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Channelling Research into Action

T A C H E E S , teacher-trainers, supervisors, and others are interested in developing the most feasible program in agricultural education. Although we have cut a long time in agricultural education in the public schools of America, there is still room for improvement in the years ahead. In this program of curriculum and research, we have a valuable tool.

GEORGE P. DYE

Channelling Research into action

Rewarding merit

C A N W E R E W D ?

The idea of rewarding the Superior teacher of agriculture is not new. In 1925 the National Education Association passed an official resolution to this effect. The results of this action were not as satisfactory as was expected.

G. P. DYE

Rewarding merit

The photo was taken at Des Moines, Iowa. Stated to the right is Mr. E. S. Smith, Head of the Agricultural Education Department of the University of Illinois, carried by the special interests of the local branch of the Illinois State Association of Agriculture Educators. The magazine is published four times a year. The editors appreciate the cooperation of all who have contributed to the success of the magazine. The publication will be available in the latter part of 1923.
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Student rating scale for the supervised farming program

GEORGE MAKER, Teacher, Berndale, Michigan

If education is a democratic process, then students should share in the responsibility of evaluating the programs that are helping them in their learning activities. It is through the supervised farming program of students of vocational agriculture that many of the objectives of vocational agriculture are being realized.

Since "Supervised Farming" is now generally accepted as the heart of the program in vocational agriculture, it is necessary that an appraisal of this program be made by pupils and teachers for the projects which the students are carrying in. In so doing, a student can observe, measure, compare and evaluate the progress made toward goals set up in the various phases of the student-supervised farming program each year and over a period of years.

The school is to be judged on the basis of certain kinds of changes in the behavior patterns of the student in the listings educational objectives, then it is our duty as teachers of vocational agriculture to aid young men in developing the abilities needed for successful employment in farming. The major objective of vocational agriculture is to develop abilities of present and prospective farmers for proficiency in farming. In planning an appraisal device for supervised farming programs, specific objectives of all types of supervised practice should be formulated. These objectives should be stated in terms of student achievement and should be related to the measures which may be obtained from supervised farming programs. The criterion of efficiency should be considered only as indications of the degree to which abilities have been mastered. It should be recognized that such things as weather and chance influence the results of projects.

What Should Be Evaluated in Relation to the Supervised Farming Program?

Any appraisal device which attempts to measure a student's progress or the outcome of his supervised farming program should include a wide range of criteria such as the following:

1. Scope: A common measure of scope of projects is the number of animals and the number of acres. The scope of the total supervised farming program may be stated in terms of productive man work units, labor units from the supervised farming program, investment in earnings in farming and/or savings and/or investments in non-farming or savings and/or investments in non-farming.

2. Growth: An evaluative device which allows the student to see an indication of his growth in improvement will aid in giving the student increased confidence in his ability to improve in the same work in the future.

3. Production Records: A student needs to know how the products of his projects compare with those obtained by other students in his same field of study. If data are available before the project has been completed, goals may be set up that are reasonable to achieve.

4. Other Factors: The student should realize that his supervised farming program is but one limited to the farming enterprises and livestock. He must know the importance of his improved production programs, supplementary farm programs, and farm activities in the community affairs toward developing a well-rounded program. Stand, ways of test for the different levels of achievement with other forms of supervised farm programs which do not differ greatly from projects.

5. Long Term Planning and Records: Only by looking ahead and making plans for the future can a student make satisfactory progress. Of course, students may be made occasionally in his plant, but this is to be expected. However, the vital link in these future plans are the records of each project which will show whether projects are being made so that changes are needed. Characteristics for the first levels of the program, making plans and keeping records can be set up. Ratings based on significant characteristics tend to make the evaluation more objective.

Design of Tables

In Michigan a so-called "harmonizer sheet" is used for adults. An adaptation of this process was developed for students in all-day class of vocational agriculture, and some of the standards used in developing this procedure in 1951. Michigan to date are being used specifically in this criteria rating scale in supervised farming programs. The results of this rating scale in supervised farming programs were taken from this "harmonizer sheet." In each of the five tables are five levels of performances. They are Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor. All of the forms in this rating scale have standards for each level of performance on a 1-5 point scale.

Methods of Rating Standards in the Two Tables

The scope and growth of the farming programs: The standards for the productive man work units for a student's supervised farming program is the freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior years were obtained through class discussion and from the reports of the state's reports. Other sources of information relating to setting up productive man work units are "Planning the Farm Business" and the "Farm Business Analysis." The income from supervised farming programs and the investment of income from supervised farming programs was the result of evaluation of the Supervised Farming Program Report of Applicants for the State Farmer Degree. The goals for the number of projects and of continuation projects were set up and goals may be set to the same sources which are stated above.

Production Records for Livestock Projects: Table 2 shows production standards for livestock, dairy, and poultry enterprises projects which can be used to evaluate the level of efficiency of projects carried by student. A similar table should be made for crop projects which are common in the community and yield a set up which is suitable for achievement in each local community. The methods used in setting up standards for livestock projects is to determine the low standard from the same source and from the same standard used in the local department.

The standards for dairy which gives the average pounds of butterfat per cow per year were obtained from a number of production data for improvement projects in dairy farming. These standards were used in the year 1950 and 1951. Production standards for poultry egg production were furnished by the poultry professors of Michigan State College.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productive man work units</th>
<th>Income from supervised farming programs</th>
<th>Investment in farming and savings</th>
<th>Improvement projects</th>
<th>Supplementary farm practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Production for Livestock Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Scope and Growth of the Farming Program

Table 2: Levels of Production for Livestock Projects
How about the city boys?

HIRSCHBAUM, C. COLLEGE, Cadet Teacher, Cornell University

The primary value in the steer feeding project is the fact that students are able to purchase and keep a steer. By using their own funds to purchase and feed the steer, students are able to take an active role in the project and develop a sense of responsibility and accountability for their own actions. Through this project, students learn valuable life skills such as budgeting, planning, and decision-making. Additionally, the project provides students with an opportunity to work together and develop teamwork skills. Overall, the steer feeding project is an excellent way for students to become more involved in their community and gain valuable life experiences.
Determining the farm…

JOB EXPERIENCES

by E. S. CLARK, Teacher Education, Purdue University

1. I have never done this job before. I have read about how to do it, or have seen someone demonstrate how to do it, or have been told the facts so as to decide how to do this job.

2. I have actually done this job, but I have described the principles that I used to accomplish the task. I may have talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

3. I have actually done this job, and I have had to follow the principles that I used in previous jobs. I have learned from my experiences and have taken what I have learned to other jobs.

4. I have never done this job before. I have read about how to do it, or have seen someone demonstrate how to do it, or have been told the facts so as to decide how to do this job.

5. I have actually done this job, but I have described the principles that I used to accomplish the task. I may have talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

6. I have actually done this job, and I have had to follow the principles that I used in previous jobs. I have learned from my experiences and have taken what I have learned to other jobs.

The validity of the device was also believed to be adequately assessed by the careful monitoring of the device. The statistical means of the validities obtained were found to be .50 or above. These results indicate that the device was reliable and therefore the validity of the device was adequate.

The validity of the device was also believed to be adequately assessed by the careful monitoring of the device. The statistical means of the validities obtained were found to be .50 or above. These results indicate that the device was reliable and therefore the validity of the device was adequate.

1. I have never done this job before. I have read about how to do it, or have seen someone demonstrate how to do it, or have been told the facts so as to decide how to do this job.

2. I have actually done this job, but I have described the principles that I used to accomplish the task. I may have talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

3. I have actually done this job, and I have had to follow the principles that I used in previous jobs. I have learned from my experiences and have taken what I have learned to other jobs.

4. I have never done this job before. I have read about how to do it, or have seen someone demonstrate how to do it, or have been told the facts so as to decide how to do this job.

5. I have actually done this job, but I have described the principles that I used to accomplish the task. I may have talked about the advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

6. I have actually done this job, and I have had to follow the principles that I used in previous jobs. I have learned from my experiences and have taken what I have learned to other jobs.
who expressed varying attitudes toward working with the selected livestock enterprise.

The data collected by the use of the device, therefore, posed evidences of the ratings' ability to aid in the differentiation to discriminate between groups of students known to differ in ways which were believed to be related to the opportunity for obtaining farm-job experience.

Implications for the Educational Use of the Device

The next question which now con- contains is this: What use can be made of this technique and device in practical teaching settings? The author is the first to acknowledge that the following represent real educational implications for current and for further study:

1. The technique and use of your students' farm-job experience and learning may be used to plan more adequate instructional programs for your students. The device should be an invaluable tool in the construction of the course early in the first year of the students' work. There should be increased student involvement in the development of the course content, and the subject should be available to students as a means of obtaining job-related experience.

2. The standard or criteria developed for farm employment, with the effects of the standard or criteria on the efficiency of the student farmer. This is a technique of selecting a student as a farm worker by the use of a predetermined set of criteria for farm employment. This technique is designed to be used in selecting students for farm employment.

3. The device may be used to compare the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

4. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

5. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

6. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

7. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

8. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

9. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

10. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

11. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

12. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

13. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

14. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

15. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

16. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

17. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

18. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

19. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

20. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

21. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

22. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

23. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

24. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

25. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

26. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

27. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

28. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

29. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.

30. The device may be used to evaluate the performance of students in the same course, to evaluate the performance of the same student in different courses, and to compare the performance of students in different courses.
Can you prove you have taught shop safety?

DWIGHT L. KINNSCH, Teacher Educator, University of Idaho

"M. J. BRUGGE, Tom caught his hand in the power saw. Words that form an adult's vocabulary are the first words a child learns to say. As a result of increasing enrollments in vocational education, shop classes will be a part of the instructional program in many of our schools, the possibility of a serious accident always hangs over every student. The question is, can you prove you have taught shop safety and have your students practice what you have taught them? We can't assume that every student in our shop is safe. There is no guarantee that the student will not be injured.

The teacher is responsible for seeing that every student is safe. He should be aware of the dangers involved in the tools used in the shop. He should know how to use the tools safely. He should know how to teach his students to use the tools safely. He should know how to correct any unsafe conditions that may develop in the shop.
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This score card, also called "Four Points on Chapter Organization," was designed by the national officers of the FFA to be used by the unit officers and the advisor as a method of evaluating the chapter's performance. The score card is divided into four categories: attendance, work on the project, leadership, and organization. Each category is rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest score. The total score is calculated by adding the scores of all four categories. The maximum score is 20. A chapter can earn a perfect score of 20, which would indicate that the chapter is performing at the highest level. A score of 15 or above would be considered excellent. A score of 10 or above is considered good, 6 to 9 is considered fair, and 6 or below is considered poor. The score card is designed to help chapters improve their performance and increase their chances of achieving a high score.
What do studies show?

This contribution is one in a series of twelve planned for the current volume. Each will review and interpret studies in a phase of the program of research that is being conducted. The principal subject of the research and point out applications in a particular phase. The phases will be extended and priorities will be changed with the growth of our knowledge.

1. Instructional methods for
(a) the high school group
(b) the college group
(c) the adult farmer
2. Occupancy status
3. Tests
4. Readiness of (a) students
(b) departments or programs
5. Outcomes of adult education had as yet been measured almost exclusively in terms of changed farm practices.
6. The means thus far available for rating teachers and departments were little, if any, better than none

Hamlin indicated that too much emphasis had been given in some cases to the survey method of collecting data. He warned that this technique is only one of the important element of interpreting the data available.

Deasy (9) urged teachers to broaden their concept of teaching beyond the confines of the classroom. A few of these written test results have

Deasy (9) suggested four problems which need study. He, too, emphasized the need for adoption of a satisfactory production, efficiency, levels; efficiency; levels; and

4. For the adult farmer

3. Occupation status

2. Instructional methods for

1. Instructional methods for

- lack of professional training.
- the need for meaningful follow-up.
- the importance of continuous improvement.
- the necessity of well-defined objectives as a starting point of any evaluation.

Another approach to teacher evaluation was described by Wilson (44) on the results of his study. Wilson, (44) indicated areas in the agricultural education program that need attention. He stated that the conclusions of this study of methods which were expected to be rated as well as those which the teacher could use might well be made possible by the use of a more complete selection of appropriate methods and the personal development of the teacher. The results of the teacher influenced the success of the program.

The conclusion of one of Wilson's studies was that

1. Evaluation of Students

2. Evaluation of Teachers

Evaluation of Teachers

When a teacher is doing a superior job his students are motivated to work and their progress is more rapid. If, on the other hand, the teacher does not have a normal consideration in making the final evaluation of the teacher's work, the teacher may become discouraged and lose interest in his work. This can result in a lower level of student achievement and a lower level of student satisfaction with the teacher. Another approach to teacher evaluation was described by Wilson (44) on the results of his study. Wilson, (44) indicated the following factors that may influence the evaluation of teachers:

- The quality of the teaching experience.
- The physical facilities of the teaching environment.
- The availability of instructional materials.
- The support and encouragement of superiors and colleagues.

The results of the teacher's evaluation should be used as a guide in planning future instruction and in making decisions about teacher assignments.

(Continued on Page 360)
Evaluation of a program of vocational agriculture

D. R. PARKER, Supervisor, Ohio

While a teacher or student researcher may further develop this device for his particular situation in making supervisory reports, the results of our efforts are contained in Exhibit A.

This evaluation sheet is completed (as completely and as properly as possible) by the teacher, the advisor, and the pupil. The section covering a year of the program part of the department file. From year to year progress reports are noted at any point made by the pupil.

Exhibit A

An Evaluation of a Program of Vocational Agriculture

School: __________ Charter: __________ Date: __________

The teacher has a long-term plan and effectively pursue the plan.

3. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

4. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

5. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

6. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

7. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

8. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

9. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

10. The pupil is in charge of the program, and the student is in charge of the program.

Teaching for Agriculture

One of the major aims of our teaching is to make students aware of what is going on in the classroom. The classroom is a learning environment that is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. Statements of approved practice are important. The teacher should be able to assess what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. It is also important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. The school program is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. The school program is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. The school program is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. The school program is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom. The school program is designed to be a step in determining what needs to be done. After determining what needs to be done, the teacher should be able to make a decision about how to do it. It is important for students to be aware of what is going on in the classroom.
Measurement and education

Components of desirable agricultural programs are listed under each of the fourteen headings. In 1987, a group reported that an agricultural education program was effective if it included the components described below.

1. Evaluation of Department or Program

2. Measurement of Student Progress

3. Evaluation of Faculty

4. Evaluation of Facilities

5. Evaluation of Equipment

6. Evaluation of Curricula

7. Evaluation of Budget

8. Evaluation of Administrative Policies

9. Evaluation of Student Services

10. Evaluation of Community Involvement

11. Evaluation of Alumni

12. Evaluation of Industry

13. Evaluation of Government

14. Evaluation of Public Opinion
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Evaluation of pre-service curriculum

in agricultural education at the Ohio State University

RALPH J. WOODIN, Teacher Education, The Ohio State University

A two-year full-time program of student teaching has been provided in the Ohio curriculum for majors in agricultural education since 1955. The preprofessional curriculum provided eight credit hours of required work in the teaching field, which were offered during the sophomore year. In the junior and senior years, one quarter each year was spent in student teaching. Students were assigned to the 25 selected training centers located in various parts of Ohio. During each quarter of student teaching an intensive five-hour course in the problems related to teaching agriculture was conducted by student teachers was presented by staff members of the Agricultural Education Department.

Four types of investigations were used in making the study. They were as follows:

1. A development of a statement of competency for teachers of vocational agriculture. This statement served as a guide for evaluating the preprofessional work of students.
2. A survey of the participation experiences of students enrolled in four groups of students enrolled in four different sections of the course.
3. An evaluation of the competency of individual students in student teaching. This evaluation was made by the supervising teachers, school administrators of training centers, state staff members of the Department of Agricultural Education, and the student teachers themselves.
4. An evaluation of the potential for teaching vocational agriculture through professional participation experiences provided by these students. A check list of 362 representation experiences was developed. Each student was asked to submit this check list at the close of a quarter of student teaching. To evaluate the potential of competency of student teachers, each student teacher evaluated himself and was evaluated by his supervising teacher, school administrator of his school, and by the student on whom he supervised his student teaching. The competency evaluation was determined in terms of the skills of competency and a composite evaluation of each student teacher's competency was determined by averaging the scores of the four evaluations.

An informal evaluation of the curriculum in terms of its basic instructional features together with suggestions for its improvement was also made. This evaluation was focused on graduating seniors and from beginning teachers. A total of 341 respondents participated in the study.

Although the preprofessional experiences secured in this curriculum prior to student teaching were studied, this report will deal particularly with the evaluation of first and second quarter student teachers. The following statements represent a brief summary of the findings of the study.

Two quarters of student teaching for students at the Ohio State University School of Education were seen to have the following results when evaluated in terms of the factors of competency and potential for teaching vocational agriculture.

1. Two quarters of student teaching more than doubled the number of professional participation experiences secured per student up to graduation. Table 1 shows that most of the professional participation experience was secured during student teaching. The table also shows that second quarter student teachers secured more professional participation experiences per quarter than do first quarter student teachers.
2. Two quarters of student teaching results in student teachers beginning their first year of teaching with a higher degree of confidence in their ability to do the job. These data were obtained through compiling the percentage of student teachers who indicated whether or not additional experience was necessary in 10 representative activities of teaching in which they engaged. It should be noted that these student teachers had completed two quarters of student teaching feeling less need for additional experience in each area of the program.

The 100 student teachers in the study made a significant gain in competency in teaching student teaching to a rating of "good" at the close of two quarters. The data which supports this conclusion is shown in Table 2.

4. A great majority of student teachers consider their student teaching to be the most valuable quarter's work which they receive in college. About 50% of the students in the program have been completed by the class serves the purpose of forming the recognition of the student upon the importance aspects of student teacher teaching and in gaining the recognition of student teaching is not a serious one in the judgment of student teachers.

The development of a statement of competency for teachers of vocational agriculture will be discussed in a second article which will appear in a future issue.

Strengthening supervised farming programs (Continued from Page 204)

may be consolidated with others when the list is being revised as points in a scorecard for evaluating farming program. Some features which are of interest in a supervised farming tour for example, the condition of the records, are not a factor in the original selection of a project. For these reasons the points on a scorecard for evaluating farming programs might vary from the criteria used for determining a project. Students using in group discussion in preparing a scorecard in school, it is a task which may be a factor in determining whether a project is worthwhile. While a specific scale of points is intended to be, for each of the factors shown on the scorecard may not be necessary, it is important to help students in considering various farming programs.

Student No. 4, Joe Belden, was the name of a hypothetical agricultural student whose performance records were used as a reference record for the class that designed the scorecard. In assigning a point value to the farming program of this student with whose records were familiar, the students in the class were better enabled to accurately place their own scores on their own farming program.

Two of the farming programs of the students in the class upon the importance aspects of the individual farming programs studied, and thereby making possible maximum use of their data.

PROJECT EVALUATION SPHER

1. Adoption of project to the community.
2. Adoption of project to the farm.
3. Project student have sufficient equipment, facilities and capital to carry through?
4. Project student have sufficient labor and management to carry through?
5. Project have an opportunity to show a profit?
6. Project require too much time and money to carry through?
7. Is it adequate to be done or is it too long?
8. Is it planning complete and accurate?
9. Is it budget based on common sense accurate figure?
10. Are record well kept, properly entered and maintained?

A Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming program</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Farmers of America</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Farmers program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Farmer program</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive program</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General school activities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social relations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farming program</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Farmers of America</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Farmers program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Farmer program</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive program</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General school activities</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social relations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values listed are for each student teacher based on his own evaluation and on the basis of the program.

A Student

| Value of points | 100 | 65 |
| Joe Belden | 80 | 63 |
| Bob Jacobson | 80 | 63 |
| L. Jensen | 72 | 60 |
| Bob Miller | 64 | 57 |
| N. Landon | 60 | 57 |

Note: The values listed are for each student teacher based on his own evaluation and on the basis of the program.
Pictures of the month... 

A contest open to all teachers of Vocational Agriculture and farm veterans.

"DOCKING LAMBS"
Photo by: John F. Kilpatrick, Waupun Vocational School, Waupun, Wisconsin
4 x 5 Speed Graphic Super XX
Lens Opening: F/16; Shutter Speed 1/100.

"IT'S MORE THAN HAY...IT'S GRASS SILAGE"
Photo by: Robert R. Yockey, R & N, 5, Columbia City, Indiana.
School: Center, Indiana.
Camera: Used: Brownie Flash—Flash attachment used.
Camera has a fixed lens and still one shutter speed.

"WARMING UP FOR TRACTOR OPERATORS' CONTEST"
Photo by: Leon D. Hamilton, Delaware, Indiana, Southside High School, Kokomo, Indiana.
Camera: Used: 4 x 5 Super XX

FIRST PLACE:

"DON LITTER"
Photo by: L. E. Newhe, Hayesville High School, Hayesville, Ohio.
Camera: C125
35 mm. Plus X
Shutter Speed: 1/100 second.

"WARMING UP FOR TRACTOR OPERATORS' CONTEST"