	Other agriculture needed	0	1
19. Agriculture Mechanics Practices	Due to teacher	0	1
20. Introduction to Instruction- al Media	Busy work	0	1

APPENDIX J

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS CONCERNING
ADDING ELECTIVE COURSES TO AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

123

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
1. Anatomy and Physiology	Good agriculture background	3	0
	Relates to agriculture- replace Organismic Biology	2	6
	Need more technical Animal Science	1	0
2. Farm and Ranch Management	Records	2	0
	Economics important	1	0
	Good background class	1	0
	Management skills	1	0
	Practical	1	0
	Better than Agricultural Economics or Economics I	0	1
3. Principles of Animal Science	Need basics	3	2
	Good livestock background	2	0
	Applicable	0	3
4. Fundamentals of Nutrition	Good background in agriculture	3	0
	Take Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry place	1	0
	Need to teach livestock	0	1
5. Sociology or Anthropology	Good background	3	0
	Relates to rural life	1	0
6. Farm Electrification and Soil Conservation	Good electricity background	2	1
	Useful in teaching	1	0
7. Farm management or similar course	Needed in today's agriculture	1	2
	Decision-making processes	1	0
	Record-keeping	0	1
8. Agronomy	Need more background	2	2
9. FFA course	Seminar is not adequate	2	0
	Advising FFA	0	1
	Contests	0	1
10. Meat Processing	Learn meat cuts and animals	2	0
	Helpful in teaching	0	2
11. Accounting	Good record-keeping background	2	1
12. Elements of Meat	Need more animal science	2	0
	Helpful in teaching	0	1
13. More agricultural economics	Necessary in today's agriculture	2	1
14. Principles of Livestock feeding	Ration formulation	1	1
	Good background	1	0

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
15. Farm Building Construction	Helpful in teaching	2	0
16. Grain Production	Good follow-up to Crop Science	2	0
17. Agricultural Law and Economics	Good background	1	1
18. Horticulture course	Horticulture background	1	1
19. Livestock Selection	Good background Reasons experience	1 0	0 1
20. Range Management	Good background	1	1
21. Adolescent Psychology	Deals with high school students	1	0
22. Advanced Agricultural Mechanics	Aid in teaching	1	0
23. Agricultural Machinery Construction	Useful in teaching	1	0
24. Business elective	Business skills outside agriculture	1	0
25. Course on energy	Future problems	1	0
26. Crop Harvesting and Handling Systems	More agricultural mechanics	1	0
27. Farm Animal Reproduction	Good background class	1	0
28. Foreign Language	Bilingual experience	1	0
29. Form and Function in Livestock	Judging and reasons	1	0
30. History of American Agriculture	Good agriculture background	1	0

Course	Reason for Adding	Frequency ¹²⁵	
		Undergraduate	Graduate
31. Trigonometry or Man's Physical World	Figuring angles and measurements	1	0
32. World and Regional geography	Ideas of total world	1	0
33. Swine Science	Useful in teaching	0	3
34. Beef Science	Helpful in teaching	0	2
35. Computer Science	Useful today	0	2
36. Dairy Science	Applicable	0	1
	Helpful in teaching	0	1
37. Entomology	Good background	0	1
38. Sheep Science	Helpful in teaching	0	1
39. Crop and Seed Quality	Good background	0	1
40. Educational Psychology I and II	Add teacher aide program	0	1
41. Genetics	Detailed information	0	1
42. Introduction to Human Development	Better than Educational Psychology I and II	0	1
43. Industrial construction, tractor maintenance, sheet metal work	Not taught now	0	1
44. Literature	View of another area	0	1
45. Livestock and Meat Evaluation	Practical, important	0	1
46. Poultry Science	Useful in teaching	0	1
47. Production Processes (550-241)	Replace Agricultural Mechanics Practices	0	1

APPENDIX K

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS CONCERNING ADDING COURSES TO
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Adding</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
1. Adult Education	Better informed on older people and Junior Colleges	1	0
2. Advising Youth Organization	Better preparation for advising FFA	1	0
3. Agricultural Education Seminar	Agdex for Juniors	1	0
4. Agricultural Machiner Operations	Lengthen to full semester	1	0
5. More FFA	Necessary for teaching	1	0
6. Practicum courses	Need more experience	1	0
7. Psychology of the Exceptional Child	Replace Educational Psychology II New state requirements	1 0	0 1
8. Record book and awards	Need better background	1	1
9. Administrator relations	Getting along with people	0	1
10. Emphasis on curriculum	Need for teaching	0	1
11. Extension education	None taught now	0	1
12. Leadership	Need more	0	1
13. School Finance	Budgeting	0	1

APPENDIX L

UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS CONCERNING
COURSES AVOIDED BY AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Avoiding</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
1. Agricultural Journalism	Teacher	6	2
	Time consuming	4	1
	Worthless	1	0
	Phobia to writing	0	1
2. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry	Difficulty	4	3
	Not related	3	0
	Instructor	1	0
	Poor class	1	1
3. Soils	Bad image	3	0
	Difficulty	3	0
4. Education Psychology I and II	Related to Elementary Education	1	0
	Time consuming	1	0
	Not practical	0	1
	Too much psychology	0	1
5. Chemistry	Difficulty	1	0
6. Economics I	Irrelevant	1	0
7. History of American Agriculture	Teacher	1	0
8. Organismic Biology	Difficulty	1	3
9. Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education	Time consuming	1	0
10. Seminar in Agricultural Education	Worthless	1	0
11. Social Sciences	Not encouraged by advisors	1	0
12. Speech	Difficulty	1	0
13. Teaching Adult Classes in Agriculture	Teacher	1	0
	Did not do enough for students	0	2
14. Agricultural Education Coll9quium	Too much material from other classes	0	1
15. Farm Electrification and Soil Conservation	Too in depth for a person with no background	0	1

<u>Course</u>	<u>Reason for Avoiding</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
		<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
16. Fundamentals of Accounting	Time consuming	0	1
17. Genetics	Difficulty	0	1

APPENDIX M

CATEGORIES OF GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING IMPROVEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHING

A. Courses and content:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Talk about amount of time spent with the program and role of instructor	3	0	1
Discipline of students	2	1	3
Courses dealing with contests	1	0	1
Longer methods class	1	0	0
More record book training	1	0	3
More video-taping in methods	1	0	0
Project construction preparation	1	0	0
Stress importance of well-rounded program	1	0	0
Teach organization of materials	1	0	0
Vocational agriculture instructors speak to classes	1	0	1
Course on budgeting, equipment purchasing, etc.	0	0	3
More class teaching by students	0	1	1

B. Student teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Give student a chance to be at more than one school	1	0	0
Make sure they do recommended activities	1	0	0
Master teachers should stress motivation and administrator relations	1	0	0
Work more on housing situations during block	0	2	0
Have a student teacher conference at mid-point of student teaching	0	1	1

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Make sure students teach all classes	0	1	0
Spend more time in community activities	0	1	0
Warn student early of time needed for block	0	1	0
Allow more time for lesson plan development	0	0	1
Cooperating centers should be chosen on past record	0	0	1
Do more 'hands on' while on campus, rather than listening in class	0	0	1
Encourage meeting with cooperating teacher earlier	0	0	1
Get student teacher involved with other teachers	0	0	1

C. Length of student teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Increase to one year	1	0	0
Increase to 10 or 12 weeks	1	0	0
Work in field longer	1	0	0

APPENDIX N

CATEGORIES OF GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING STRENGTHS OF THE BLOCK SEMESTER

A. Courses:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
agricultural mechanization instruction	3	1	0
Busy schedule	2	1	0
Methods class is good practice	2	2	0
Organized, good quality instruction and instructors	2	1	0
Methods class - video taping	1	3	0
Individual attention	1	0	0
Size of classes	1	0	0

B. Student teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Student teaching in general	5	0	4
Working with FFA	2	0	0
Working with parents and people in community	2	0	0
Teaching all classes	1	1	2
Writing lesson plans and tests	1	1	0
Eight weeks under a cooperating teacher	1	0	0

C. Course content:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Job-like atmosphere: stress, time, assignments, etc.	5	1	7
Guidelines for curriculum development	1	1	1
Tells where to find information	1	0	0

D. Comradery:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Togetherness of students	3	3	0

<u>Responses</u>	Frequency		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Getting to know fellow teachers	2	0	0

E. Other:

<u>Responses</u>	Frequency		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Good semester, good experience	1	0	2
Good balance of time in class at time involved in teaching	1	0	0
Intense instruction	0	0	2
Working with Nigerian students	0	0	1

APPENDIX O

CATEGORIES OF GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING WEAKNESSES OF BLOCK SEMESTER

A. Courses and content:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Former Teacher</u>	<u>Non-Teacher</u>
More work on discipline and motivation	4	0	1
Agricultural Machinery Operations-concentrate on MIG and TIG welding-more shop, less class	4	0	0
More written work and tests	3	0	0
More FFA, record book and Supervised Occupational Experience Programs work	2	0	2
Require more lesson plans for future use	2	0	0
Unnecessary paperwork	1	0	4
Stressing ideal situations-little realism	1	0	1
Too much information	1	0	1
Need variety in course offerings	1	0	0
No project construction instruction	1	0	0
Repetition between many classes	0	1	3
Not enough emphasis on mechanics	0	1	0
Too many lessons and assignments	0	1	0
Deal more with role of teacher in the school system	0	0	2
Not challenging	0	0	2
More time presenting lessons	0	0	1
Need more stress on preparation	0	0	1
Replace Methods of Teaching Agriculture with course on what to teach and where to find information	0	0	1

B. Student teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Choose cooperating centers better, alternate; don't allow student teachers there year-after-year	2	0	0
First eight weeks of semester	2	0	0
Schedule needs classes before and after teaching practice	2	0	0
Not enough time in field	1	0	2
Expense to student	1	0	1
Require student to teach more than 100 miles from home	1	0	0
Too much time with one teacher	1	0	0
Need an extension option to block	0	0	1
Watch student placement closer	0	0	1

C. Other:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>		
	Teacher	Former Teacher	Non-Teacher
Worry more about quality than quantity when certifying teachers	1	0	0
Big transition, student to teacher	0	0	1
Some prejudice against Nigerians	0	0	1

APPENDIX P

CATEGORIES OF UNDERGRADUATES' AND GRADUATES' OPINIONS
CONCERNING IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

A. Courses:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Less Biology and Chemistry (Organismic Biology and Introduction to Organic Biological Chemistry)	10	1
More Agricultural Science hours	7	7
More practical courses	6	5
More Animal Science courses	5	1
Combine Educational Psychology I and II	2	0
Fewer Social Science requirements	2	0
More International Agriculture	2	0
Agricultural Journalism	1	0
Another class similar to Farm Power	1	0
Course on law and teachers	1	0
Evaluate curriculum periodically	1	0
Job interview class	1	0
More Agricultural Mechanics	1	0
More management courses and computer use	1	0
More record book work	1	0
Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education revised to deal with life of a teacher and information on forms	1	0
Put Principles and Philosophies of Vocational Education on block and make Agricultural Machinery Operations a one semester course	1	0
Substitute Anatomy and Physiology for Organismic Biology	1	0
Replace Educational Psychology I and II with course dealing with Agriculture problems	0	1

B. Advising:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Communicate with junior colleges on transferring	2	0

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Do more to promote the curriculum	2	0
Inform about requirements (courses and certification) earlier	2	0
Inform students of all job opportunities	2	1
Advise more about specialty areas	1	0
Don't assume all majors want to teach	1	0
Get more people involved in the curriculum	1	0
Have slideshow or film on Kansas vocational agriculture teaching	1	0
Listen to students needs better	1	0
Send letter to high school vocational agriculture students about agricultural education	1	0
Work with students more	1	0
Advise students to student teach in fall and pick up courses in weak areas in spring	0	1
Don't allow students to take classes A-Pass-Fail	0	1
Have information on class helpfulness available	0	1

C. Course Content:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Give a chance to teach classes before student teaching	2	2
Reduce busy work on block	2	0
Most education classes are worthless	1	1
Combine all seminars into one-three course	1	0
Option on block for those not wanting to teach	1	0
Bring in speakers to Agricultural Education Colloquium or have students research and teach the class	0	1
Change Agricultural Journalism	0	1
Improve leadership, state and local policies content	0	1

D. Student teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Change student teaching schedule to: four weeks class- eight weeks student teaching- four weeks	1	0
Deal more with real life situations	1	0
Have a past block talk to future block	1	0
More lesson plan instruction	1	0
Upgrade Agricultural Machinery Operations	1	0
Watch student teacher placement closer- make sure student is satisfied	1	0
Work some methods in before block	1	0
Make student teaching longer- 12 weeks	0	2
Lengthen some block classes to full semester	0	1
Spread block out a little	0	1

E. FFA:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Elective FFA course for non-FFA students	2	0
More FFA	0	2
More work with FFA forms	0	2

F. Relation to vocational agriculture teaching:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Course on dealing with administration	0	1
Curriculum suggestions	0	1
List of reference materials and books available	0	1
One or two hour course on what it takes to teach	0	1
Teach more methods	0	1

G. Miscellaneous:

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	Undergraduate	Graduate
Good curriculum ^a	2	0
Definitely keep Agricultural Education Colloquium required ^a	1	0

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
Hard to get into background and classes due to some required courses	1	0
More flexibility	0	1
Retain basic requirements	0	1
Start Ft. Hays Agricultural Education program for competition	0	1

^aUndergraduates and graduates were asked to list improvements; however, some of them felt there was no need for improvement and it was thought necessary to report these comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Ronald D. "Western Kentucky University's Teacher Preparation Evaluation Model." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 075 362, 1972.
- Arthur, Nolan Lee. "An Assessment of Selected Aspects of Academic Preparation as Perceived by a Group of Transfer Students Graduating from Oklahoma State University." ED.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975.
- Benton, Ralph A. "Trends in Agricultural Teacher Education - 'Ten Years Later'." Agricultural Education Magazine, August 1973, p. 31.
- Bruce, Herbert. "Innovations in Preparing Teachers of Agriculture." Agricultural Education Magazine, May 1972, p. 291.
- Field, William E. "A Review of the Undergraduate Program in Agricultural Education at the University of Minnesota." ED.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1977.
- Harris, John Mark. "An Evaluation of the Pre-Service Program for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture at Oklahoma State University." Master's Report, Oklahoma State University, 1973.
- Hendrickson, Billy Forrester. "The Perceptions of the Pre-Service Agricultural Education Program at Oklahoma State University as Perceived by Those Who Chose a Non-Teaching Occupation." Master's Report, Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- Mannebach, Alfred J. "Program Evaluation--Questions and Strategies." Agricultural Education Magazine, August 1971, pp. 42-43.
- McGhee, O. Claude. "The Impact of Participating Experiences for Agricultural Education Majors." Agricultural Education Magazine, October 1971, pp. 106-107.
- Reynolds, Eldon R. "An Evaluation of the Pre-Service Program in Agricultural Education at Colorado State University." Master's Report, Colorado State University, 1970.
- Ritchie, Austin E. "Evaluative Criteria for Beginning-Teacher Programs." Agricultural Education Magazine, May 1957, pp. 247, 254.
- Ryan, Kevin et al. "'My Teacher Education Program? Well. . .': First Year Teachers Reflect and React." Peabody Journal of Education 56 (July 1979): 267-271.

- Pull, Richard W. and Very, Phillip S. "A Description and Evaluation of Vocational Teacher Training Programs in the State of Rhode Island." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 025 650, 1968.
- Ptacek, Carmen. "An Evaluation of the Teacher Training Program for Consumer Homemaking Education in Utah." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 076 761, 1972.
- Stevenson, Mike and Walleri, Dan R. "Federally Mandated Evaluation of Vocational Programs: One College's Response." Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 164 045, 1978.
- Weigers, George W., Jr. "Evaluate to Improve." Agricultural Education Magazine, May 1957, pp. 244-245.
- Wilson, Richard H., ed. A University Department Evaluates its Curriculum . . . An Evaluation of the Curriculum in Agricultural Education at the Ohio State University. Columbus: Ohio Department of Education, 1958.

AN EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM IN
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AT KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

by

DALE GENE UNRUH

B.S., Kansas State University, 1979

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1981

The Agricultural Education curriculum at Kansas State University prepares teachers for the 166 vocational agriculture programs in Kansas high schools. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of that preparation as perceived by undergraduates and graduates.

The 1980-81 undergraduate students and graduates of the past four years (1976-1980) of the Agricultural Education curriculum participated in this study. Respondents included 92 of the 98 undergraduates (93 percent) and 67 of the 128 graduates (52 percent). A questionnaire was developed for study participants, containing Likert-scale checklist, and open-ended questions pertaining to the respondents' background, extra curricular activities, departmental advisement, and coursework in the curriculum. Undergraduates completed the questionnaire on campus, while the graduates received a mailed questionnaire.

The major findings of the study were divided into three areas: extra curricular, advisement and coursework. Agricultural education students and graduates indicated the most extra curricular involvement in the Agricultural Education Club and Alpha Tau Alpha. They recommended the organizations spend more time in planning programs that related to vocational agriculture teaching. More advising during times other than pre-enrolling was found to be the main suggestion to improve advisement in the department. Introduction to Organic and Biological Chemistry and Organismic Biology were the two classes more often recommended for removal by undergraduates and graduates. The main idea expressed by both groups was for more required technical agriculture classes or more elective agricultural science hours available, with fewer general education course requirements.