November 15, 1966

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by William Brown Long entitled "A History of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee from 1917 to 1955." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Education.

Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Dean of the Graduate School

# A HISTORY OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE FROM 1917 TO 1955

---

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

William Brown Long

December 1966

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This history would not have been possible without the professional interest and cooperation of many persons. The writer desires to acknowledge his indebtedness to all those who assisted in the progress of the study.

Appreciation is expressed to the personnel of the State Department of Vocational Education; to the Vocational Agriculture Teachers of Tennessee, and to other individuals who gave so unselfishly of their time and counsel.

Finally, the author wishes to acknowledge a special obligation to G. E. Freeman, former State Director of Vocational Education in Tennessee, N. E. Fitzgerald, former Head Agricultural Education Department and Dean of the College of Education of The University of Tennessee, and J. W. Brimm, former Assistant Supervisor of Vocational Education, for their help in making this study possible. The author also wishes to acknowledge the expert guidance and counsel provided by Dr. George W. Wiegers, Jr., Head of the Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, who directed the study.



685206

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED | 1 |
| | Need and Purpose of the Study | 1 |
| | Limitations of the Study | 2 |
| | Definition of Terms | 3 |
| | Sources of Data | 7 |
| | General Nature of the Problem and Method of Procedure | 9 |
| II. | EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE PRIOR TO PASSAGE OF THE SMITH-HUGHES ACT | 12 |
| | Historical Review of Agriculture through the Ages | 12 |
| | Secondary Schools offering Education in Agriculture Prior to 1917 | 16 |
| | Events Leading to the Passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 | 17 |
| | Farragut--One of the First Agricultural High Schools in Tennessee | 21 |
| | Early Provisions of Education in Agriculture in Tennessee | 23 |
| | Agriculture of Less than College Grade at The University of Tennessee | 25 |
| | Short Courses in Agriculture | 25 |

CHAPTER PAGE

III. ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE. . . . 27

The State Superintendent of Education. . . . . 27

The State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture . . . . . 31

The State Board for Vocational Education . . . . . 32

Policies and Relationships in the Administration of Vocational Agriculture . . . . . 35

Assistant Supervisors in Vocational Agriculture. . . . . 42

IV. EARLY HISTORY OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FROM 1917 TO 1925. . 48

Early Teachers and Departments of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee . . . . . 48

The Early History of the Negro in Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee . . . . . 61

Growth of the Negro in Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee. . . . . 66

V. THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE . . . . . 71

Development of The University of Tennessee Agricultural Education Department . . . . . 71

The Development of the Practice Teaching Program . . . . . 81

The Development of Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Conferences. . . . . 88

The Itinerant Teacher Training Program . . . . . 96

The Tennessee Vocational Agricultural Teacher Association. . . . . 104

CHAPTER PAGE

V. (CONTINUED)

The Master Teacher Program and the Rating of Vocational Agriculture Departments. . . . . 108

In-Service Training of Vocational Agriculture Teachers . . 113

Qualifications of Vocational Agriculture Teachers. . . . . 120

Vocational Agriculture Teaching Aids . . . . . 129

VI. THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION IN TENNESSEE . . . . . 138

Early Programs of Instruction in Tennessee . . . . . 138

The All Day Program of Vocational Agriculture. . . . . 142

Supervised Farming Programs. . . . . 149

The Adult Evening School Program . . . . . 156

The Development of the Farm Shop Program . . . . . 169

Vocational Agriculture and the C. C. C. Camps. . . . . 179

The Public Relations Program in Vocational Agriculture . . 181

The Institutional-On-The-Farm Training Program . . . . . 187

Education for Rural Family Life. . . . . 195

Junior Project Work. . . . . 199

Day Unit Work. . . . . 202

Part-Time Instructional Program. . . . . 204

The Formation, Development and Changes in the Vocational Agricultural Curriculum Through the Years. . . . . 211

CHAPTER PAGE

VII. COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE . . . . . 220

The Community Cannery and Its Relationship to the Vocational Agriculture Program . . . . . 220

Veterinary Service Work Provided by Vocational Agriculture Teachers . . . . . 223

Community Fairs and Vocational Agriculture . . . . . 227

The Food Production War Training Program . . . . . 232

Other Community Activities in Vocational Agriculture . . . 236

VIII. SUMMARY. . . . . 242

BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . . 244

APPENDIXES. . . . . 253

A. TEACHERS AND DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FROM 1917 TO 1956. . . . . 254

B. OUTLINE FOR PROPOSED TWO-YEAR COURSE FOR PART-TIME CLASSES. . 256

C. A COURSE FOR THE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS OF TENNESSEE FOR THE YEAR 1918 . . . . . 261

D. ACTIVITIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL TEACHERS OF TENNESSEE DURING THE SUMMER. . . . . 263

LIST OF TABLES


TABLE PAGE

I. Teachers, Schools, and Departments Qualifying for Smith-Hughes Funds on July 1, 1919. . . . . 30

II. Negro Vocational Agriculture Departments in Tennessee, 1917-1918. . . . . 63

III. Negro and White Vocational Agriculture Departments by Years, 1917 to 1951 . . . . . 67

IV. Negro Teachers with over Twenty Years Service in Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee . . . . . 68

V. Men in the Department of Agricultural Education, 1919 to 1956, of The University of Tennessee . . . . . 77

VI. Recipents of the Master Teacher Award. . . . . 110

VII. Average Project Yields as Compared to Average State Yields, 1924 . . . . . 145

VIII. Labor Income Per Capita and Per Unit Comparison for White and Negro Students of Vocational Agriculture, 1924 . . . . 146

IX. Part Time Enrollment in Vocational Agricultural From 1922 to 1944. . . . . 209

# CHAPTER I

## THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

### I. NEED AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to explore the events, places, and people involved in the development of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee from its beginning in 1917 to 1955.

There does not seem to be a comprehensive history of the development of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee. Such a study should be made while those connected with its early infancy are living.

Such a document should be compiled so that those interested in vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee could know and understand something of its beginning and growth.

Such a document would be valuable in evaluating the growth, underlying causes and effects, and impact of vocational education in agriculture from its beginning on the people and the agricultural industry in Tennessee.

It was further hoped that this study might preserve some of the historical facts that were available which might otherwise become destroyed or lost.

It should be pointed out that this study will pave the way for future studies and investigations that might be in historical areas of vocational agriculture.

Finally, it was hoped that this study might provide enjoyment, fond memories for those who have participated in its past, and a sense of pride and achievement for those who have contributed to the growth and development of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee.

## II. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

It is not within the means of the writer to accumulate a detailed history of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee. This, then, of necessity will be a brief history.

The activities and accomplishments of the Negro race are many and consist of many things that they should be justly proud, but due to the very extent of their activities they could not be covered in this brief historical account. It was felt that a research person of their number understanding their accomplishments and growth could do a much more creditable job in that area of vocational education in agriculture. An attempt was made to show how the Negro fitted into the history of vocational education in agriculture in its infancy and, in a brief manner, something of its growth in the succeeding years.

No attempt was made to show in detail all the various events, people, and places involved in the history and growth of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee. To go into such a detailed study would have gone far beyond the scope of this brief historical account. However, a more detailed emphasis was placed on these things as they apply to the early years of vocational agriculture's history.

No attempt was made to cover the development of the Future Farmers of America in this work. It was felt that this was adequately related in the work of McBride (46).*

## III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The term "all day students" refers to those students regularly enrolled in vocational agriculture in the high schools of Tennessee.

The term "young farmers" refers to those students who are younger farmers and have recently entered upon the full time business of farming and who do not make up the members of the adult farmers classes or all day classes.

The term "adult farmers" as used here refers to those older farmers who are farming full time and are more firmly established in the business of farming. They are not considered as members of the young farmer group.

"The Future Farmers of America" is a national organization of farm boys studying vocational agriculture in the high schools.

The term "institutional on the farm training" as used in this study refers to those veterans of World War II who studied agriculture under provisions of Acts of Congress as administered by the Veterans Administration. Korean War veterans come under this program also.

---

*Numbers in parentheses refer to numbered references in the bibliography.

The term "teacher trainer" as employed in this study refers to teachers in colleges who train students to be qualified vocational agriculture teachers.

The term "state supervisory staff" refers to those people on a state, local, or district level upon whom the responsibility of promotion, development, maintenance, and improvement of instruction in the field of vocational agriculture rests. Much of their work is concerned with in-service training of vocational agriculture teachers.

The term "vocational agriculture teachers" refers to the teachers in high schools who teach vocational agriculture and act as advisers to the Future Farmers of America.

The term "supervised farming program" refers to a combination of farming activities carried on by a student in vocational agriculture on his own home farm or other farm, under the direction of the instructor, for the purpose of making a beginning in farming.

The term "state board of vocational education" refers to the agency created by a state having major responsibility for the general supervision of vocational education in the state. It is responsible for maintaining certain minimum standards in the expenditure of federal funds allotted to the state for vocational education.

The term "state director of vocational education" refers to an administrator designated within the state to be directly responsible to the executive officer of the state board for vocational education for the administration and operation of the total vocational education program in the state.

The term "state plan" refers to an agreement between a state board for vocational education and the U. S. Office of Education, describing (1) the vocational education program developed by the state to meet its own purposes and conditions and (2) the conditions under which the state will use federal vocational funds (such conditions must conform to the federal acts and the official policies of the U. S. Office of Education before programs may be reimbursed from federal funds). The plan is usually revised every five years.

The term "school farm" refers to a farm which is used to facilitate instruction in vocational agriculture and farmed by students.

The term "project" is an article, activity, investigation, or problem chosen by or assigned to a student who is assisted by the teacher in its planning.

The term "New Farmers of America" refers to the national organization for Negro students in vocational agriculture, similar in purpose and organization to the Future Farmers of America.

The term "job analysis" refers to a detailed listing of duties, operations, and skills necessary to perform a clearly defined, specific job, organized into a logical sequence which may be used for teaching, employment, or classification purposes.

The term "itinerant teacher" refers to an instructor or training specialist employed by a state, county agency, or cooperatively by schools, to travel within an assigned area and give instruction in specialized areas of the curriculum.

The term "in-service training" as used here refers to instruction and supervision for employed vocational agricultural teachers for the purpose of improving their professional abilities.

The term "teacher-training institution" refers to an educational agency responsible for the proper preparation of teachers. Each state board for vocational education designates the agencies within the state which train vocational teachers.

The term "evening school" as used here refers to an organized course of instruction offered to adult farmers on the basis of their needs and desires. These courses are usually taught by the teacher of vocational agriculture.

The term "day-unit classes in agriculture" refers to classes, meeting not less than one day a week, planned to meet the needs of youth desiring agricultural instruction as a foundation for farming enrolled in a school which does not have an all-day program. Classes may be planned on a circuit so that one teacher may serve more than one school.

The term "area vocational school" refers to a school offering specialized training to prospective students in a large geographical territory, usually involving more than one school district, and often operated or sponsored by the state.

The term "agricultural education" as used in this study means a systematic program of instruction for prospective and established farmers, organized for the purpose of improving farm methods and rural

living. Objectives are to develop abilities to: make a beginning and advance in farming, produce farm commodities efficiently, market them advantageously, conserve soil and other resources, manage a farm business, and maintain a favorable environment.

The term "advisory committee" refers to a group of persons, usually outside the educational profession, selected for the purpose of offering advice and counsel to the school regarding the vocational program, with particular attention towards keeping the program practical and attuned to community needs. Members are representatives of the people who are interested in the activities with which the vocational program is concerned.

The term "OSYA" as used in this study refers to the Out-of-School Youth Administration, a federal program, under the supervision locally of the vocational agriculture teacher for the training of out-of-school rural youth in farm mechanics and other shop skills.

"CCC" as used in this study refers to the Civilian Conservation Corps, a federal program initiated during the first administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt for the purpose of providing jobs and training in forestry and conservation skills for economically deprived youth in the economic depression of that period.

## IV. SOURCES OF DATA

The sources of data for this study were secured from the following:

1. Interviews with those men who were directly associated with vocational education in agriculture from its beginning to 1955.

2. Interviews with widows, relatives, and associates of the early workers in vocational education in agriculture.

3. Written materials such as letters, dairies, memoirs, pictures, and other written documents left by early members in the vocational agriculture profession who are no longer living.

4. A study of historical data found in the archives of the State Department of Education and the State Department of Vocational Education at Nashville, Tennessee.

5. A study of historical data found in the department of vocational education in agriculture at The University of Tennessee.

6. Personal observations by the author as recorded when visits and interviews were made over the state.

7. A study of records of former students of vocational agriculture.

8. A study of records of the State FFA Association.

9. A study of old newspapers and periodicals.

10. A study of reports of deliberative bodies such as the Tennessee Association of the Future Farmers of America, Tennessee Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, County Courts, School Boards, and others.

11. A study of reports of school surveys and commission reports.

12. A study of related information in The University of Tennessee Library.

## V. GENERAL NATURE OF THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

It was the intent of the author to present the events and happenings in this history in such a way that the reader may visualize how the program of vocational agriculture has become the structure that we have today.

It was the plan of this history to show some of the significant events that led to the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act and the birth of vocational agriculture. The author further attempted to show the condition of education in agriculture that enabled it to accept the conditions of the Smith-Hughes Act.

A more detailed study was made of the formative years of vocational agriculture up to 1925. Other events were recorded in the order of their appearance on the scene of this narrative.

An attempt has been made throughout the study to show the part each person has contributed to the history of vocational agriculture. In many instances a fine line of distinction has not been possible because much of the history of vocational agriculture has not been the work of one man alone but many persons working together.

One section of this history has dealt with the pioneers in vocational agriculture. It was felt that this was due those people who laid the foundation for the structure of vocational education in agriculture. Some of the early men in the profession have passed on and in their stead the work that they did speaks for them. In a majority of the cases many of the early men in the work are still living and active in

the work. A few of them have retired from teaching but still maintain their interest in vocational education in agriculture. These men without exception gave freely of their time and interest to help to make this history a possibility.

It was the further plan of this study to show the historical entry and significant impact of those now considered major events and developments on vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee.

1. Early workers in vocational agriculture in Tennessee.

2. Early schools offering vocational agriculture.

3. The all-day vocational agriculture program.

4. Adult farmer education and its relation and growth in vocational agriculture.

5. The program of young farmer education in vocational agriculture.

6. The institutional on-the-farm training program and its impact on vocational agriculture in the state.

7. The growth and development of the teacher training program for vocational agriculture teachers in Tennessee.

8. The state supervisory staff and its contribution to the promotion and growth of vocational agriculture.

9. The contributions of the vocational agriculture teacher and the development of the program of instruction.

10. The development of the various areas of community service contributed by vocational agriculture.

11. A brief view of the contributions and growth of the Negro in vocational agriculture, especially in the early years of development.

These events, organizations, and people is the history of vocational education in agriculture in Tennessee. It is hoped that each will be given their just part in this history as they enter upon the scene of this narrative.

# CHAPTER II

## EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE PRIOR TO PASSAGE OF THE SMITH-HUGHES ACT

### I. HISTORICAL REVIEW OF AGRICULTURE THROUGH THE AGES

Vocational agriculture was the result of the thinking of many people down through the years. Agricultural education is not a new thought. Its development can be traced down through the years from the dim unwritten past. It is the belief of the author that to fully understand the development of agricultural education one must review the earlier pangs of its birth. It was the purpose of the author to show this growth toward present day concepts of agricultural education by making a historical review down through the years with the aid of Dadisman's work on this subject (16, p. 15). His work is referred to freely in the succeeding pages.

Agriculture was first carried on by slaves who were given instruction by their masters. The first definite reference given to this subject was in 1015 B. C., when King Solomon had his extensive gardens.

Dadisman mentions that the Chinese Civil Service Examination included agriculture as early as 150 B. C. (16, pp. 15-16). Plato felt that the common people should know more about the soil in order to raise better crops.

From early Christian writings little agriculture was taught but was based largely on religion and superstition. There was a legend

that King Alfred planted school gardens to give boys training in forestry and gardening. This is the probable beginning of agricultural education.

In Europe in 1525, rich noblemen had gardens laid out for instructional purposes. The Jesuits in 1534 argued that learning should have some relation to living things and that material for education should not be drawn from books alone, but from the external world--from the heaven, the trees, and even from the occupations of men. Milton in his day advocated the study of agriculture. Hungary was teaching agriculture in 1630.

One of the first publications in agriculture in London was An Essay for the Advancement of Husbandry Learning, written by Samuel Hartlib in 1651. His idea was to take pupils as apprentices. The Hungary University of Science at Buda established a chair of agriculture and experimental grounds in 1777. A Swiss educator, Fellenberg, took great interest in the peasantry of his country and established a school, the object of which was to train definitely for a trade or occupation.

Dadisman points out the beginning of experimental farms in noting the work of Thaer in Germany. He applied science and sound business principles so that he attracted many observers to his own farm (16, pp. 18-19). Pestalozzi opened a school in Switzerland for instruction combined with labor in the fields.

In the year 1846, John Stimson of Niagara Falls published the first agricultural reader for the use of schools in Canada. Ryerson

published First Lessons in Agriculture in 1870.

The first account of agricultural instruction in the United States was in 1671 when William Smith designed a model school for colleges. Benjamin Franklin was one of the early advocators of agricultural education. He felt that youth should have training in the professions.

John D. Lahows founded one of the first purely agricultural schools in 1797 at Letham, South Carolina. He left an endowment to help teach agriculture to the poor boys and girls of the district.

One of the best examples of early agricultural education in the United States was in New Harmony, Indiana in 1824. It was here that William McClure had the methods of Pestalozzi's teaching put into practice.

Dadisman continues his account by pointing out that the first textbook in agriculture in the United States for use in the schools was the Agriculture Reader by Daniel Evans, published in 1824 (16, pp. 19-20).

Many sporadic attempts to get agriculture established in the schools failed, according to Dadisman (16, pp. 21-22). A farm school at Boston was one of the first to succeed. Instruction was given in agriculture for thirty-seven years beginning in 1883. From these early attempts at introducing agriculture there arose the academies. The Michigan State Agricultural College was founded in 1857. The Maryland Agricultural College began instruction in 1859. The Kansas Agricultural

College likewise had its origin as one of the agricultural schools of this era. All these early attempts at instruction opened the way to the establishment of agricultural instruction in the United States. They formed the basis for Federal aid in the form of the Federal land grant colleges.

Many of the first courses in agricultural education were a nature study type of instruction, according to Dadisman (16, pp. 27-30). Four year courses in agriculture were outlined by men in Texas, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa and others. There was much variation in their content, however, and a need was noted for some method of uniformity. During this period of reconstruction following the Civil War there was much unrest from the courses offered. Educators believed that there was a need for a course in the "bread and butter" type of learning. This was an attempt to get away from the stiff unrelated lectures, expensive apparatus, and useless presentation of material that did not fit one for a life's work.

Dadisman felt that the origin of the school farms in this period started agricultural instruction toward the point of becoming vocational as the students got first hand experience in agriculture by working on these farms as a part of their work (16, pp. 31-34). Many of the schools in 1917 and before had such farms which were used as part of the daily instruction. The examples of these vocational courses paved the way for Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia proposing the Smith-Hughes bill which has done so much to unify this work.

# II. SECONDARY SCHOOLS OFFERING EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE PRIOR TO 1917

Alfred Charles True, in his history of agricultural education in the United States, reviewed the agricultural secondary school's contributions to the development of vocational education in agriculture.

Secondary schools on a private foundation early began to introduce the teaching of agriculture. One of the schools that did this was the National Farm School at Doylestown, Pennsylvania, established in 1896, which was set up to train city boys. This school was successful, and in 1901 the state gave it an appropriation of $2,500. This was an annual grant for two years, and later this amount was increased. The school had 122 acres, a main building, barn, greenhouses, and livestock. Other subjects were taught, and the boys did much of the work on the farm. This was only one of the many agricultural schools that came into being along about the turn of the century. Other schools were set up by authority of the last will and testament of friends of agriculture. Such a school was the Smith's Agricultural School and Northampton School of Technology at Northampton, Massachusetts. Provisions for the school were made in the will of Oliver Smith in 1844 (91, p. 354).

True goes on to say that other schools such as the Lyndonville school in Vermont were opened by donations by Theodore N. Vail, President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in 1910 (91, pp. 354-355).

Such schools sprang up all over the country, and in 1908 the Office of Experiment Stations reported that there were sixteen private colleges and schools teaching agriculture. The introduction of this subject into private schools proceeded rapidly. In 1915-16 the Bureau of Education reported that some instruction in agriculture was given in 149 private secondary schools in thirty-seven states.

These desires and needs expressed in this way by the people of the country set the stage for the birth of the Smith-Hughes Act of February 23, 1917.

## III. EVENTS LEADING TO THE PASSAGE OF THE SMITH-HUGHES ACT OF 1917

At this point the reader will note the various events that have paved the way for the Congress of the United States to provide such legislation that would meet the burning desire on the part of the people of the United States for an organized program of vocational education in agriculture. None of the state programs had the financial means to provide the type of program that was indicated. Even though they had done much to pave the way, their programs differed, and there seemed to be no organized effort on the part of the nation as a whole to provide education in vocational agriculture to those who needed and wanted it. It will be noted that the Extension Service under the Smith-Lever Act was functioning, but its program due to its nature was not a vocational program.

Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia was quick to note this and proceeded to encourage legislation toward a system in vocational education in agriculture.

True, in his history, traces this movement through its preliminary stages to the final culmination resulting in the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (91, pp. 355-356). These activities are recorded here that the reader might understand the problems involved in each state, including Tennessee, in the acceptance of the provisions of the Act.

In the beginning, True tells us, there were some in the Congress who sought to include with the Smith-Lever Act, which provided appropriations for the Extension bill, recommendations which would include the vocational education appropriations. Debate ran so high and it was decided to set up a commission on national aid to vocational education to make a study and report to Congress on their findings with recommendations (91, pp. 356-357).

Its members, appointed by the President (then President Woodrow Wilson), were Hoke Smith, of Georgia, and Carroll S. Page, of Vermont, from the Senate; D. M. Hughes, of Georgia, and S. D. Fess, of Ohio, from the House of Representatives; John A. Lapp, director of the Indiana Bureau of Legislative Information, who had been secretary of the Indiana Commission on Industrial and Agricultural Education; Agnes Nestor, President of the International Glove Workers Union and member of the committee on industrial education of the American Federation of Labor; Charles A. Prosser, secretary of the National Society for the

Promotion of Industrial Education; and Charles H. Winslow, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, who had been a member of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education. It will be observed that the Commission had no members from organizations especially interested in agriculture education. Senator Smith was elected chairman and Ernest A. Wreidt, director of the Public Education Association of New York City, was made secretary.

True further states that the commission studied the extent of the need of vocational education in the United States, the need of national grants for such education, what kinds or forms of vocational education should be stimulated by national grants for such education, how far the Federal Government could aid through expert knowledge and to what extent Federal grants should be made and under what conditions (91, pp. 365-366).

The general thinking of the commission was that there was a great need for national grants for vocational education, leaving the states free to determine the character and extent of the use of such funds, but requiring them to devote at least an equal amount to the same general purpose. Federal departments could be helpful in furnishing information and advice.

After much diligent investigation, True states, the commission concluded that there was an urgent demand for aid that would prepare workers for the more common occupations in every part of the United States having for their purpose to conserve and develop our resources;

promote a more productive and prosperous agriculture; prevent waste of labor; supplement apprenticeship; increase wage earning power; meet the demand for trained workmen; and offset the increased cost of living.

A bill was then drafted on this general basis and the recommendations of the commission, as embodied in this bill, summarized as follows, according to True:

1. That national grants be given to the states for stimulating vocational education in agriculture, trade and industrial, and home economics subjects.
2. That grants be given in two forms:
   a. for the training of teachers of agricultural, trade and industrial, and home economics subjects,
   b. for the paying of part of the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects and teachers of trade and industrial subjects.
3. That appropriations be made to a Federal board for making studies and investigations which shall be of use in vocational schools (91, pp. 367-368).

It can be seen by the reader that the Federal Government was to set up conditions to safeguard the proper expenditure of the money, and the state was to provide for the custody of the money and disbursement of the grants.

True's history continues by noting that as a result of the commission's recommendations, a bill was introduced in the Senate by

Senator Hoke Smith, December 7, 1915, and the House of Representatives by D. M. Hughes, December 19, 1915 (91, p. 369). The bill passed the Senate unanimously, July 31, 1916. There was some disagreement in the House and after some lengthy discussion and some amendments the bill was approved.

True points out that the friends of home economics education were not satisfied with the provisions for that subject in the commission's bill, which were confined to the preparation of teachers. They therefore secured the addition of home economics to those sections of the bill which dealt with the payment of the salaries of teachers in service, though not more than 20 per cent of the annual appropriation could be spent for the teaching of that subject.

The bill passed the House January 9, 1917 and was sent to conference. The agreement reached by the conferees was adopted by both Houses, and the bill became a law through its approval by President Wilson February 23, 1917.

## IV. FARRAGUT--ONE OF THE FIRST AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOLS IN TENNESSEE

Farragut High School in Knox County, Tennessee, was a good example of the type of agricultural high schools that existed in Tennessee before the birth of vocational education in agriculture and the coming of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. The school and its activities was described in 1914 in an issue of The Ohio Farmer (50, p. 17).

Courses that were introduced early in the life of the school were agriculture, manual training, home economics, and a school farm laboratory. In 1914 there were two years of agriculture that was offered three times per week for both boys and girls. The agriculture courses were based on Hatch's High School Agriculture for first year students which outlined the whole course. The second year course was based on Warren's Elements of Agriculture, giving special attention to laboratory work. The work consisted of laboratory and field demonstrations, and was supplemented by lectures on soils, farm crops, rotations and fertilizers, plant improvement, animals and poultry, seed selection, fruit growing, insect pests, and fungus diseases.

A description of the farm mentioned twelve acres of land owned by the school and eight acres that was rented.

Phillips described some of the activities carried on in the school as part of its instruction and social activities. Demonstrations were carried out on the farm with lime and fertilizer plots. Such farm practices as rotations, subsoiling, winter cover crops and green manure crops, and fertilization and liming of crops were used. Animals for the farm consisted of a Percheron brood mare, three of her colts, brood sows, and purebred Plymouth Rock chickens. Farming tools were owned by the school, and feed was grown for livestock. The janitor cared for the stock and did farm work supervised by the principal. Phillips emphasized that school was not confined to all day students but was a community school dedicated to meeting needs of the people (50, p. 23).

Some of the activities instigated by the school were community activities including improvement work, boy's corn club, girl's canning club, farmer's institutes and "moonlight socials." These "moonlight socials" were conducted on the last Friday before the full moon. People came from all over the community by horse and buggy to enjoy the music, singing, plays and skits, and speeches made at the meeting. On Commencement Day former graduates returned, commencement exercises were held at 10:00 o'clock, and a basket dinner was served at noon. In the afternoon the farm plots were examined and after this they adjourned for a social hour. There was a baseball game in the evening, and then supper was served. Immediately after supper the group enjoyed a two-hour drama.

This short summary of the activities of Farragut school shows the type of school and agricultural instruction that existed in the years just prior to the advent of the vocational agriculture schools which were to come into being in 1917.

## V. EARLY PROVISIONS OF EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

Stimson and Lathrop in their history point out some of the early attempts in Tennessee to provide education in agriculture. In 1784, twelve years before Tennessee was admitted into the Federal Union, the settlers of the territory south of the Ohio River formed a Union and called it the State of Frankland, which later became the State of

Franklin. These early settlers were thinking of education when they wrote the constitution of the State of Franklin, because they provided in this document the following:

> That a school or schools shall be established by the legislature for the convenient instruction of youth, with such salaries to the masters, paid by the public, as may enable them to instruct at low prices; and all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities (55, p. 429).

Before Tennessee became a state, the people of the State of Franklin, in 1785, chartered the first institution of learning and called it Martin's Academy which was later named Washington College.

Stimson and Lathrop mention the Burkholder and Dozier private schools at Lynnville, in 1911, which employed Dudley M. Clements to teach agriculture with the hope that this new course would attract sons of good farmers in that fertile section of Tennessee (55, p. 430). At about this same time there were three other schools that instituted agriculture instruction in their high school. These were the E. W. Grove School at Paris, Tennessee, Davidson County Central High School in Davidson County with C. F. Alden as teacher, and Farragut High School in Knox County with Adams Phillips as agriculture teacher.

In 1915, there was established by the state legislature an institution known as the State Polytechnic School, at Cookeville. The original purpose of this school was to teach agriculture and the mechanical trades. It later became a teacher-training institution.

## VI. AGRICULTURE OF LESS THAN COLLEGE GRADE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

In its early days The University of Tennessee had a preparatory department because facilities in public and other schools for instruction in college-preparatory subjects were meager, according to Stimson and Lathrop (55, pp. 432-433). "Lessons in agriculture" were included in the curriculum for the first year in the scientific course and "lectures in agriculture" in the curricula for the Latin-science and classical courses. From 1885 to 1886, the preparatory work was reduced to one year, and the agricultural aspect taught under the heading "elements of agriculture," was omitted from the curriculum. Some of the agriculture teachers who began the work in 1917 told the writer of these courses and declared that they were the only education courses of any type that they were able to get in those days. They stated that Dr. H. A. Morgan and Adams Phillips taught these courses (45).

## VII. SHORT COURSES IN AGRICULTURE

Prior to the establishment of the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee, a few short courses in agriculture were offered. The first short course was offered in 1897 by R. L. Watts, instructor in horticulture, assisted by S. M. Bain, C. E. Chambliss, and C. A. Mooers, according to Stimson and Lathrop (55, pp. 432-433). In 1900, a twelve-week course was offered to farmers, dairymen, stock men, and fruit growers. A comprehensive list of subjects was announced.

The highest enrollment was 118 in 1912. Until 1924 a similar course was offered; after 1924 short courses in special subjects were given, such as dairying, tobacco, agriculture for ministers, poultry, agriculture for CCC advisers, gardening and livestock feeding. These short courses are called to the attention of the reader to show the gradual development of a need for agricultural education for professional teachers. This need was finally realized, and eventually the Smith-Hughes Act made it possible to organize the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee.

# CHAPTER III

## ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

### I. THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

With the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, February 23, 1917, Tennessee immediately made plans to set up a program of vocational agriculture. The General Assembly of the state legislature was then in session and the opportunity given to immediately accept the Act for the state so that participation was assured for that year for those departments that could qualify in the schools of the state.

The state plan for the administration of the Smith-Hughes Act in Tennessee for the year ending June 30, 1919, pointed out the plans for the administration of the act for the first year of its existence in Tennessee (88, pp. 1-6). The Tennessee State Board of Education, which was the Board for Vocational Education for the state, named the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, S. W. Sherrill, as executive officer of the State Board for Vocational Education, and Albert Williams, State Director of Vocational Education (41, p. 6). He thus became the first person to serve in this capacity. This duty was temporary until later in the year, at which time a permanent supervisor was appointed. The Board also provided for the direction of vocational education by increasing the office force of the Director, who was State High School Inspector, and instructed him to devote one-half of his time to the supervision of vocational education. He was

to receive $1,000 in addition to his salary as High School Inspector. His traveling expenses were to be paid exclusively from the state funds.

The Board further provided for the supervision of agricultural education by requiring that Harry Ogden, the Head of the Agricultural Department at the Middle Tennessee State Normal School, now Middle Tennessee State University, as a State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture (88, p. 1). His duties required him to spend his entire time inspecting and training vocational agriculture teachers then engaged in the teaching of vocational agriculture. Part of his duties required him to inspect and take inventory of the facilities and qualifications of the departments that were seeking to become qualified under the new law. Penciled diaries in the Department of Agricultural Education and letters to various people in the profession showed the various teachers and departments that were in operation at that time. Mr. Ogden's job was a difficult one since no previous experience or policies had been developed in this new field of education. All of the counties were eager to participate in the program since it meant sharing in the federal funds available. Many were eager to rush into the program with little thought as to the demands that might be made on them as part of the responsibility of the program. Officials in the counties had not been briefed on regulations governing the funds and requirements of teachers for vocational agriculture, and as a result many misunderstandings arose. Early supervisors of the program, such as Mr. Ogden,

had the difficult job of deciding who met the qualifications and who did not. Some were paid the full amount of funds allowed under the Smith-Hughes Act and others a fractional amount. Table I, page 30, shows the white schools, teachers, and amounts paid.

The reader will realize the difficult task imposed upon early workers in trying to ascertain the eligibility of schools to participate. In many cases no policy existed to guide the supervisor, and at the same time he had to grope for information himself on the new program.

The Supervisor of Agricultural Education had his headquarters in the office of the State Director of Vocational Education and worked under his direction. Half of his traveling expense was paid from the Smith-Hughes funds. Much of Mr. Ogden's time was spent in the field working with the vocational agriculture teachers and determining if they would qualify to receive the federal funds allowed for the program.

Later on, in the year of 1919, Robert Lowery, a soils expert, and N. E. Fitzgerald, of The University of Tennessee, aided in this supervision in an attempt to qualify and supervise as many teachers of agriculture as could meet the standards of qualification (19).

N. E. Fitzgerald, who had just joined the staff of The University of Tennessee, was loaned April 1, 1919 to the State Board of Vocational Education to act as State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture for three months. At the end of this time, July 1, 1919, he recommended D. M. Clements, then teaching at Grove High School at Paris, Tennessee,

TABLE I

TEACHERS, SCHOOLS, AND DEPARTMENTS QUALIFYING FOR SMITH-HUGHES FUNDS
ON JULY 1, 1919

| School | Teacher | Time Given To Vocational Agriculture | Total Salary | Recommended Federal Aid | Total Months Taught |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bradley County | J. T. Lovell | ½ time | $1,500 | $ 375.00 | 12 |
| Farragut | Adams Phillips | Full | 2,000 | 1,000.00 | 12 |
| Soddy | E. E. Shouse | 3/4 | 1,500 | 281.25 | 6 |
| Davidson County | C. F. Alden | Full | 2,500 | 1,250.00 | 12 |
| McLemoresville | G. E. Freeman | 3/8 | 1,200 | 225.00 | 12 |
| Grove | D. M. Clements | Full | 2,304 | 1,152.00 | 12 |
| Columbia | T. C. McCormick | Full | 1,500 | 750.00 | 12 |
| Fayette | E. S. Routon | 28/35 | 1,200 | 320.00 | 8 |
| Tyner | J. D. Cliett | 3/4 | 1,500 | 562.50 | 12 |
| Huntingon | C. H. Moody | Full | 1,800 | 450.00 | 6 |
| Millington | E. K. Schultz | Full | 1,200 | 600.00 | 8 |
| Murfreesboro | R. E. Bruner | 1/2 | 1,615 | 336.46 | 10 |

as the permanent State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture (19). This recommendation was acted on and Mr. Clements became the first official permanent State Supervisor and remained so for seventeen years thereafter.

## II. THE STATE SUPERVISOR OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Qualifications of supervisors and directors as outlined by the state plan required that these men should be graduates of a standard four-year agricultural course of college grade and that each should have in addition at least three years of successful teaching experience in agriculture or in supervising that type of work. At the time of Mr. D. M. Clements' appointment to the position of Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, Mr. Albert Williams set a precedent by appointing a person who had taught agriculture as State Supervisor. He felt that such experience was necessary in the proper administering of the duties of the supervisor. It was also made clear in the state plan that the supervisor must be a man who would command the respect of the farmers of the community, not only because of his experience in farming and his training in the science of agriculture, but also because he possessed qualities of leadership.

The state plan outlined the duties of the State Supervisor (88, pp. 1-6). He was required to inspect the schools and classes receiving Federal aid for agriculture at least quarterly and submit in writing a statement to the Director indicating the amount each school and class

was entitled to receive from state and Federal funds for that quarter. In addition, the Supervisor was to devote a portion of this time to the establishment of new schools and classes. He was to work in co-operation with the teacher training institutions in the preparation of bulletins and other special literature which would be of service to agricultural teachers. Although the plan did not so state, the Supervisor was a promotional agent for establishing and enlightening the public as to the value of vocational agriculture. In the early years much of the supervisor's time was spent at this task. As the years went by the program became larger and more complex, resulting in the State Supervisor adding help in the form of other District Supervisors of vocational agriculture whose duties were somewhat the same in nature. The demands of the program have added many other duties to the job of State Supervisor, which will be treated in other areas of this work. Some of the activities are included in this portion of the history as well.

## III. THE STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

With the signing of the Smith-Hughes Act, February 23, 1917, Tennessee started at once to set up a program of vocational agriculture. The Tennessee State Board of Education was made the State Board for Vocational Education as well.

The Federal Board for Vocational Education stipulated that those states sharing in the Smith-Hughes funds must set up a State Board to administer the vocational program in each individual state, which was

to be directly responsible to it in all matters concerning the program in that state.

The first state plan for the year ending June 30th, 1919, outlined plans in Tennessee for administration and supervision of vocational agriculture. The Board named the State Superintendent of Public Instruction S. W. Sherrill, as Executive Officer of the State Board and Albert Williams State Director of Vocational Education.

The First Annual Statistical Report showed the personnel of the first State Board (87, p. 2). Governor A. H. Roberts was then Governor of Tennessee, P. L. Harned, State Commission of Education and Chairman of the Board, Albert Williams, State Director of Vocational Education and Secretary to the Board. Other members of the Board were L. A. Legion, a lawyer; J. F. Fowlkes, a farmer; F. R. Ogilvie, Editor and County Superintendent of Schools; W. L. Gentry, a college president; W. D. Cooper, a druggist; C. B. Ijams, City Superintendent of Schools; T. W. Peace, a lawyer; and J. S. Ziegler, a principal of a county high school. These first members of the Board were given the difficult job of formulating policies and practices that were to shape the course of vocational agriculture in Tennessee (88, pp. 1-6).

The services of the early board members was one of public service without pay. The annual report showed that each member received five dollars per diem and expenses. Meetings were held after the State Board for Education had met.

The Board provided that not less than one-fifth of the Federal funds from Smith-Hughes be expended for the promotion of vocational

education among negroes (88, pp. 1-6).

The teacher-training work in agricultural, trades and industries, and home economics education was to be under the supervision and control of the State Board, according to a ruling by the Board. Funds were to be provided to maintain such facilities as needed to train and prepare teachers, supervisors, and directors for vocational education.

The Board set up requirements and qualifications for vocational education supervisors, directors, and teachers in the first plan (88, pp. 1-6). It also recognized the essential part of vocational agriculture instruction that was entitled to receive aid from Smith-Hughes for the six-months supervised practice work in agriculture.

It was of interest to note that the state plan of the Board requested the Federal Board to allow them to use so-called "emergency agricultural teachers" who had the following qualifications: a college education or the equivalent, successful teaching experience, two years of science of college grade, at least two years of farming experience, and at least a two-months short course in technical agriculture preparatory to giving one year's work in vocational agriculture (88, pp. 1-6). This indicated that no qualified vocational agriculture teachers then existed in the state due to the fact that no such training prior to the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act was offered by any of the then existing training institutions.

This, then, was the Board's early endeavors to put the new infant, vocational agriculture, on the road to becoming an efficient educational device.

# IV. POLICIES AND RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Much of the credit for the pleasant relationships existing between vocational agriculture and other agencies as well as the general public must go to the early leaders in the field of vocational education in Tennessee. Their intelligent leadership and foresight has molded a strong bond of friendship between vocational agriculture and the other public service agencies that commands the respect of all those elements across the state and nation. Such men as D. M. Clements, N. E. Fitzgerald, and G. E. Freeman have done much to place the field of vocational agriculture in the proper perspective in the eyes of the public down through the years.

It would not be possible to give a complete picture of this phase of the development of vocational agriculture in this study. This must be left to historical accounts to come later. Some events, people and places will be mentioned here merely as examples of the work done through the years. The writer wishes to emphasize that no attempt was made to go in detail on the subject.

All matters concerning policies or administration on a state level were channeled through the office of the State Director of Vocational Education. His duties required him to meet with the State Board of Education to represent the Division of Vocational Education in all matters pertaining to policies in that field of education. The state plan was the guide and instrument through which policies were stated.

From the early years up to 1955 the State Director of Vocational Education and the State Director of Vocational Agriculture were one and the same. The duties of the two became too many and complex for efficient administering, so that in 1955 a separate Director of Vocational Agriculture was appointed with John Carney, a former head of the institutional on-the-farm training program and former vocational agriculture teacher, becoming the first person to fill this position (35). The State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture was responsible and worked closely with the State Director of Vocational Education in the formulation of all policies relating to vocational agriculture.

The Agricultural Extension Service and vocational agriculture participate in similar work and services. Both have much in common as related to teaching of farmers and farm youth. It was only natural that while many activities would overlap in the work of both organizations, the teaching of agriculture was the objective of both agencies. It was also natural that situations would arise that created overlapping of activities and the consequent duplication of Federal funds, which was not permissible under existing Federal laws. These situations required close cooperation and understanding by the heads of the two agencies.

One of the early situations which arose under the leadership of the Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, D. M. Clements, and the Director of the Extension Service, C. E. Brehm, concerned the youth organizations, the 4-H Club and the Future Farmers of Tennessee, later to be known as the Future Farmers of America. Some disturbance arose

among the two services as to membership by boys in both organizations. The two Directors, wishing to clarify this situation, issued a joint memorandum in 1929 to home agents, county agents, and vocational agricultural teachers in regard to high school youth, grade school youth, adult farmers and young farmers (85).

The Extension Service recognized the duties of teaching demanded by the State Department of Vocational Education and agreed that both agencies would work with older youth but no organization would extend outside the limits of the community served by the vocational department. This was interpreted to mean that the vocational teachers could conduct several part-time classes with older youth, and that they are usually held in outlying communities, but in the normal service area of the teacher.

In regard to the membership of youth in the 4-H Club and the FFT, the agreement stated that day-unit and part-time students were both eligible for membership in the FFT and chapters could organize around any of these classes. However, membership in the FFT was restricted exclusively to those who were enrollees in day-unit or part-time classes.

Both agencies pointed out that the educational job with youth was a bigger field of educational activity than either could completely fill. The Extension Service recognized that systematic instruction could be offered to a greater advantage by the vocational departments in the high schools and encouraged youth to enroll in these courses. In light of the above, they felt that the Extension Service should not

solicit students for 4-H Club membership if they were enrolled in FFT. The Extension Service Director felt that elementary students should be members of the 4-H Club and upon entering high school they should enroll in the FFT. It was felt, however, that a student insisting on membership in both organizations should not be denied the right to belong to both. It was further agreed that local classes could be formed for out-of-school older youth, but no organizations would be formed for them by the Division of Vocational Education.

Groups of youth could be organized on a county wide basis by the Extension Service in areas where vocational education was not available through established vocational agriculture departments. It was felt by both services that they could serve the youth of the area without duplication of work by either agency.

A few minor violations of this agreement have been committed by both agencies through the years, and misunderstandings arose which were mostly local in nature. Many of the misunderstandings were clashes in personalities rather than state wide in nature. New memorandums of agreement have been issued through the years, but basically they contained the same elements as discussed above. It should be pointed out that investigation shows much good-natured rivalry has existed between the two youth organizations, and this is a normal, healthy situation. Relationships between the Extension Service and vocational agriculture were on a high level of cooperation, with close cooperation and aid being given on both a state and local level in a reciprocal manner by each service.

Down through the years the vocational agriculture teacher has been conscious of the importance of good relationships between himself and the principal of the high school. Unfortunately, these relationships have not always been the best for a number of reasons. In the earlier years it was often the case to find the vocational agriculture teacher with a larger salary than the principal and he was hired on a twelve months basis. He enjoyed the trust and respect of the local citizens by virtue of having the opportunity of working closely with them and often having them as members of evening schools. In many instances the vocational agriculture teacher was better trained due to requirements for qualification as a vocational teacher and the field courses offered through in-service training. The schedule of the agriculture teacher many times called for him to be away from school when other teachers must stay on the campus. In many instances, due to the fact that the vocational teacher did not realize the value of good relationships with the principal and faculty, he neglected to inform them of his activities. Many times it was assumed that he was away working on personal business. These things contributed to misunderstandings that were not for the best working relationships. D. M. Clements, State Director of Vocational Education, first recognized this and the Descriptive Report of June 30, 1937 stated that the most far reaching piece of work done during the year was acquainting the Superintendent and Principal with the program as each teacher presented them with his annual plan of work (72). More and more attention was given

in the succeeding years to better understandings and relationships with these administrators.

In the years of teaching agriculture before the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act the agriculture teacher was sometimes hired by consent of the County Courts very much as the county agent. R. E. Bruner, an agriculture teacher in Giles County in this period, related an incident concerning the agriculture teacher and the County Court (10). A court member stated that agriculture teachers were hired to teach boys more efficient crop and livestock practices but there was a surplus of those products and poor prices at that time, so the teacher was not needed and he recommended that they be discharged, whereupon all agriculture teachers in the county were fired. Vocational agriculture teachers, although they are not hired by the County Courts, realized the importance of keeping the Court members aware of their activities since they represent the people in financial matters affecting the vocational agriculture departments in the various counties.

D. M. Clements, as State Director of Vocational Education, spent much time in the early years visiting counties over the state in order to familiarize county officials, school boards, county courts and others with the function of vocational agriculture departments, and by this personal contact caused the work to spread rapidly in the early years. This policy has continued over the years, but the Director became laden with other activities to the extent he found it impossible to make personal contacts but delegated this responsibility to assistant supervisors.

The Annual Report of the State Supervisor in 1926 pointed out the awareness of the early administrators of the importance of public relations (63). At that time D. M. Clements was State Supervisor of vocational agriculture and G. E. Freeman was his assistant. The 1926 report states that promotional work and public relationships was given most attention during the year. Bankers, railroad officials, newspaper reporters, farm journals, Extension Service, and others were advised of the main purposes of vocational agriculture in taking the boy with an agricultural background and through organized instruction assist him to become established in farming. FFA foundations, pig and bull chains, scholarships and so on, were the offspring of these early public relation attempts.

The radio, press, farm magazines and television continued the task of informing the public of vocational agriculture's role in training youth. "Noontime Neighbors" under the direction of John MacDonald, a former vocational agriculture teacher, carried a weekly broadcast featuring vocational agriculture activities. J. D. Cliett, vocational agriculture teacher at Tyner High School near Chattanooga, was credited with forming the first radio program publicizing vocational agriculture in January of 1937 (15). It featured activities of vocational agriculture students and was rotated with other departments in the surrounding area.

Many other activities such as an official proclamation during FFA week by the Governor of the state helped to promote and enlighten the public concerning the worth of vocational education in agriculture.

## V. ASSISTANT SUPERVISORS IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

In the early years of vocational agriculture in the state, the Supervisor spent much time traveling and in personal supervision of teachers on the job. D. M. Clements as first State Supervisor did much of this type work (60). As the program became larger and the administrative job became more complex the Supervisor found that he was unable to be away from office duties at the state office and this required the addition of Assistant Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture.

The part played by early Supervisors has been mentioned in other areas of this work but for clarity an attempt will be made to trace each Supervisor and the date of entry on the job. This information was supplied by Former Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, J. W. Brimm (7).

Assistant Supervisors were known by various names and titles such as Helping Teachers, County Supervisors, Assistant State Supervisors, District Supervisors and so on. While all of these men were assistant supervisors, the job varied slightly in many cases.

After the acceptance of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1919, S. W. Sherrill, Executive Director of Vocational Education, was appointed to get the program underway. He in turn appointed Albert Williams, then State High School Inspector, as State Director of Vocational Education. Williams then sought the aid of Harry Ogden, Head of Middle Tennessee State Normal School at Murfreesboro, and appointed him

Agricultural Education Supervisor with offices in the office of Williams. Ogden's job was to visit schools and teachers of agriculture to see if they met the qualifications of the State Board for Federal aid under the Smith-Hughes Act. Robert Lowery, soils expert at The University of Tennessee, was employed to do the same type of work and assist Ogden in East Tennessee.

In April of 1919 the State Board for Vocational Education obtained aid from The University of Tennessee by borrowing N. E. Fitzgerald for a period of three months to act as State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Williams released from temporary duty in this position returned to his work as State High School Inspector. Fitzgerald visited all the departments of vocational agriculture and made a report to the State Board as to their condition as fit departments for the instruction in vocational agriculture (19).

At the end of the three months loan period, Fitzgerald recommended D. M. Clements, vocational agriculture teacher in Grove High School at Paris, Tennessee, as Director of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee. This recommendation was acted upon and Clements became the first permanent Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee located in Nashville.

After a few years the job of State Supervisor became too complex for efficient operation by one person and this led to the appointment of G. E. Freeman, vocational agriculture teacher at Grove High School, as Assistant State Supervisor February 1, 1926. His duties revolved

largely around individual visits to schools to help teachers with problems encountered on the job.

Freeman served as Assistant State Supervisor until July of 1933 at which time the state was divided into three grand divisions with a District Supervisor in each division. Freeman became District Supervisor in East Tennessee with an office in Knoxville. G. E. Thaxton, vocational agriculture teacher at Gainesboro, was appointed Middle Tennessee Supervisor and Frate Bull, the West Tennessee Supervisor.

Frate Bull resigned November 23, 1935 and J. W. Brimm, vocational teacher at Farragut High School became West Tennessee Supervisor. In the spring of 1936, D. M. Clements was appointed Federal Agent for the Southern Region to succeed R. D. Maltby who had died. G. E. Freeman became State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. L. A. Carpenter, vocational agriculture teacher at Madisonville succeeded Freeman as District Supervisor in East Tennessee and remains in that position until the present. Carpenter is the oldest District Supervisor in years of service in the state.

J. W. Brimm resigned as District Supervisor of West Tennessee May 15, 1944 to become Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. He was succeeded by Ben Douglas, vocational agriculture teacher at Lexington. Brimm remained Assistant State Supervisor until he later resigned to become a Community Development Specialist with The University of Tennessee Extension Service.

Ben Douglas, District Supervisor in West Tennessee, resigned to go into private business and was succeeded by H. C. Colvett who

remained District Supervisor until his appointment as State Director of Vocational Education to succeed G. E. Freman who became Director of Area Vocational Schools.

G. B. Thaxton, Middle Tennessee District Supervisor, resigned in 1949 and was succeeded by H. N. Parks. Parks went to Middle Tennessee State College for one year in 1945 but returned as Middle Tennessee District Supervisor and served until his death January 15, 1952. Parks also served as Supervisor of the State Office of Food Production War Training from 1941 to 1944.

T. J. Hendrickson, vocational agriculture teacher, was appointed Middle Tennessee District Supervisor in 1948, to aid H. N. Parks and after Parks' death remained in that position.

In 1940 S. L. Sparkes, vocational agriculture teacher, became an OSYA Supervisor and in 1945 at the conclusion of the program became District Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Middle Tennessee until 1951. In 1951 he became Assistant State Supervisor. Sparkes also served as State FFA Executive Secretary.

G. E. Freeman remained State Director of Vocational Education and State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture until 1955 at which time he dropped the title of State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture and John C. Carney, who had been head of the institutional on-the-farm training succeeded him in that capacity.

It is not clear when Assistant Supervisors became known as such, rather than Helping Teachers, but this change in terminology changed gradually with the appointment in 1933 of three District Supervisors

being the actual end of Helping Teachers as such.

As far back as 1929, the Annual Reports of the State Director refers to County Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture. These were vocational agriculture teachers appointed in the various counties to help other teachers in the area of planning the vocational agriculture program there. They received some extra pay for this and also served as full time vocational agriculture teachers in the county. J. E. Moss served in this capacity in Davidson County in 1929 and for a number of years following (44). Frate Bull served in this capacity before becoming a full time District Supervisor. This plan was not followed in all counties and other teachers served in this capacity in other areas, but investigation was fruitless as to documentation of these positions.

In 1929 an unusual agreement, in light of more recent practices, was agreed upon by the Director of Vocational Agriculture and the Extension Service as to supervision of agriculture teachers (7). The Annual Report of the Director in 1929 outlines the agreement made at that time in Shelby County. The general purpose of the agreement was to provide a uniform agricultural program in the county. The person hired for the job was equally responsible to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Office of Extension, and the Shelby County Board of Education each of which contributed to his salary. This person was to act as County Vocational Agriculture Supervisor and Extension Club Agent. L. J. Kerr was appointed to fill the position and according

to the terms of the agreement served in the capacity outlined above until mutual agreement terminated the agreement. Miss Sue Powers, Superintendent of Schools in Shelby County at the time of the agreement, was in charge of the joint program.

A similar program was initiated in Hamilton County by William (Mack) Landess, then county agent in that county, similar to the joint supervisory program in Shelby County. In fact, it is generally concluded by Brimm and others that Landess be credited with the origin of the idea which Shelby County put into practice. Freeman in outlining this program pointed out that although these supervisors taught classes in agriculture and did club work they were never on a vocational standing.

Another program of short duration originated along about this era in which TVA, under Dr. H. A. Morgan's leadership, were hiring vocational agriculture teachers after which the teachers continued under the TVA program to do the same educational work they had done before among adult farmers and claimed the credit for such activities (7). When this matter was brought to the attention of the TVA head the program was stopped.

# CHAPTER IV

## EARLY HISTORY OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FROM 1917 TO 1925

### I. EARLY TEACHERS AND DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

It seemed wise to include a brief chapter in this work to show how the work of the early men in vocational agriculture did much to shape policies that are still evident. It was felt by the writer that these early men should be placed apart for historical emphasis and to give them credit for their efforts in laying the foundation for vocational agriculture as it now exists.

This early history will attempt to narrate people, places, dates, and other things that caused vocational agriculture to have its birth and growth.

Much has been said already about the early workers in vocational agriculture in this work. Their activities will only be mentioned as thought necessary to make clear events as they took place from 1917 to 1925.

The Smith-Hughes Act which made vocational agriculture possible for the rural high schools of the nation was passed February 23, 1917. Previous to that time a number of high schools in Tennessee had been offering courses in non-vocational agriculture. A discussion on these schools was given in earlier sections of this history.

Early in April of that year, Grove High School of Paris, was the first school in Tennessee to set up a program of vocational agriculture and from the records available, it was very likely the first in the nation. At that time D. M. Clements was principal of the high school and teacher of agriculture and thus became the first teacher of vocational agriculture in the state of Tennessee (19).

Other departments were quickly certified and the following teachers and schools were the first in Tennessee in the school year 1917-1918. J. T. Lovell, Bradley County High School, Cleveland; C. F. Alden, Davidson County Central High School, Nashville; Adams Phillips, Farragut High School, Concord; D. M. Clements, Grove High School, Paris; G. E. Freeman, McLemoresville High School, McLemoresville; J. D. Cliett, Tyner; and A. Barnett, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville. According to N. E. Fitzgerald, this last department at Cookeville was never approved as a vocational department (19).

The first negro vocational agriculture departments and teachers were: G. W. Thomas, Bakewell, Soddy; A. M. Dobbins, Bruce High School, Dyersburg; M. L. Morrison was also at Bruce High School; W. P. Ware, Fayette County Training School, Somerville; F. E. Jeffries, Haywood County Training School, Brownsville; S. H. Johnson, Lauderdale County Training School, Ripley; E. M. Billingsley, Orchard-Knobb, Chattanooga; T. J. Johnson, Shelby County Training School, Lucy; L. L. Campbell, Wilson County Training School, Lebanon (8, p. 1).

Many things took place during this period, one of the most outstanding was a noticeable desire of farm boys for some organization of their own within the school. A number of clubs sprung up sponsored by agriculture classes throughout the state and nation. These organizations bore various names such as agriculture clubs, agricultural science clubs, Future Farmers and others. This prompted D. M. Clements to state that there was a distinct desire on the part of the boys in vocational agriculture for an organization of their own. He did much in his seventeen years as Director to help Tennessee boys realize this desire. The actual development of this organization has been covered by McBride in The History of the Future Farmers of Tennessee (46).

The first year of the program of vocational agriculture in Tennessee was under the direction of Albert Williams, State High School Inspector, who was appointed temporary Director of Vocational Education. It should be noted that during this first year vocational agriculture was not a part of the division of education. It was not until April of 1919 when N. E. Fitzgerald was loaned for a period of three months as temporary State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture that plans were formed to make the new vocational education a part of the division of education. After D. M. Clements became permanent Supervisor, the vocational section became a part of the division of education in 1919 (7).

The following years saw rapid growth under Clements' vigorous leadership. He had an abiding love and faith in the future of vocational agriculture. He had seen it perform in the agriculture classes

he had taught earlier at Lynnville, Tennessee and later at Grove High School at Paris, Tennessee. He carried the case to the county courts, school boards and the people by individual contacts. Clements immediately started to work to improve and inform the teaching staff by calling group conferences and employing well known men in the field of agriculture to come and speak to his men so that their teaching could be improved.

Most of the early school boards and county courts were anxious to obtain departments. It is suspected in a great number of cases that they sought the Federal financial aid more than the educational benefits, but Clements made a special effort to so inform them as to the requirements and benefits to be obtained that soon vocational agriculture was sought for its educational benefits.

One of the early limiting factors was the shortage of qualified teachers. At the beginning there was no department in any of the colleges for teaching men for positions as vocational agriculture teachers. Clements refers to a number of early teachers as emergency teachers. He, with N. E. Fitzgerald, quickly set about forming an agricultural education department at The University of Tennessee with N. E. Fitzgerald as its first head. Fitzgerald informed Clements that there was no money available to finance the new department as he thought it should be and asked Clements to make $5,000.00 of Smith-Hughes funds available for setting up a model vocational agriculture department with equipment and materials for teaching prospective teachers (19). Clements agreed

and a model department was set up to form a laboratory for teaching purposes.

Very little guidance was given on a national level as to the requirements for teachers of vocational agriculture. Here again such men as Fitzgerald and Clements had to set up standards as to what constituted a proper training course for teachers. These decisions and policies, while they have been improved upon as the times demanded, still remain the basic foundation stones of policy and guidance in the field of vocational agriculture in the state. Both men also made a definite imprint along with other educators in the South in regional meeting in formulating an educational philosophy for vocational agriculture.

The transition period from non-vocational to vocational agriculture represented a change from technical classroom agriculture to a study of agriculture "as she is farmed." This expression was used by N. E. Fitzgerald to express the change from books to learning by doing (19). Slowly, as new teachers came into the field trained in functional methods and as older teachers were taught on the job, the program became less of a book program with one "project" limited to one enterprise production cycle, to an idea of a "farming program" containing many enterprises with the latest up-to-date farming practices being taught on the basis of experiment station data and other proven information in modern agriculture.

Early requirements called for one-half day as work in vocational agriculture and one-half day on other academic subjects in

school. Many times the teacher took all the boys out on farms for the whole afternoon to prune trees, spray orchards, set plants, doctor animals and so on. This sort of schedule interfered with other school work and soon was revised to shorter hours for vocational agriculture.

Early departments had great difficulty in obtaining the proper equipment. G. E. Freeman stated that in his first department the county did not furnish chalk. Another teacher, J. T. Lovell, at Cleveland, Tennessee had one of the most up-to-date departments in the state. W. E. Robinson, teacher at Karns High School, tells of a trip to Cleveland, as a student in agricultural education under the supervision of N. E. Fitzgerald, on the train to observe Lovell's department (51).

Lovell mentioned in the beginning there was no allowance for travel, but all teachers were urged to visit boys to help them with their farming program (45). He did his first supervision in a horse and buggy spending a week or more away from home and spending the night with the boy that he visited late in the afternoon. These visits were made mostly in the summer since the time element would not allow much visiting during the school term. He later added a Model T Ford as transportation which enabled him to speed up the visiting program.

Freeman stated that teacher travel allowance was not provided until the beginning of the fiscal year 1937 (35). Difficulty was encountered by Director Freeman when he asked for funds for this purpose. Officials involved were of the opinion that an increase in salary of each teacher would be better than a stated amount for travel. The

Director felt, however, that this might mean paying some teachers who did not travel and under-paying teachers who traveled extensively. He maintained that travel pay should be on a merit basis.

The types of rooms and equipment required under the first state plan of 1919 had a marked influence on the type and arrangement of school rooms for vocational agriculture later (88, p. 2). The plan made only general recommendations but advised school systems participating in the program to provide movable tables and chairs rather than the conventional fixed seats. This was to allow for movement so that on occasion demonstrations requiring large apparatus, or even the presence of a coop of chickens, could be brought in. There was to be sufficient equipment for teaching the ordinary improved scientific methods of testing milk, incubating eggs, grafting trees, testing seed, soils study, and making butter. Suitable room was required for properly storing apparatus and properly caring for material collected in the community, such as grains, grasses, fruits, vegetables, small implements, poultry, animal feeds and so on. A picture in an early bulletin of the vocational agriculture department at Cleveland shows a model vocational agriculture department with all these plus other visual aids displayed. The early leaders made attempts in this manner to make the work functional. School systems that desired to participate had to agree to provide this sort of equipment before a department was approved for the system that requested one. Suitable reference books and bulletins plus farm papers and periodicals were recommended.

The equipment for fifteen to twenty pupils was estimated to cost about $250. From the wording of the plan, it is assumed that farm mechanics was not required but strongly recommended in the first plan (88, p. 3). The plan stated that:

> In case farm mechanics formed a part of the instruction about $200 will be added for such equipment. The State Board recognizes the importance of farm mechanics as a part of the vocational course in agriculture and wherever such work forms a part of the vocational course in agriculture the State Board will see to it that this work will be given in a room especially equipped for it. This will enable the school to give a course included among other things, in rope splicing, knot tying, harness mending, building chicken coops, milking stools, saw horses, gates etc.

In an interview with J. D. Cliett, vocational agriculture teacher at Tyner, he stated that his first shop was a product of an old horse barn on school property which he and his students converted to a shop (15). Skills taught were similar to the above with emphasis on carpentry and blacksmithing. Blacksmithing was taught with the aid of the local blacksmith.

The plan called for an expenditure by the local county board of education of a minimum of $2.00 per pupil every year in order that the teacher would not be handicapped by lack of small supplies.

The plan required the county boards to provide proper transportation facilities for the agricultural teacher in the supervision of the six months directed supervised practical work in agriculture. The writer did not find evidence of this part of the plan being carried out.

The first teachers were well paid according to the wages paid other teachers at that time. This caused some jealousy among other teachers and often times the local boards felt that the vocational teacher should be required to spend more hours at work and take on other duties in the school above and beyond agricultural teaching. This resulted in many teachers carrying out the duties of vocational agriculture teacher, principal, coach, plus many civic duties. This situation prompted a vocational teacher to state that when J. T. Lovell resigned at Cleveland the Board of Education had to hire three teachers to take his place, a principal, a coach, and a vocational agriculture teacher (44). These activities many times hampered the work of the program of vocational agriculture. Many of the early teachers still maintained high standards as evidenced by the part-time work, adult evening schools and other projects mentioned in the early annual reports.

To give the reader an idea of the salaries in the early years, facts are given as stated in a letter to L. E. Barnes, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Frankfort, Kentucky, April 25, 1926, from N. E. Fitzgerald (33). This gives some clue as to the top salary being paid in the state. It stated that a vocational teacher in the state had received $2400 salary the previous school year. The letter stated that this was practically the limit in Tennessee. The teacher involved was also principal and coach.

The annual report (58) of the State Supervisor listed the names of the teachers teaching in the school year 1920-21:

| | |
|---|---|
| R. E. Bruner | Jones High School |
| G. W. Bullock | Joelton High School |
| W. J. Field | Orlinda |
| K. T. Hutchinson | Davidson County Central |
| G. B. Thackston | Smyrna |
| J. E. Contry | Tennessee Polytechnic Institute |
| J. F. Thomason | Clarksville |
| J. H. Moore | Murfreesboro |
| O. J. Mattil | Hawkins County |
| C. H. Moody | Monroe County |
| Adams Phillips | Washington County High School |
| W. W. Smith | Sulphur Springs |
| J. D. Cliett | Tyner |
| Otto Hunnerwadl | Hixon |
| J. T. Lovell | Bradley County |
| H. C. Graybeal | Harriman |
| J. E. Dail | Anderson High School |
| | Glen Alpine |
| J. W. Lovell | Lebanon High School |
| C. H. Lacrosse | Trimble |
| N. Hancock | Rose Mark |
| R. A. Jones | Neshoba |

These men are considered the foundation teachers. Some of them are deceased and others dropped out seeking different positions and other reasons. It should be noted that most of them stayed in the profession.

Many of them are retired, or near retirement. Those who went out of the field of teaching became assistant secretaries of agriculture, college workers, assistant supervisors and some went into fields other than agriculture. The names of all the agriculture teachers in 1920-21 do not appear in this list but it gives the reader a glance of some of the pioneer teachers who have done much to earn vocational agriculture the high respect it has enjoyed.

G. E. Freeman listed the number of departments of vocational agriculture in Tennessee for 1917-18 as six white and eight colored; 1927-28, 121 white and twenty-one colored. The number of students enrolled in all-day classes for 1917-18 was 189 boys in white schools. The number of negro students was not available. By 1927-28 there were 139 negro and white students taking vocational agriculture.

The first evening class of which there is a record was taught by G. E. Freeman at McLemoresville in 1919-20 with a total of fourteen farmers enrolled and the major problem considered was terracing (58, p. 11). No other adult evening classes were shown in the reports until 1922-23 when a total of forty-three are listed but only nine of which had as many as ten meetings. The average number of meetings was four. The total enrollment was 680 in evening classes, 222 of which were sixteen years of age or under. Adult class work is described in detail in other sections of this work.

The first report showing any part-time work was for 1921-22 with sixteen classes and a total enrollment of 336. Here again, only five of

the classes met for as many as ten hours. Those meeting for less than ten hours ran from two to eight.

The Annual Report of the State Supervisor for 1922 showed that of the total number of boys beginning projects in corn, hogs, dairying and poultry, the most popular projects that year, 1,145 had completed the projects.

In addition to The University of Tennessee, some of the state normal schools, and others, the program for training agriculture teachers was carried on at the Peabody College Knapp School of Country Life under the leadership of Dr. Karey C. Davis (44). Dr. Davis was highly respected by the teachers of agriculture who had training under him. The Knapp School was set up to teach people to go into the country and teach rural people. These teachers were not necessarily agriculture teachers, but any school teachers who desired the training. Many of the teachers in Middle Tennessee who were teaching vocational agriculture obtained Master's degrees under Dr. Davis. Some of the teachers were G. E. Horn, J. E. Moss, J. H. Tucker and M. D. Capps.

Although some of these colleges helped educate vocational agriculture teachers in the early years, they were never certified to educate Smith-Hughes teachers. Middle Tennessee State Normal graduated one class of teachers of which Dr. Clifford N. Stark was a member. The policy of the State Board for Vocational Education became such that only the state university would certify Smith-Hughes degrees

(53). The feeling was that the university had the best facilities and could supply the demand for trained vocational teachers that was needed each year.

The first Vocational Agricultural Teachers Conference was called by Director Clements in the State Capital building at Nashville in August 1919 (1). It lasted three days.

Some of the subjects discussed were annual conferences, home projects, exhibits and contests, courses of study in vocational agriculture, and relation of the vocational agriculture teacher and the county agent.

Albert Williams, State Director of Vocational Education, spoke on integrating the vocational program with the high school course, C. H. Lane, Federal Agent for Agricultural Education, spoke on standards for teachers. Harry P. Ogden and N. E. Fitzgerald spoke on agricultural education for vocational agriculture teachers. Adams Phillips, President of Washington College, spoke on farm mechanics and farm management. The teachers of agriculture were each asked to speak for twenty minutes on the work they had done in the school year 1918-19.

This conference called by Clements set the pattern for future training conferences and for the preparation of a state program of work in vocational agriculture. Many of the methods of this conference were followed in later years.

N. E. Fitzgerald, head of the newly formed Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee, had outlined and put

into operation a program of agricultural education for prospective agriculture teachers. In a letter to Clements in 1921 he outlined the course in agricultural education (27). It consisted of a four-year course of 139 semester hours. In addition to the basic sciences of mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and bacteriology, courses in field crops, husbandry of breeds, dairy, horticulture, veterinary science, and economic entomology were required. There was a nine-hour requirement in agricultural education. The courses made some provisions for observation of teaching at Farragut and Central High School at Knoxville.

This brief history will give the reader an idea of some of the early policies and developments that led to the present program of vocational agriculture in Tennessee. The early pioneers in the program left their successors a strong foundation that has left its imprint on the activities of vocational agriculture.

## II. THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE NEGRO IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

As was pointed out in the beginning of this history, no attempt will be made to explore in detail the development of vocational agriculture in negro schools. It was felt that one of the members of that profession would be better able to perform this task.

A history of vocational agriculture in Tennessee would not be complete, however, if some of the general facts related to the negro effort was not represented.

Records show that the negro was quick to take advantage of the opportunity to qualify for departments of vocational agriculture. In fact, there were more negro teachers of vocational agriculture in the beginning, 1917 and 1918, than there were white teachers. Table II shows the list of schools in vocational agriculture along with the teachers and the area of the state represented in 1917-1918. It will be noted that the West Tennessee farming counties certified more departments. No reason was determined for this except that there was a density of negro farm population in these areas. Noted, too, was the fact that some of the most able and active teachers were in these West Tennessee schools. Five departments were located in the West Tennessee area, two in East Tennessee in the Chattanooga area, and one in Middle Tennessee in Wilson County.

Fitzgerald visited these schools in 1917 and 1918 to determine if the department and teacher could meet the requirements for a department of vocational agriculture. It so happened that more negro schools could qualify than white at the time. This could have been due to the type of vocational training offered at this time in negro schools being agricultural in nature due to the occupation of a large part of the negro population. Agricultural and Industrial Normal for negroes at Nashville had furnished the graduates in these fields for the work.

The Annual Report of the Supervisor in 1921 showed that the Watertown Preparatory School and Carroll County Training School were dropped and at the same time negro schools were added in July of that year at

TABLE II

NEGRO VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS IN TENNESSEE, 1917-1918

| Name of Teacher | School | Address |
|---|---|---|
| G. W. Thomas | Bakewell | Soddy, Route One |
| A. M. Dobbins<br>M. L. Morrison | Bruce | Dyersburg |
| W. P. Ware | Fayette County Training School | Somerville |
| F. E. Jeffries | Haywood County Training School | Brownsville |
| S. H. Johnson | Lauderdale County Training School | Ripley |
| E. M. Billingsley | Orchard Knob | Chattanooga |
| T. J. Johnson | Shelby County Training School | Lucy |
| L. L. Campbell | Wilson County Training School | Lebanon |

Eads School, Arlington, Bethlehem, Colliersville, Log Union, Mt. Pisgah and Millington (58). Again it will be noted that the greatest growth was in West Tennessee.

The report for the year of 1922 shows that West Tennessee had fifteen departments in the counties of Dyer, Lauderdale, Tipton, Haywood, Madison, Shelby, Fayette and Hardeman (59). By comparison there were fourteen white departments in those counties. The Middle Tennessee area had two departments at two locations in Davidson and Wilson County. East Tennessee had two departments in Hamilton County. At the same time there were twenty departments of white pupils and twelve white departments in Middle and East Tennessee respectively.

The report also noted that the itinerant teacher trainer had visited each negro school three times that year. That same year a conference was held at Brownsville in October for the negro teachers and all had been present, with the exception of three, for two full days of planning.

The State Supervisor reported that he had visited each school one time that year. He pointed out that one of the major accomplishments of that year had been the organization of part-time work on a unit course basis. Six negro schools had held a community fair during the year. Three had held special "Farmer's Conference Days."

In 1921 there were fourteen departments with fourteen teachers. This increased to nineteen departments with sixteen teachers. This meant that some departments were served by the same teacher. One

teacher at Hardeman County School had died and been replaced by transferring L. L. Campbell from Wilson County there.

The first Head of the Department of Agricultural Education of the Agricultural and Industrial Normal for negroes at Nashville was a man by the name of Lawson, according to G. E. Freeman (35). He was succeeded shortly by W. S. Davis who later became president of the institution. Davis was succeeded by W. S. Flowers who was Head of the Department of Agricultural Education. David Hamilton was associated with Flowers in the work there.

In the early years, 1928 and 1929, the department at Agricultural and Industrial Normal was inactive as noted in the reports of the State Supervisor. Freeman explained that W. S. Davis left Agricultural and Industrial Normal for two years for further training and study (35). The work was continued when he returned to the college.

Fitzgerald stated that he had nothing to do with the development of agricultural education at Agricultural and Industrial Normal, but he felt that a great deal of the credit should go to W. S. Davis for that effort (27).

The Annual Reports of the Supervisor carry statistics showing the growth and development of the negro work in vocational agriculture for those who might want to pursue the work further.

Freeman traced the development of the New Farmers of America (35). He defined it as a parallel to the FFA as an organization of negro vocational agriculture students and noted that it was confined

to the states in the south where segregation of students by races was practiced. It had been inactive in the northern states where the schools were not segregated. There have been a few instances in recent years, Mt. Juliet Vocational Agriculture Department for example, where negro students have entered integrated classes. Up to 1955, no negro students had become members of the Future Farmers of America. This, perhaps, will be a development in the future.

Freeman stated that the New Farmers of America was founded within a few months after the Future Farmers of America was organized (35). It was patterned in organization and action very much along the lines of the Future Farmers of America. In 1957 about 13 per cent of the vocational agriculture students were negroes. This would amount to about 1500 students in Tennessee and thirty teachers, according to Freeman.

## III. GROWTH OF THE NEGRO IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

The growth of the negro in vocational agriculture is difficult to trace due to the limited amount of information available to the author. Statistics found in the files of the State Supervisor are presented in Tables III and IV. These tables show the growth as reflected in the negro schools compared to the white schools from 1917 to the end of the school year in 1951. Figures were not determined after this date. The table shows the number of teachers and departments by years and the enrollment in both negro and white vocational

TABLE III

NEGRO AND WHITE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS BY YEARS, 1917 TO 1951

| Year | Departments | | Teachers | | Enrollment | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Negro | White | Negro | White | Negro | White |
| 1917-18 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 6 | ? | |
| 1918-19 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 420 | 217* |
| 1919-20 | 13 | 19 | 10 | 19 | 255 | 280 |
| 1920-21 | 14 | 44 | 15 | 44 | 519 | 1,612 |
| 1921-22 | 16 | 46 | 16 | 44 | Not Given | |
| 1922-23 | 19 | 60 | 16 | 58 | Not Given | |
| 1923-24 | 16 | 65 | 15 | 66 | 918 | 1,857 |
| 1924-25 | 18 | 78 | 18 | 79 | 648 | 1,779 |
| 1925-26 | 20 | 104 | 20 | 106 | 619 | 2,376 |
| 1926-27 | 18 | 123 | 18 | 122 | 377 | 2,907 |
| 1927-28 | 18 | 122 | 18 | 117 | 536 | 3,136 |
| 1928-29 | 17 | 117 | 16 | 115 | 419 | 3,215 |
| 1929-30 | 22 | 139 | 22 | 134 | 580 | 4,135 |
| 1930-31 | 23 | 147 | 25 | 141 | 746 | 5,475 |
| 1931-32 | 25 | 156 | 25 | 149 | 856 | 5,927 |
| 1932-33 | 22 | 161 | 22 | 152 | 906 | 6,595 |
| 1933-34 | 23 | 161 | 20 | 151 | 736 | 7,053 |
| 1934-35 | 22 | 159 | 21 | 151 | 736 | 7,053 |
| 1935-36 | 22 | 151 | 21 | 141 | 694 | 6,803 |
| 1936-37 | 23 | 153 | 23 | 145 | 961 | 7,642 |
| 1937-38 | 26 | 175 | 27 | 171 | 1,066 | 8.707 |
| 1938-39 | 29 | 200 | 29 | 198 | 1,243 | 10,643 |
| 1939-40 | 36 | 211 | 35 | 210 | 1,197 | 12,104 |
| 1940-41 | 37 | 215 | 37 | 216 | 1,323 | 12,458 |
| 1941-42 | 36 | 215 | 36 | 214 | 1,201 | 11,794 |
| 1942-43 | 39 | 198 | 38 | 180 | 1,434 | 9,920 |
| 1943-44 | 36 | 192 | 34 | 171 | 1,145 | 8,461 |
| 1944-45 | 36 | 177 | 34 | 161 | 1,190 | 7,995 |
| 1945-46 | 36 | 180 | 36 | 177 | 1,504 | 8,991 |
| 1946-47 | 37 | 191 | 37 | 187 | 1,659 | 10,707 |
| 1947-48 | 38 | 219 | 35 | 219 | 1,902 | 13,185 |
| 1948-49 | 39 | 242 | 38 | 249 | 1,987 | 15,269 |
| 1949-50 | 40 | 259 | 42 | 266 | 1,839 | 16,901 |
| 1950-51 | 41 | 268 | 42 | 279 | 2,512 | 19,583 |
| 1951-52 | 40 | 277 | 45 | 293 | -- | -- |
| 1952-53 | 40 | 279 | 43 | 295 | -- | -- |
| 1953-54 | 39 | 279 | 39 | 294 | -- | -- |
| 1954-55 | -- | 278 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 1955-56 | 34 | 280 | 40 | 294 | -- | -- |

*Some girls.

TABLE IV

NEGRO TEACHERS WITH OVER TWENTY YEARS SERVICE IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

| Name | School | Years Service |
|---|---|---|
| Armour, O. L. | Collierville | Retired in 1954 with Twenty-two Years Service |
| Gilmore, B. L. | Denmark | Thirty Years |
| Mebane, J. S. | Mt. Pisgah | Twenty-three Years |
| Rawls, Ned | Bolivar | Twenty-six Years |
| Roddy, R. J. | Shelby County | Thirty-two Years |
| Sects, J. L. | Webb | Twenty-nine Years |

agriculture departments. It will be noted that there were some conflicting figures in the early years as to the number of teachers and departments. Some of the departments received more aid from Federal funds than others. For instance, some of the first negro departments were accepted as full-time with teachers employed for twelve months and some one-half time for eight or nine months and in one case, one-third time with six months of school. The amount of Federal funds varied accordingly.

Personnel records in the office of the State Supervisor shows the number of negro teachers with over twenty-five years of teaching service in vocational agriculture in the state (6, 93). These figures were as of the year 1957. Undoubtedly some of the older teachers in service had reached retirement age and left the profession by this date. Table IV will show some of the older men in the profession.

One of the factors in the growth of the negro in vocational agriculture might be expressed in a statistical fact found in the annual report of 1933 (68). It stated that of the white boys studying vocational agriculture that year, who had dropped out of high school and who were in agricultural pursuits, 71 per cent were engaged in some type of agricultural work. Eighty-nine and six-tenths per cent of the negro students who had dropped out were engaged in agricultural pursuits. Most of the negro dropouts found employment in agricultural work due to the fact that the area offered more of an opportunity to them for a job. Many of the white boys often found employment in fields not so easily accessable to the negro dropout.

This, then, is a very brief account of the early major developments and trends in vocational agriculture by the negro race. It is a field that some member of this group should explore in more detail in order that the history may be preserved.

# CHAPTER V

# THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER TRAINING IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE IN TENNESSEE

## I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

In his work, Dadisman pointed out that the training of teachers was under the direction of the State Board of Education which is responsible for the administration of the funds (16, pp. 35-38). In most states the training was done from the beginning, in 1917, in the state universities or colleges of agriculture.

No definite policy had been worked out in Tennessee as to what institution would do the training of teachers. Of course, most of the state colleges and The University of Tennessee desired a part in training these teachers for several reasons. They could add a new department to the existing college of agriculture, new department positions would attract new men to the college or provide jobs for those already employed, and the college could participate in the Smith-Hughes funds which provided funds for training of teachers. It should be noted that all colleges did not have colleges of agriculture at this time.

Several men aided in determining a policy concerning the future plans for teacher training. Albert Williams, State Director of Vocational Education, asked Harry P. Ogden in 1917-18 to aid as Supervisor

of Vocational Agriculture and to ascertain what existing agriculture departments and teachers of agriculture were eligible for Smith-Hughes. Ogden set up an office in the Department of Vocational Education and immediately started upon this task (88). He thus became the first person to act in the capacity of a supervisor. His purpose was to determine the condition of teachers and schools for the certification of Smith-Hughes agriculture, however.

N. E. Fitzgerald was loaned to the State Board for Vocational Education on April 1, 1919 from The University of Tennessee for the purpose of setting up a program for training teachers of vocational agriculture and to get the program of reimbursement of funds set up for that year (19). In some respects this was the actual beginning of a Department of Agricultural Education at The University of Tennessee. Fitzgerald and Ogden visited every department that taught agriculture in the state. Those that met the requirements set up by the first state plan of that year were certified for reimbursement from Federal funds. It should be noted that some of the schools teaching agriculture that year did not meet the requirements and as a result did not share in Federal funds. Some of them were able to qualify later.

J. W. Brimm related to the writer that Middle Tennessee State Normal, later Middle Tennessee State Teachers College, never had the opportunity to graduate but one class of vocational agriculture teachers under the Smith-Hughes qualifications (7). This was made possible because the State Board of Vocational Education certified three institutions in the state plan for 1919 to train prospective vocational

agriculture teachers. These were The University of Tennessee, Middle Tennessee State Normal, and Agricultural and Industrial Normal for Negroes, Nashville, Tennessee.

Since Ogden was the Head of the Department of Agriculture at Middle Tennessee State Normal, and had worked with the program as Supervisor, he immediately started the program of training teachers.

The Federal Board after some consideration took the position that the universities of the states were best equipped to train teachers and would be able to supply the expected demand. The Board ordered the state boards to set up departments in the universities (19). With the exception of the one class graduated under Smith-Hughes at Middle Tennessee State Normal, none have been graduated meeting the requirements except at The University of Tennessee and Agricultural and Industrial State Normal for Negroes since that date.

No teacher training work specifically for Smith-Hughes agricultural teachers was done in Tennessee until the fall of 1919 when The University of Tennessee set up a program for white teachers there and a program for negroes at Agricultural and Industrial State Normal at Nashville (19).

Fitzgerald spent the time between April 1, 1919 and the following August in visiting the men in the profession in an attempt to determine their educational needs toward qualification as Smith-Hughes vocational agriculture teachers (19).

Most of the first teachers were trained in technical agriculture but had little or no training in agricultural education teaching

techniques. J. T. Lovell mentioned that Dr. H. A. Morgan, the Dean of the College of Agriculture at The University of Tennessee, had taught one agricultural education course somewhat along the lines of a sociology course prior to 1917 (45). For most of the men teaching in 1917-18 this was the only training received toward the teaching of vocational agriculture.

Fitzgerald mentioned that the courses outlined in 1919 were very theoretical in most respects because very little had been done that could be placed in courses in a tangible way other than the short visits with the men during the summer (19). There was one three-hour course in "Special Methods" but the rest of the time was spent in psychology, principles, general methods, and courses in rural and vocational education. There were no electives in this eighteen semester hours of professional work. The eighteen hours were selected because of the state law. As time went by the policy of the department was to make the courses practical as indicated by the men in group conferences.

Itinerant teacher training was done from the university in 1922 under the direction of the State Board (59).

Farragut High School was selected as a teacher training school for the school year 1921-22 but was not used due to poor conditions prevailing on the roads that year.

The teachers completing work in agricultural education in 1921-22 were issued five-year certificates under Smith-Hughes requirements to teach vocational agriculture (58).

The first Department of Agricultural Education was not located at Morgan Hall as is the present one. Fitzgerald related that the first department had little to support it but its official name as a department of the college with him as the head. A picture of the inside of the first department showed its location in the Science Department of old Morrell Hall which has since been destroyed by fire. Fitzgerald pointed out the constant source of annoyance while teaching a class was to have students come in and out for botany specimens (19). The photograph mentioned above shows the entire equipment of the first Department of Agricultural Education as consisting of one large table, a straight back chair for the instructor, and three arm chairs for the students. The three chairs were especially significant, according to Fitzgerald, because that was all the chairs necessary for three students!

Morrell Hall burned and the Agricultural Education Department was moved to the then new building, Morgan Hall, which housed the college of agriculture where it has remained (19). There has been some discussion in recent years as to the advisability of moving it back to the college of education on the main campus. To date this has not been advisable although it is a part of the college of education.

In the beginning there were no funds available from The University of Tennessee to equip an Agricultural Education Department. This was made known to D. M. Clements, then State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, and he agreed to make available $5,000 for this purpose

(19). He stipulated, however, that enough of this money must be spent to completely equip the department with all the materials then thought to be necessary to teach vocational agriculture in high school. This was to be used as a model to teacher trainees so that they would know what to expect in a Vocational Agriculture Department. The Head of the Agricultural Education Department, Fitzgerald, agreed to this and the department was equipped in this manner.

According to Fitzgerald, the first members of the Agricultural Education Department staff were: N. E. Fitzgerald, originally from the University of Missouri, J. P. Buck, who later went to Arkansas to work, Albert Barnett, who after one year went to Arizona and set up an agricultural education department in that state, and Henry C. Graybeal, who specialized in the development of shop programs throughout the departments in the state (19).

Table V shows the names, rank, dates began work, and the dates resigned of all the men in the Department of Agricultural Education from the year the department was originated until 1956. Vocational agriculture teachers in some of the nearby high schools were listed as cooperating teachers who aided in the instruction of students in practice teaching. Three of those listed, Beamer, Wiegers, and Paulus were still employed in the department in 1955.

Buck, Barnett, and Lockhart were employed as itinerant teachers to work with the men in the field. Stivers did some of this type work until it was discontinued.

TABLE V

MEN IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, 1919 TO 1956, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

| Name | Rank | Began Work | Resigned |
|---|---|---|---|
| N. E. Fitzgerald[a] | Professor | April 1, 1919 | May 1, 1943 |
| W. O. Lockhart | Assoc. Prof. | Sept. 1, 1919 | June 1, 1920 |
| J. P. Buck | Assoc. Prof. | Sept. 1, 1920 | Oct. 1, 1922 |
| Albert Barnett | Asst. Prof. | Oct. 1, 1920 | May 1, 1922 |
| H. C. Graybeal | Asst. Prof. | June 1, 1921 | Sept. 1, 1924 |
| A. L. Rubin[b] | Instructor | Aug. 15, 1924 | Feb. 10, 1935 |
| E. D. Stivers | Professor | Feb. 1, 1925 | Aug. 31, 1935 |
| J. W. Brimm[b] | Instructor (Farragut) | July 1, 1929 | Jan. 15, 1936 |
| J. B. Kirkland[c] | Instructor (Karns) | July 1, 1929 | Aug. 31, 1948 |
| C. F. Rollins[b] | Instructor (Gibbs) | Mar. 16, 1935 | Mar. 31, 1942 |
| Clyde York[b] | Instructor (Farragut) | Jan. 15, 1936 | May 30, 1936 |
| Bennett Brown[b] | Instructor (Farragut) | June 1, 1936 | Sept. 30, 1939 |
| W. E. Robinson[b] | Instructor (Karns) | Sept. 1, 1936 | June 30, 1949 |
| A. J. Paulus[d] | Assoc. Prof. | Aug. 15, 1938 | ---- |
| E. B. Knight[e] | Assoc. Prof. | Aug. 15, 1938 | Aug. 31, 1949 |
| H. E. Gibson[b] | Instructor (Farragut) | Oct. 1, 1939 | June 30, 1949 |
| Max M. Clendenen[b] | Instructor (Gibbs) | Sept. 1, 1942 | June 30, 1949 |
| Bonard S. Wilson[f] | Asst. Prof. | Sept. 1, 1947 | March 1, 1955 |
| R. W. Beamer[g] | Asst. Prof. | July 1, 1949 | ---- |
| George W. Wiegers, Jr.[h] | Asst. Prof. | Sept. 1, 1949 | ---- |
| Robert Warmbrod, Jr.[i] | Instructor | May 1, 1956 | ---- |

[a]Became Dean, College of Education, May 1, 1943.

[b]Cooperating teachers of vocational agriculture and part-time instructors in agricultural education.

[c]Appointed Associate Professor of Agricultural Education, Sept. 1, 1936 and later Head of the Department of Agricultural Education.

[d]Appointed professor in 1950.

TABLE V (continued)

[e]Resigned and joined agricultural education staff at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute.

[f]Appointed Head of Agricultural Education Department.

[g]Appointed Associate Professor in 1954.

[h]Appointed Professor and Head of Department, July 1, 1955.

[i]Resigned June 30, 1957 and joined faculty of University of Illinois.

Rubin, Brimm, Kirkland, Rollins, York, Brown, Robertson, Gibson and Clendenen were cooperating teachers in the outlying schools near Knoxville and aided in the practice teaching program.

H. C. Graybeal, a vocational agriculture teacher, was employed as a shop expert and was instrumental in getting the farm mechanics program in operation in the state.

A. J. Paulus was employed to develop subject matter to be used by teachers in the field and did much to develop this segment of the department.

Others on the staff have served as department head including Fitzgerald, Kirkland, Wilson, and George W. Wiegers, Jr.

George Peabody College did some work in training vocational agriculture teachers, but not to supply men with a Smith-Hughes certificate, although they did qualify home economics teachers under the act. Under the direction of Dr. Karey C. Davis the Knapp Farm offered to pay the tuition of anyone interested in completing a Master's degree in agriculture. Some of the vocational agriculture teachers in the surrounding area took this opportunity to complete work on their Master's program (44). In a letter dated May 27, 1936 G. E. Freeman stated that Peabody discontinued this work (39). This date is not the date that it was discontinued but no work was offered after this time.

Requirements in 1930 for teachers of vocational agriculture were outlined in a letter written by Fitzgerald to an inquiring student (26). A prospective agriculture teacher must be a graduate in agriculture with

twenty-seven hours in education of which one-half of these hours must be agricultural education. This agricultural education must include course organization and practice teaching. Sixty hours of technical agriculture with courses in the basic sciences and other subjects were required.

Most of the early vocational agriculture teachers were majors in some technical field of agriculture with no training in agricultural education. They taught on permits which were issued for a few years based on summer work done in agricultural education courses offered by The University of Tennessee. There was no degree offered with a major in agricultural education. Freeman relates the story of how permission was granted by the University to obtain a degree in agriculture with a major in agricultural education (35). A meeting was held with the faculty of the University at which Dean Hoskins and Dr. H. A. Morgan were present and the request for a major in agricultural education presented. It met with disapproval from others on the faculty, but after some persuasion it was agreed that a survey be launched among agriculture teachers in the state to determine their needs and wishes. The men were to evaluate courses in technical agriculture and in agricultural education that they had received and those needed. After some investigation following the survey a major was set up. Professor Wylie in the Dairy Department was very instrumental in helping to get the program underway and was one of the first to see the value of educational courses.

The number of hours required for certification as a vocational agriculture teacher has changed but little since 1930 which was about the time the legislature set the hour requirements for vocational agriculture teachers, according to G. E. Freeman. Freeman explained that the legislature was reluctant to change these requirements because it might mean invalidating some of the certificates held by qualified vocational agriculture teachers. Higher education did not want to change for that same reason. They felt that it was better to let the hour requirements remain the same and change the course content to fit the changing needs of the profession. It still operates the same way and the number of hours changes relatively little. The certification requirements are not set by the legislature, according to Freeman, but have been set up by law.

## II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRACTICE TEACHING PROGRAM

There was no practice teaching program before 1923, according to Fitzgerald (19). There were no courses offered in agricultural education at The University of Tennessee until the fall of 1919 as Fitzgerald has started on the job as head of the department in April of that year. He spent the summer visiting teachers to determine their desires for a program of agricultural education. The first concern of the department was to give aid to emergency teachers as they were called by Clements. Practice teaching plans came after this need was met.

In 1922 Farragut High School was to be used for a practice teaching program. Roads were very bad in those days and since the pike was torn up all that year the school was not used very much. Most of the roads were impassable in those days, related Fitzgerald, and transportation was by Model T Fords.

The annual report of the Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture mentioned that money had been appropriated that year for a practice school which would be under the control of the supervisor (60). It mentioned that heretofore there had only been cooperative relationships between the teacher-training department at the University and the vocational agriculture departments where students went for observation only. After the money was appropriated there were plans to set up a practice teaching department at Farragut but this did not materialize as has been pointed out.

The annual report went on to outline the practice teaching program. It pointed out that all types of work, such as recitation, laboratory, part-time instruction, promotional work, and project visitation would be offered to students seeking to become vocational agriculture teachers.

Since the practice school was not used much the program did not get underway until the year of 1923 at Central High School at Fountain City which was about two miles outside the city limits of Knoxville at that time. A. L. Rubin was the teacher of vocational agriculture. He was an experienced man in all day and part-time work in agriculture and was employed by and paid chiefly by The University

of Tennessee through the Department of Agricultural Education. The whole plan, according to the annual report, was in cooperation with the County Board of Education which supplied a small sum toward the salary of the supervising teacher and supplied the equipment and facilites. The teacher of agriculture was an instructor in the Department of Agricultural Education and was required to keep in touch with the theories and methods endorsed by the department. The supervising teacher spent about one-half of his time attending classes at the University and the other half in the community developing the work that he undertook during the coming year.

The report further outlined the plans of the teaching program to be centered around the practice teaching program (60). Five semester hours credit for the practice course and the Director expected an increase in the amount of work over the year before in actual practice work. The community was surveyed and as much as practical the practice teaching dealt with those problems.

Some of the teachers who were students in this early practice teaching program were W. E. Robinson and D. E. Drinnon. Robinson described the training under Rubin at Fountain City (51). There they investigated the school facilities, observed the vocational agriculture teachers teach, learned to set up a vocational agriculture program and did some teaching of agriculture students.

The 1922 annual report mentioned that the economic depression had kept many boys from college who would have otherwise enrolled.

The Director offered this as a reason for the small number of graduates. In the same report he mentioned that in 1922 The University of Tennessee graduated eight seniors and four others making a total of twelve in agricultural education. These eight graduating seniors all received practice teacher training.

The 1922 annual report mentioned the training program for negroes at Agricultural and Industrial State Normal in Nashville (59). They offered two years of teacher training work for the students in their junior and senior years. This qualified them to teach agriculture under the requirements of the Smith-Hughes Act. They were allowed to do a limited amount of observation and practice teaching. In addition, they were trained on the job by itinerant teacher-trainers.

The annual report of the State Supervisor mentioned that observation and practice teaching were required of all graduates in agricultural education. Additional observations were made in schools outside of those in Knox County by taking all-day trips by train. Students who scheduled practice teaching did not schedule classes in the afternoons.

The annual report of the State Supervisor of 1925 mentioned that practice teaching work was going well at Central High School and for the first time that year the students were able to make project visitations (62).

The annual report of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture for 1928 reported that there had been no changes in plant and equipment but two training departments, those of Farragut and Karns

High Schools in Knox County, were added for practice teaching purposes (65). This made a total of three practice teaching departments since Central High School at Fountain City had been used since 1923.

J. W. Brimm, vocational agriculture teacher at Farragut High School, was one of the early supervising teachers in the practice teaching program. He mentioned that in 1930 the supervising teachers at Farragut, Karns, and Central High Schools were paid for the first time for training practice teachers (7). Brimm and J. B. Kirkland, vocational agriculture teacher at Karns, had trained four boys free of charge before this. He mentioned that the failure to appropriate funds for this purpose had been the reason for them not being paid for this extra work.

Letters from N. E. Fitzgerald to agricultural education majors at The University of Tennessee who were attempting to schedule practice teaching showed that Karns, Central, and Farragut High Schools were being used for practice teaching in 1931 (25).

It was of interest to note that John McDonald, now WSM Farm Director and former vocational agriculture teacher, was notified in a letter by N. E. Fitzgerald that it would not be possible to place him in practice teaching until later in the school year of 1931 (32).

The annual report of 1935 reported that A. L. Rubin, cooperating teacher at Central High School and the first vocational agriculture teacher to work with practice teaching students, resigned due to ill health (70).

The annual descriptive report of 1938 outlined some of the requirements of the practice teaching trainee (73). Practice teaching required six weeks of observation prior to four weeks of actual practice teaching. The student teachers taught freshman and sophomore classes. In addition, they were to teach two part-time classes plus observation of others. They also taught a minimum of two adult evening classes plus observation of a minimum of ten evening classes. The report mentioned that the same high schools as in the past were used for the practice teaching work in 1938.

The descriptive report of 1939 showed that C. F. Rollins, W. E. Robinson and B. E. Brown were cooperating teachers in the practice teaching program (74). Some changes had been made in the program for student teachers. They were to observe for four weeks, act as helping teachers for four weeks, and were required to have actual teaching experience for four weeks.

The descriptive report of 1940 showed H. E. Gibson, vocational agriculture teacher at Farragut, was added as a cooperating teacher in the practice teaching program effective as of the school year 1939 (75).

The descriptive report of 1941 showed that in addition to Karns, Gibbs, and Farragut, Carter High School at Norris was used in the practice teaching program. This showed the growth in facilities as reflected in the interest manifested in the vocational agricultural profession.

The annual statistical report of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture for 1943 showed the high schools of Farragut, Karns, Gibbs, and Norris being used in the practice teaching program.

According to a letter of 1942 to J. B. Kirkland, there was reason to believe that Kirkland started the program at The University of Tennessee of apprentice teaching (30). This called for those students entering the program of agricultural education to do a period of observation of the teacher of vocational agriculture in order to determine if they were interested enough to continue the work in agricultural education. This was a guidance technique devised by Kirkland. It was discontinued after he resigned from the staff in 1948.

This, then, is the development of the practice teaching program. Many of the basic principles devised by Fitzgerald, Rubin, Kirkland, Brimm, and others in its infancy are still in use. There have been changes made as time presented new needs. Basically it remains the same as in the early years which attests to the soundness and wisdom of those early leaders.

After Kirkland resigned as Head of the Agricultural Education Department, Bonard Wilson and others made some changes in the program. One major change was to branch out to other high schools as practice teaching centers. High schools as far away as Columbia Vocational Agriculture Department and some West Tennessee departments were used. Some of the departments and high schools used in addition to the above since 1950 were Tellico Plains, Madisonville in East Tennessee and Mount Pleasant in Middle Tennessee. The departments close in to

Knoxville such as Karns, Farragut and others were becoming engulfed by city dwellers and part-time farming was becoming more prominent. Outstanding teachers in other areas of the state were utilized in the practice teaching program.

## III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER'S CONFERENCES

Bulletin 13 of the Federal Board for Vocational Education provided the authority for the establishment of annual Teacher's Conferences for Vocational Agriculture Teachers (17, p. 21). The Board did not seek to place any restrictions on the number of times the teachers should meet or where they should meet. These meetings were to be for the professional improvement of the teachers and two per year were suggested. One could be on a sectional basis and the other on a state-wide basis. It was left to the discretion of the State Director of Vocational Agriculture as to the formulation of plans for the meetings but the Board felt that the state agricultural colleges would probably be the best suited site for the meetings. As has been the case for many years, this and the other suggestions of the Board have been employed as a basis for most of the teacher conferences through the years.

In the beginning it was very difficult to get all the teachers scattered over the state together. Transportation and highways was one of his big problems. W. E. Robinson, an early teacher of vocational agriculture, stated in an interview that he attended his first

teacher's conference in 1927 while teaching in Shelby County (51). L. J. Kerr, Roy Hendricks and Robinson came to The University of Tennessee from Shelby County in a Model T Ford. This trip required two days over muddy almost impassable roads in some parts of the state.

The first record of any type of conference held for vocational agriculture teachers was outlined in a printed program dated to show that the conference was held at the State Capital in Nashville, Tennessee August 13 and 14, 1919 (5). Freeman stated in an interview that the first general conference for vocational agricultural teachers was held at The University of Tennessee in the summer of 1920 (35). It was assumed by the author that the first conference held in Nashville in 1919 did not bring together all the teachers then teaching in the state and was not a formal training type of conference as those to follow later. The printed program referred to earlier outlined the speakers and subjects discussed at the conference. Some of the problem areas that are recognized by present day teachers were discussed at this first conference. D. M. Clements presided over the meeting and at the outset of the meeting appointed committees to formulate plans for future conferences, home projects, exhibits and contests, courses of study in vocational agriculture schools, and to discuss the relation of vocational agriculture teachers and the county agent.

Albert Williams, State Director of Vocational Education, spoke on tying in vocational agriculture with the regular courses in the high school. C. H. Lane, Federal Agent for Vocational Education of Atlanta, Georgia was present and spoke on standards for the teachers

of vocational agriculture. D. M. Clements brought the men up to date on vocational agriculture in the state. In the remaining part of the conference, various men and vocational agriculture teachers in the state spoke or held round table discussions on the ways and means used by them to teach vocational agriculture. One should remember that these early men had no stated policy to go by in the beginning since vocational agriculture, as such, was new. These early attempts to outline the job of the vocational agriculture teacher show some clear constructive thinking on their part since many of these policies are still practiced by present day teachers.

Ogden, Professor of Agriculture at Middle Tennessee State Normal School, Murfreesboro, spoke on content of the course in plant production, Clements on animal production, and N. E. Fitzgerald on the content of the course in horticulture. Adams Phillips, President of Washington College, spoke on farm management and farm mechanics. A round table discussion was led by Clements on the laboratory equipment required for teaching agriculture. Phillips led a discussion on the farm library needed by the teachers of agriculture.

The teachers attending, in addition to the ones already mentioned, were given twenty minutes to discuss the experiences they had in teaching the previous year. A report was given on teacher training at The University of Tennessee by Fitzgerald and also at Middle Tennessee State Normal by Ogden. It should be noted here that Middle Tennessee State Normal was recognized up to this time as a teacher training institution.

Fairs, various type projects, contests, and endless chain pig clubs were discussed. Judging by the conference that came in later years, this first conference set the pattern for those to come in the succeeding years. Present day conferences still follow somewhat the same pattern.

The first general Vocational Agriculture Teachers Conference was held in 1920 at The University of Tennessee in conjunction with a teacher training course offered in the summer session there (19). While this served as a conference for the annual training program for teachers of agriculture, it was something more than the conference held the year before in Nashville. The teachers stayed in Barbara Blount Hall and twenty-seven teachers were present at the conference. Some of these had never taught but were going to teach as they had graduated and qualified with the board to teach. The home economics students at that time needed some home management experience to qualify some of them to receive a B. S. degree in home economics education. It was arranged so that these girls could feed the men while they were there in summer school and get home management credit. This enabled the girls to graduate and they were the first group to graduate with this type of degree (19).

This conference lasted for four weeks and intensive courses were offered in farm mechanics, poultry, farm management, general methods, and agricultural methods. In addition to the courses above the men often met for frequent round table discussions of their

problems and a number of able lecturers on particular phases of the work were brought in from time to time to speak during the period covered by the courses. The total attendance at this conference and summer session was thirty-two teachers and prospective teachers of agriculture. Credit was allowed toward the Master's degree for the work done.

The conference for the teachers of agriculture was held in Nashville in the year of 1921 (35). Teachers who were particularly good in some phase of the work told how they were doing the job. At this conference the men voted to discontinue the annual conferences until such time as they could be paid travel to the conferences. The sectional conferences were still held however. As a result of this decision there was no annual conference in 1922.

In 1923 the teachers of the state again came together in an annual conference which was unlike anything that had ever been tried in the South, according to N. E. Fitzgerald, who was largely responsible for the type conference held (19).

The conference was held at The University of Tennessee at which the agriculture teachers were to spend ten intensive days in the job analysis of farm enterprises, part time and evening school work as well as supervisory methods and farm shop. With job analysis as the theme Fitzgerald called in some of the ablest lecturers on the subject to be found in the country. Among the men addressing the conference were C. B. Gentry, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Connecticut;

George A. Works of Cornell University; J. A. James of the University of Wisconsin; Paul W. Chapman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Georgia; E. B. Matthew, Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Arkansas; W. F. Stewart, Ohio State University; L. M. Roehl, Cornell University; and Dr. C. A. Prosser. The reader will recognize many persons who later became outstanding leaders in the field of vocational agriculture.

Many of the teachers of agriculture in 1921 were prone to teach from outlines contained in texts on the subject. As a result they taught animal husbandry one year, crops the next and so on. Fitzgerald thought by bringing in men such as Gentry, who had originated the plan the job analysis, that the teachers in the state could be influenced into changing to the more acceptable plan of teaching "Agriculture as She is Farmed" (19). This expression was used by Fitzgerald and denoted functional teaching of a vocational nature based on the needs of the people then being taught in farming. The job analysis method taught an integrated agriculture so that the present problems and needs of the whole farming program of the student was considered. This was the program presented to the teachers in the conference of 1921 by experts from all over the country. Fitzgerald stated that the men were not eager to subscribe to this method and thought it impractical and took issue with Gentry and others as to the merit of the system (19). The general conclusion was that the purpose of the conference had been defeated at the time but the men went home and thought over

what they had heard and many unconsciously put into practice the job analysis method on some enterprises and later on more and more. Thus was born the true functional approach to teaching and was widely practiced in the state.

In June of 1924, Fitzgerald again organized a teachers conference at The University of Tennessee and acquired the services of outstanding men in the field of vocational agriculture to aid in promoting the job analysis method. The success of their efforts is still evident in Tennessee vocational agriculture. This conference did not reach all the teachers, however, since road conditions, transportation and the long distance did not lend themselves to state wide conferences.

A letter from G. E. Freeman to E. D. Stivers of The University of Tennessee agricultural education staff in 1927, advised Stivers that after conferring with Clements that it would be well to hold the conference in Memphis on Friday, February 18, 1927. He mentioned that the projects in Shelby County were not very well chosen and for that reason could be very profitable to the teachers to spend the entire time on supervised practice work. It is believed that this was a sectional conference instead of the annual state conference.

A newspaper clipping gives an account of the annual teachers conference held in 1929 and 1930 at The University of Tennessee (4). It was a two day affair that ended a three weeks short course according to D. M. Clements, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Plans for the next year's work were discussed and special plans were

made to further the advancement of the Future Farmers of Tennessee. Seventy-two teachers were expected to attend.

The annual report of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture of 1935 reported that the annual conference for teachers of agriculture was held in June at Camp Clements at which the program for the next year and accompanying problems were discussed (70). The unique phase of the program featured the teachers themselves who told of their accomplishments and contributions during the year. District supervisors also held sectional conferences during the year.

The annual report for 1939 reported forty-nine small group conferences as well as a state conference (74). The conference meeting place was not mentioned in the report but letters in the files of the Department of Agricultural Education at The University of Tennessee indicated that the conference was held in June of each year for the years of 1939, 1940, and 1941.

During the war years there were some restrictions placed on travel and many teachers entered the armed services. Those who worked on the home front found more and more demands made on their time and a greater need for conferences and program planning was shown. After the war the number of departments and teachers increased to the point that it was impossible for the conferences to be held at Camp Clements and the teachers reverted to the plan devised earlier of meeting in one of the major cities such as Nashville, Memphis, or Knoxville. The most often used plan was to meet at The University of

Tennessee where facilities were such as to aid the teachers in professional improvement. Many of the conferences featured the teachers themselves who related their experiences with an effort to help other teachers with their problems. Occasionally experts were brought in to talk and provide information on related fields in agriculture. The purpose in recent years is still to improve the teacher professionally, exchange views, and to plan the program of work for the succeeding year.

## IV. THE ITINERANT TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

Itinerant teaching training came about in the very beginning of the agricultural education training program. The beginning teachers of vocational agriculture had little or no training for teaching. Most of them were trained in a field of technical agriculture with no training in teaching methods and this gave rise to an immediate need for some sort of emergency training to aid these teachers. The teachers were busy on the job and could not be absent from the job long enough to go to the University for training so the idea of the itinerant teacher came into being.

Bulletin 13 of the Federal Board of Vocational Education defined the job of the itinerant teacher (17, p. 21). Itinerant teaching had a two-fold purpose and it embraced the idea that the teacher go to the student and not the conventional method where the student goes to the teacher. The two purposes of the itinerant teacher were to insure that

the work was kept up to a certain standard and to give beginning teachers needed help and correct faults in teachers wherever they existed. In some cases, as in the beginning teachers in 1917, certain talents needed to be developed.

The State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture who with the Head of the Agricultural Education Department of The University of Tennessee were responsible for the itinerant teaching training program. The State Supervisor advised the Agricultural Education Department and indicated where the need for this service existed.

The first itinerant teacher was W. O. Lockhart, a personal friend of N. E. Fitzgerald, and at the time of his employment in the Agricultural Education Department was working on some advanced degree work at the University of Wisconsin (19). He was credited with the first official itinerant teacher training work in the field with the teachers. Fitzgerald, Ogden, and Lowery had done work of this nature earlier but their main purpose had to do with the certification of departments for Federal funds. Lockhart worked at this job for one year and then resigned to go into the book publishing and selling business.

Reports made by Lockhart in the files of the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee show some of the problems and conditions existing in 1920. Some of the departments were highly praised for the fine work that was going on while others due to a lack of knowledge of a vocational program on the part of the

teachers were rated poor. The department at Central High School at Cleveland was rated as one of the best departments in East Tennessee. Other departments were criticized for lack of equipment, teacher know-how, teacher spent too much time on other jobs, lack of a planned program, weakness in supervised study, and poor housekeeping. The Vocational Agriculture Department at Davidson County Central High School at Nashville was rated by Lockhart as one of the strongest in the state. The teacher, C. F. Alden, made little pretense at following the state outline for a program, Lockhart noted, but the work given was practical, interesting and satisfying to all concerned. There were other examples but the writer mentions these to give the reader an insight into the conditions that existed at the time the itinerant teaching program was born.

Fitzgerald stated that J. P. Buck was employed as the itinerant teacher trainer in September of 1920 and stayed on the job until October of 1922 at which time he resigned and went to another state (19). It was of interest to the writer to note some of the difficulties of the itinerant teacher in the reports coming to the Department of Agricultural Education. Transportation was one of the major difficulties. The itinerant teacher had to keep a train schedule in one hand and his daily itinerary in the other. Many times he visited teachers who lived some distance from the train depot by hired car or horse and buggy and then hurried back to town to either catch another train for the next town or else spend the night with the

vocational agriculture teacher inspecting his department and working with the teacher during the night. His reports to the department head were usually made in longhand enroute to another destination. Of course, the reports were mailed in and the teacher received instructions about other visits by letter which were aimed to catch him ahead at some expected stop. This sort of program required the utmost in planning and many times disappointments and delays occurred.

Albert Barnett was a vocational agriculture teacher at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute when the institution was a high school in 1917. He applied for certification as a Smith-Hughes department of vocational agriculture but the request was denied due to the fact that training and facilities did not meet the State Board's requirements. He was later hired as a member of the agricultural education staff by Fitzgerald and served from October 1920 to May 1922 as an itinerant teacher trainer (19). He resigned from the department and went to Arizona and set up a department of agricultural education in that state. Fitzgerald and members of his staff spent three months with Barnett at his request in order to get the department on a sound footing. Mr. Barnett also wrote unpublished material while on the staff.

H. C. Graybeal was a teacher of vocational agriculture in Roan County High School and was well known for his farm shop teaching skill. He was brought to The University of Tennessee Agricultural Education Department by Fitzgerald with the intent of developing the farm shop program of the work in the state which was very weak at the time (19).

The annual report of 1922 pointed out that, generally, visits were made to new teachers only, but that the special problem of a farm shop program was carried directly to every teacher in the state during the previous year (59). This work was done by Graybeal.

Graybeal in cooperation with the Agricultural Engineering Department of the University set up a model farm shop as a teaching laboratory for beginning teachers and those on the job who came to the university to do work in the summer.

Fitzgerald pointed out an important fact concerning the farm shop instruction in Tennessee at this point (19). Many states, particularly in the north, taught farm mechanics as a unit. This was never the case in Tennessee. Graybeal and Fitzgerald felt that farm shop work should be correlated with whatever enterprise the boy had in his farming program. If he had dairy then he might make stanchions or provide milk cooling equipment. These men felt that this was more functional than the unit method. Thus began a farm shop philosophy that continued down through the years.

Graybeal later went to Emory College, his alma mater, for further training and from there went to Roanoke, Virginia to work there with his father-in-law who was president of the college. He has since died.

The annual report of the State Supervisor of 1923 stated that the work of the itinerant teacher for that particular year had been in the area of promotion of part-time and evening school work (60).

It stated that fifty-six teachers were reached through the work for that year. Much of this work was the result of aid offered by Frate Bull, vocational agriculture teacher in West Tennessee. Bull went to East Tennessee and aided the teachers there in early attempts at evening school work where they worked on units based on dairy farming. Many accounts of this work and its success were given in the Knoxville papers during this period. While the work done by Bull might be considered as itinerant teacher training, he was never employed in this specific sense.

The annual report of 1924 announced a change in policy toward itinerant teacher work (61). Prior to this time it had been the practice to visit every teacher in the state at least one time. With more departments and teachers being added to the work every year the problem of time and numbers became apparent. Most of the work of the itinerant teacher during the first part of the year was given to visiting new teachers and the remainder of the year was spent visiting teachers with special problems. The State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture felt that by cutting down on the number of teachers visited, and visiting them more often during the year, accomplished more than visiting every teacher regardless of his need. The itinerant teacher was in the field one-half of his time and visited a total of thirty teachers with sixty-six visits.

The annual report of 1925 stated that the work for the year had been confined to seventeen new teachers who began work in July

(62). All new teachers were visited and a total number of visits for the year was ninety-six.

It is not clear just when the type of itinerant teacher training work that existed in the beginning was discontinued. Fitzgerald felt that it might have ceased with J. P. Buck. G. E. Freeman felt that Buck might have been the last itinerant teacher since those following him were not designated as such in the reports even though they did the same type of work. It is safe to assume that this work was discontinued with the employment of District Supervisors who were in charge of itinerant work.

Fitzgerald employed E. D. Stivers as a member of the agricultural education staff in February of 1925 and he remained with the department until August 1935 at which time he resigned and went into the Extension Service (19). Although he was not designated as an itinerant teacher he spent much time in this capacity and aided in the promotion of public relations through the F. E. T. and fairs.

Many people had worked as pioneers in the itinerant teacher program prior to Stivers, and thus had formed a basis for the work. Fitzgerald stated that Stivers was the best man that he had to handle this program. He spent more time and visited more teachers in the field than anyone had prior to that time.

Sometime after J. P. Buck resigned, and probably after the year 1925, the itinerant teacher ceased to exist by that name but the program continued in various forms. Changes were made to fit

the changing needs. Teachers who were graduated from the University training program needed less help than did the early teachers who did not have the opportunity to receive training while in college. The agricultural education staff members were increasingly busy with duties at the University and means of getting information to teachers in the field became much easier than was the case in 1920. Much itinerant work could be done possibly with teachers in the field, but the District Supervisor, who has that responsibility, is burdened with other duties of Future Farmer of America activities as well as other duties. He can make visits only in cases where a definite need arises.

In the early days it was next to impossible to get teachers together for training conferences. Later transportation and communications were such that it was more practical to train teachers in group conferences, both small group and large state conferences. So the itinerant teacher program served its purpose and then gave away to inevitable change.

The state plan of 1955 gave the policy as to itinerant teacher training. It stated that the staff of the Department of Agricultural Education would make as many visits as time would permit, in providing professional service to employed teachers. The staff of the Department of Agricultural Education would also enlist the cooperation of the Dean of the College of Agriculture in providing itinerant service to employed teachers in the several areas of technical agriculture.

## V. THE TENNESSEE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHER ASSOCIATION

The writer found it difficult to document many of the facts concerning the origin and development of the organization of vocational agriculture teachers in Tennessee. Much of the information given here comes from memories of the early teachers and in many instances they could not recall the exact date of occurrence. The writer was not able to find any accurate records concerning the association. The reason for this seems due to the fact that the organization was a teachers organization from the beginning and records were passed from old officers to new with no central place to file records. This area of the work should be explored further.

Freeman states that the vocational agriculture teachers had a strong teachers association before they became affiliated with the American Vocational Association and even before it was an organization (35). There was a strong organization before any dues were paid and it was largely operated in conjunction with the regular conferences of agriculture teachers as was the case in succeeding years. The teachers had officers and their chief objective was in those activities dealing with legislation favorable or unfavorable to the vocational agriculture field. At this time the law did not require the Governor to file a plan with the legislature showing what money would be needed and as a result there was no plan presented to the legislature. The legislature passed legislation on the advice and recommendation of influential groups who consulted them. This provided one

purpose for a united front of vocational agriculture teachers to request legislation favorable to the field of vocational agriculture.

Later on in the development of the association grievance committees and a code of ethics which protected the teachers against bidding for jobs in the depression years, especially, were formed.

The exact date of the founding of the association cannot be determined but the association became an organization with official standing when it joined the American Vocational Association.

Freeman's thesis work shows more specific facts concerning the history of the Tennessee Vocational Agriculture Teacher Association. During the summer conference of Smith-Hughes teachers of vocational agriculture at Knoxville in 1920, there was organized the Tennessee Association of Agricultural Teachers. This organization admitted all men who were teaching vocational agriculture in Tennessee. The organization set forth as its purposes to help each other, especially beginners, to standardize the work throughout the state, and to confer with the supervisor as a group through representatives. The major purpose was the foundation of a progressive plan of conducting the work in the county high schools.

The founders of the association expressed the desire that the organization might grow into a marketing agency for the products produced by the boys in their project work and that through it better seeds and animals in some cases might be purchased in quantity for boys desiring them for use in their practice programs and that it

would see to it through its officers that a number of contests and exhibits were arranged at the State Fair.

The first officers of the association were: President, C. F. Alden of Central High School, Nashville; Secretary-Treasurer, C. H. Moody of Central High School, Madisonville. Representatives of sectional leaders of the three geographical divisions of the state were: West Tennessee, Leonard J. Kerr, Millington; Middle Tennessee, R. E. Bruner, Lynnville; East Tennessee, Adams Phillips, Washington College. Sectional leaders were responsible for the development of the work in their sections and to get proper publicity through the Tennessee News Letter, a publication distributed through the office of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. They were to report all unusual successes and results so that other members of the profession could keep abreast of the work. This would have worked well except the men went home and in the busy rush of the job forgot about sending in any items.

The organization served a good purpose to unite teachers more closely but it did not accomplish the promotional work set out for it since transportation and communication was not as good then, as later, and the teachers tended to get lost in their work and became too busy to promote the work in their section as a cooperative group as the organization intended it to do.

J. T. Lovell, teacher at Cleveland, Tennessee and one of the first teachers in the state, gave some information that served to clarify some of the facts concerning the teacher association (45). He stated that the association had existed as an informal group before 1920 and that C. F. Alden, fondly referred to by the teachers as "Daddy" Alden, was looked to by the men for leadership. Alden was an older man than the majority of the teachers at that time and was willing to go to the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in matters concerning the welfare of the men. Lovell stated that the association was formed to work out something on salaries to get them more nearly in line with other teachers in the profession and to settle problems or grievances brought up in the group. Alden was elected first president due to his position of respect among the men and held the position for a number of years.

Some of the early secretaries of the organization were H. J. Fowler, J. H. Tucker, W. S. Baldwin, and J. D. Cliett.

In 1948 David McPherson and J. T. Lovell were elected delegates from the Tennessee Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association to the National Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association in Milwaukee. McPherson was instrumental in writing the constitution for the national organization. The year following McPherson's report to the Tennessee Association it became associated with the National Association for Vocational Agriculture Teachers.

# VI. THE MASTER TEACHER PROGRAM AND THE RATING OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS

G. E. Freeman stated that the master teacher program and the rating of the departments of vocational agriculture were not original with Tennessee (35). Other states in the South had used the idea of rating teachers as master teachers during the same period that this program existed in Tennessee. Most of the states in the southern region did participate in the contest during the years it was popular. Freeman thought this could be attributed to the fact that R. D. Maltby, Federal Agent for the Southern Region, was one of the original planners of the program. He spent much time promoting the program in the southern states.

While many of the individual states used the master teacher contest, it finally became so popular that it gradually evolved into the master teacher of the south.

The program was never designed as an administrative device but one to help the teacher of agriculture to examine his work and do some self evaluation. Many teachers, however, thought that they were being evaluated personally and that the evaluation might be to fire them or some other reason. Maltby was interested in the master teaching program because he felt that it was good evidence that he could present to congressmen and others when they wanted evidence of the work being done by the men in the field of vocational agriculture. He many times used the reports sent from the various states on the master

teacher program for this very purpose.

A scorecard devised by Maltby and the State Supervisor outlined the procedure for selecting the master teacher of the year (35). The first rating of departments and selection of the first master teacher is reported in the annual report of 1928 from the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture.

On the basis of the state contest teachers were selected, some eight to ten in number, by the state supervisory staff as being the ones most likely having a chance to win the contest. After these men were selected all the data possible concerning their work was collected such as program of work, accomplishments, long time plans and progress toward these plans, plus any other material that might show the work of the teacher in a favorable light. After this material was collected it was submitted to a committee usually composed of one member from the Southern Agriculturalist magazine, member of the editorial staff of the Progressive Farmer, Dean of the Agricultural College, and the editor of some metropolitan newspaper. These men reviewed the accomplishments of the names submitted and out of their deliberations came the one teacher designated master teacher of the year. Their selection was weighed and selected on the overall objectives of vocational agriculture. Teachers receiving the award are shown in Table VI.

Lovell stated that the award given to the master teacher, the year he received the award, was a gold key suitable inscribed. He was

TABLE VI

RECIPENTS OF THE MASTER TEACHER AWARD

| Year | Name | School |
|---|---|---|
| 1928 | Frate Bull | Clarksburg |
| 1929 | T. L. Mayes | Tazewell |
| 1930 | W. S. Baldwin | Milan |
| 1931 | J. T. Lovell | Cleveland |
| 1932 | J. H. Tucker | Donelson |
| 1933 | O. R. Long | Decaturville |
| 1934 | J. S. Irvine | Washington College |
| 1935 | N. H. Baulch | Gallatin |
| *1936 | C. T. Pardue | Paris |

*The master teacher award was discontinued in 1936 by order of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture G. E. Freeman.

to go to some western state and compete with others in the contest but it was during the depression years and there was not enough money to send him and he missed the trip. The same year he ranked second in the southern region. He felt that his program was hampered because of his teaching only half time.

The rating of vocational agriculture departments was in operation for nine years according to Freeman (35). One of his first official acts was to order the program discontinued in the year 1936 when he succeeded D. M. Clements as State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. He gave as a reason for discontinuing the program the dissatisfaction among the men concerning the purpose of the rating. Many of the men felt they were being rated personally instead of the department. Freeman was very emphatic in stating that the program was never an administrative device for such purposes. The program was designed to help the teacher of agriculture to examine his department and program of work and do some self evaluation. Freeman felt that the program did have merit and expressed the hope at the time of discontinuing the program that the men would still continue to try and use it to evaluate themselves.

Freeman told the writer this story to illustrate the discontinuance of the rating of departments and the selection of the master teacher which were closely related (35).

> A young teacher was attending a civic club and at the club a skit was presented for the entertainment of the group. The skit centered around an award of a Fedora hat to the club member who had been most faithful to his wife. There was a

> humorous list of criteria by which the young men in the club were measured. When the young teacher got home he related the story to his wife expecting her to go into gales of laughter but was very much surprised to see that she did not so much as smile. The young teacher questioned her as to her refusal to appreciate the humor of the situation to which she replied with the question, "Where is the hat?"

Freeman felt that when one man was picked from the group as a master teacher it left the other teachers in the position of the young teacher who failed to bring home the hat. He felt that the people in the various communities all felt that their agriculture teacher was good enough to win the master teacher award and he wanted them to keep thinking this.

The rating of departments was done on the basis of a score card which showed different evaluative devices to evaluate the department, the teacher's work, supervision, adult classes, and housekeeping in the department. A score was given each department and then rank was given each department from the highest score to the lowest. Departments were grouped into superior, standard and below standard. Many of the teachers made a strong effort to rank high in this program.

Nationwide evaluative criteria came out of the master teacher program and the department ratings. Evaluative Criteria for Teachers of Vocational Agriculture by Lathrop in the U. S. Office of Education was an outgrowth of the master teacher program, according to Freeman (35).

Because of the attitude of the teachers toward the program, it was discontinued in 1936.

## VII. IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

The Federal Board for Vocational Education in 1918 issued the first policy-making statement in regard to the professional improvement of vocational agriculture teachers in service (17, p. 21). It advised all State Directors of Vocational Agriculture to form some plan for professional improvement of the teachers. In some of the states the teachers were required to complete some project of professional improvement in the course of the year. This could be work at the University, short courses, or some correspondence work. The Board further stated that some means should be taken to evaluate and rate teacher's professional ability and movement.

Immediately after D. M. Clements became Sate Director of Vocational Agriculture in 1919 he embarked on a plan for improvement of the teachers that he referred to as emergency teachers. Fitzgerald states that the first courses taught in the Department of Agricultural Education were psychology, rural problems and methods (19). These were only figure heads and gave no indication of the type of material that was actually taught. Much of the material did not qualify the teacher to teach agriculture. Cliett states that the first course taught at The University of Tennessee for agriculture teachers in service was in 1918 by Dean Wilson. Only two people showed up for the course (15).

To understand the status of the vocational agriculture teacher in 1917 the reader should understand the requirements for the first agriculture teachers. Freeman stated that the agriculture teacher

then was required to be a college graduate, having training in agriculture with a B. S. degree (35). There was no certification program as such from 1917 until 1920. Teachers were granted a permit to teach by the State Board for Vocational Agriculture. Later on courses were given at The University of Tennessee by the Agriculture Education Department and through field courses and teachers conferences. Negro teachers were only required to have two years of college work since there was no four-year college course available for them.

In 1919 the Tennessee State Board of Vocational Education requested that during the emergency existing at that time that it be permitted to approve teachers who have the qualifications of a college education or its equivalent; successful teaching experience; two years of science of college grade; farm reared; at least a month's short course in technical agriculture preparatory to giving one year's work in vocational agriculture (88). This was the solution to the emergency problem of qualified teachers in vocational agriculture in order to carry on the work in Tennessee until such time as the Department of Agricultural Education under Fitzgerald at The University of Tennessee could set up a training program.

Lovell stated that the first teachers were required to go to summer school for three weeks each summer (45). Usually a specialist was brought in to teach such courses as would aid the teacher in his teaching and to remove the deficit qualifications of the teacher so as to meet the requirements of the State Board of Vocational Education.

The first state plan for improvement of teachers in service bears the date of 1919 and was for the years 1919 and 1920 (88). It stated that systematic visits would be made to vocational teachers for the purpose of giving them individual help. This was done through the itinerant teacher program. Definite monthly reports were to be required of the agriculture teachers. This was to be criticized and returned to the teacher by the supervisor. This was never done (19).

State and sectional meetings were held by the supervisor to discuss some of the troublesome problems.

Courses were given for the benefit of teachers then in service who were not graduates of an agricultural college. This meant that some of the early teachers did not have formal agriculture degrees but earned credits in service to qualify them under the Smith-Hughes law.

Freeman mentions the first conference in which teacher training was given in 1920 (35). It lasted four weeks and intensive courses were offered in farm mechanics, poultry, farm management, general methods, and agricultural methods. In addition to the courses pursued the men met for frequent round table discussion of their problems and a number of able lecturers on particular phases of the work were brought in from time to time to aid in the work. The total attendance at this conference and summer session was thirty-two teachers and prospective teachers of agriculture. Credit toward a Master's degree was allowed in these courses.

In 1921 a conference was held in Nashville and teachers who were particularly outstanding in some field of vocational agriculture told how they had done the teaching job. The men voted at this conference to discontinue state conferences until men could be paid for their travel. Sectional conferences and small group conferences were still held however. There was not a conference held in 1922.

In 1923 the teachers of the state again came together at Knoxville to spend ten intensive days in the job analysis of farm enterprises, part time, and evening work and, also, supervisory methods. Farm shop work and methods was also offered (35). Fitzgerald and Clements attempted to draw upon the most outstanding men in the country in their various fields related to the teaching of vocational agriculture. Among the men addressing the conference were C. B. Gentry, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education in Connecticut; George A. Works of Cornell University; J. A. James of the University of Wisconsin; Paul W. Chapman, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education of Georgia.

The theme of the conference was job analysis and teaching related to this method. The men had been trained and accustomed to teaching in units largely from textbooks and, therefore, the job analysis method presented by C. B. Gentry was received with much skepticism. Freeman relates that many of the teachers went home and gave the method a try and found it to have merit. Others were slow to take to the new method.

Letters in the files of the Department of Agricultural Education verify the fact that many of the teachers in the early 1920 and 1930 era left school with some training in the field of agriculture and went into teaching (31). They found the work in vocational agriculture under the Smith-Hughes Act to be attractive and came back to qualify for the work under the summer school program

The annual report of 1923 mentioned that training in service of new and experienced teachers on specialized jobs was done (60). The work offered was optional, however. Courses for men on the emergency list so far as professional training was concerned were offered courses in special methods for directed teaching.

The annual report of 1924 mentioned that the itinerant teacher had been busy visiting fourteen new teachers and older teachers making a total of thirty teachers visited (61). Teachers on the emergency list were offered correspondence courses in special methods based on the annual conference of the year before. Directed teaching was offered based on the experience and success of the teacher in his regular work in agriculture.

E. D. Stivers, itinerant teacher from The University of Tennessee in a letter to an agriculture teacher outlines work done in training men in service through small group conferences in 1926 (63). This work was on part-time work and took the form of round table discussions on teachers personal problems, study and discussion of the Federal Board Bulletin Number 108 and Federal Bulletin Number 112.

Freeman, Assistant State Director of Vocational Agriculture, was present with teachers Roberts, Meadows, Broyles, Gholson, Riggan and Moss. Similar meetings were held in Middle and West Tennessee divisions. L. J. Kerr, Assistant County Agent in Shelby County, was in charge of men in West Tennessee.

In-service training in 1928 emphasized supervision of project study and planning (65). Evening school work was encouraged.

The annual report of 1929 mentions that a three-weeks summer school was held from June 9 to 27th (85). One hundred twelve teachers were enrolled. Courses in organizing a course of instruction in agriculture, orienting students of vocational agriculture, agriculture outlook material, cooperative marketing, and conference methods of procedure in conducting evening classes were given. Classes were given in addition to the technical courses. Robert D. Maltby, Federal Agent for the South, spent one week with the teachers. Rogan, Craddock and LaCour, representing the Federal Farm Board, appeared before the entire group.

In-service training for teachers in 1937 was in the form of small group conferences, according to the annual report of that year (72). The areas studied were concerned with community programs and plans. This was carried on in connection with the one week of the annual state conference. Every teacher served on a committee and contributed to the annual program.

The annual report for 1939 mentions that the same procedure was followed as in 1937 (74).

In 1941 the in-service training program was carried out through small group conferences and the problem areas studied were program planning, planning out-of-school work, reports and teaching methods and planning the OSYA program (76).

The reader will see that prior to the above dates most of the in-service training of teachers had been done through the itinerant teacher program with one or two day or night meetings. Some work was offered to emergency teachers at The University of Tennessee. The remainder of the training work was done through the annual conference of vocational agriculture teachers. This work had to be of necessity hurried and intense since time was a limiting factor. Courses were not offered in the field for the men until 1950. The first course was offered in 1950 at Columbia, Tennessee for credit (48). Prior to this field courses had not carried graduate credit, had been short in duration, and had little carry-over effect and usefulness to the men in the field, according to Dr. A. J. Paulus. Courses in shop skills, technical shop teaching methods and arrangement, soils, feeding, farm management and crop pest control have been offered as field courses from The University of Tennessee since that time. These courses have done much to give the teachers in service the technical aid and training that they need to meet the real needs of their service areas.

Much of the in-service training work after the end of World War II had to do with the institutional on-the-farm training program for veterans. This was done largely through small group conferences held in the three geographical sections of the state.

## VIII. QUALIFICATIONS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

When the Smith-Hughes Act became a law in 1917 there were many agriculture teachers in Tennessee who were teaching non-vocational agriculture in the high schools of the state. The legislature of the state accepted the provisions of the law in the same year but since no program existed for training vocational teachers, the State Board was hard pressed to find teachers with the requirements to become Smith-Hughes teachers. It was not until April 1919 that a Department of Agricultural Education was set up at The University of Tennessee so that a time lag existed between the passing of the Smith-Hughes Act and the time when properly trained teachers could be produced.

The State Board for Vocational Education using the suggestions handed down from the Federal Board for Vocational Education proceeded to take measures to qualify teachers on an emergency basis so as to participate in the funds for vocational agriculture work during the year of 1917 and 1918 and for a few years following until such time as teachers could become qualified according to requirements of the law.

It was natural that the teachers of non-vocational agriculture in the schools become the first vocational agriculture teachers, which was the case. In order to qualify these men, the Tennessee State Board of Education requested that during the emergency outlined above that it be permitted to approve agricultural teachers who had the following qualifications: a college education or the equivalent; successful

experience in teaching, two years of science of college grade; farm reared; and at least two months short course in technical agriculture preparatory to giving one year's work in vocational agriculture. It was further believed that the teacher should be a man who was in sympathy with farm life and one who could command the respect of the farm people.

Lovell stated that it became necessary for the emergency teachers to qualify themselves through summer school work as soon as possible (45). He also stated that the only training that he had that related to teaching was a course taught by Dr. H. A. Morgan which was a rural sociology course.

Teacher-training of white teachers of agriculture were begun by the election of a faculty member to take charge of this work at The University of Tennessee April 1, 1919 and the formal beginning of the course in the fall of the same year according to Fitzgerald (31). Fitzgerald became the first head of the department and spent the time elapsing from the time of his election until the opening of the fall session of the University with the men in the field in an effort to get at their problems for purposes of curriculum building and aiding them in their work.

The courses outlined in 1919, according to Fitzgerald, were very theoretical in most respects because very little had been done that could be placed in courses in a tangible way. There was one three-hour course in special methods but the rest of the time was

made up in psychology, principles, general methods and courses in rural and vocational education. There were no electives in this eighteen semester hours of professional work. The eighteen hours was selected because of the state law. It has continued for some time to be the minimum as well as the maximum number of hours required since the establishment of the work. It has been the tendency of the Department of Agricultural Education to make the courses more practical from the very beginning of the work in 1919. A course in educational psychology is still required. All teaching was based on the farm survey and job analysis of farm enterprises.

The course in 1921-22 for prospective vocational agriculture teachers was a four-year course consisting of 139 semester hours which was outlined in a letter from Fitzgerald to D. M. Clements in April of 1921 (28). The entrance requirements stated that the student must be at least sixteen years old, have at least fifteen Carnegie units with three in English, two in mathematics, three in science which was to include physics. Four units in vocational agriculture could also be presented.

The course for freshmen at The University of Tennessee in 1921 listed English, mathematics, field crops, animal husbandry, chemistry, biology, agriculture, military science, and physical training and hygiene. The course for sophomores called for chemistry, bacteriology, zoology, dairy, general economics, animal husbandry, physics, soils, military science, physical training and hygiene.

The other two years consisted of agricultural education and technical agriculture courses.

The annual report of 1928 listed educational psychology which had been increased from a one-term three-hour course to a two-term three-hour course (65). Special methods were also given. The total hours of agricultural education consisted of twenty-seven hours. This twenty-seven hours has remained the requirement down through the years but the courses have been changed to meet the changing needs of the teachers.

Students were also required to visit boys on farms, observe agriculture teachers teach classes and do student teaching or directed teaching as it was called. The high school at Farragut became the first school to cooperate with the University in providing practice teaching experience (19). It was used very little in 1920 and 1921 due to the condition of the roads. Another high school at Fountain City became the first practice teaching school that gave the students their first experience in teaching vocational agriculture.

It was not until 1922 and 1923 that money was appropriated for a practice school that was under the control of the Department of Agricultural Education of The University of Tennessee (19). Up until this time cooperative agreements with the vocational agriculture departments existed and the cooperating teacher received no pay for his services.

Those teachers who completed the requirements for the B. S. degree in 1921 and 1922 were issued a five-year certificate to teach

vocational agriculture (19). Prior to this period no certification program existed except the emergency certification plan.

The courses offered in agricultural education in 1925 consisted of organization of vocational agriculture, directed problems, methods and materials in vocational agriculture, farm shop work, vocational education and practice teaching (19). Project visitation was also required.

In a letter written by Fitzgerald an outline of the requirements of Smith-Hughes work for qualification of vocational agriculture teachers was given (34). The requirements called for ninety quarter hours of agricultural subjects plus seventeen hours of special methods in agricultural education.

Another letter of the same year listed the courses offered which consisted of general psychology, principles of secondary education, materials and methods in vocational agriculture, vocational agricultural education, and practice teaching in vocational agriculture.

A letter from Fitzgerald listed the requirements of vocational agriculture teachers as sixty-six hours of agriculture and twenty-two hours of agricultural education of which one-half could be general education (24).

In 1938 the requirements of vocational agriculture teachers was outlined in a letter to H. B. Smith by Fitzgerald (29). In the junior and senior years specific courses in a field were not required but a certain number of hours credit in each subject matter department

were required as follows: agricultural economics, nine hours; agricultural engineering, three hours; agronomy, nine hours; animal husbandry, twelve hours; dairy husbandry, nine hours; and horticulture, nine hours.

The reader will see that from an uncertain beginning when the needs of the teacher were not known that a gradual process of changing to meet the needs of the teacher gave him the training that was required to teach present day vocational agriculture. Courses in the early days were mainly titles and tended to hinge on sociology and psychology. Gradually method courses were added. While the hours of agricultural education have remained around the twenty-seven hour figure, the courses have changed with the times. Freeman explained the reason for the twenty-seven hour requirement remaining the same as one of convenience. Many of the older men who held certificates to teach vocational agriculture would find their certificate invalid if a constant change was made in the quarter-hour requirement. The State Board felt that it would be wiser to let the hour requirement remain the same and change the courses in order to facilitate the above plan.

The Tennessee regulations for certification of teachers of vocational agriculture as of February 11, 1955 by the State Board of Education was as follows: the candidate must complete a four year curriculum in an institution approved by the State Board for Vocational Education and by the U. S. Office of Education for the training of teachers of vocational agriculture. The only institutions with this

approval were The University of Tennessee and Agricultural and Industrial University for Negroes. In addition specific training in the following fields were required: communication including composition, literature, advanced writing and speech, mathematics designed to meet the needs of students in such fields as natural science, statistics, genetics and land engineering. Social science including economics, government, history, psychology and sociology. Natural science including botany, zoology, bacteriology, entomology, genetics, chemistry and physics. Agriculture, including the following, with a minimum of ninety quarter hours credit. A maximum of thirty-six quarter hours of general or introductory course in: agronomy, animal husbandry, dairy husbandry, poultry husbandry, and horticulture. Agricultural economics including farm management, agricultural marketing and farm finance. Agricultural engineering including farm shop, farm power and machinery, farm buildings and land engineering (irrigation, drainage and terracing) was required. Animal nutrition and one or more advanced courses in each of the following fields: animal science including feeding, breeding, hygiene and management of meat animals, dairy cattle and poultry, plant science including breeding, physiology, pathology and production of cereal crops, forage crops and pastures, cotton, corn, fruits, vegetables, farm forests and other special crops common to the area. Soil science including classification, fertility, conservation and soil and crop management and in addition to the above, there was a requirement of twenty-seven hours of agricultural education.

Vocational agriculture teachers have earned their degrees of Bachelor of Science in agriculture from the various state universities. Many have received Master's degrees from such colleges as the George Peabody College for Teachers and other state institutions. In 1927 and 1930 the Davidson County Board of Education offered to pay anyone's tuition to Peabody if they would do work toward their Master's degree. Many of the teachers got the Master's degree in this way, according to G. E. Horn (44). The Knapp School of country life under Dr. Kary C. Davis was the department under which many of the teachers including D. M. Clements, G. E. Horn, J. H. Tucker, M. D. Capps, Huddleston, now at Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, and Jerry Evans, received their M. A. degrees. Peabody did not train men under the Smith-Hughes Act, according to Freeman (35). However, it did train women as home economics teachers for Smith-Hughes certification for a few years. Peabody was instrumental in giving valuable training in the amount of fifty to sixty hours in technical agriculture to teachers who later qualified to teach vocational agriculture at the University.

It was of interest to note some of the problems in the early life of the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee in gettting approval of the University staff on a sound course of training for teachers of vocational agriculture.

Freeman, Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture at that time, relates an incident concerning the course of training (35).

According to Freeman, the problem of getting a satisfactory curriculum approved by members of the University staff had been difficult due in part to the lack of facts which would show the type of program the teachers in the field needed. Freeman and Clements had discussed the problem for some time and it was felt that the agricultural subjects then offered to teachers in the state through the University did not properly equip them to teach. They designed a survey in which they asked the men then teaching to designate courses that they had at the University that was of most value to them and those that the felt were least valuable to them. They were also asked to list the courses that they felt would be valuable to them. In addition, they were asked to make a list of the activities that they were called on in their community to do in which they had no training. Armed with this information Clements and Freeman asked to appear before the faculty of the College of Agriculture and discuss a program that would fit the vocational agriculture teacher's needs as indicated by the survey.

Dr. H. A. Morgan, then Dean of the College of Agriculture, was somewhat shocked and chagrined to know that the people were not satisfied with the program then offered. He felt that an attempt was being made to disrupt the college program and made remarks at some length to this effect. Dean Hoskins who was also present at the meeting reminded Dr. Morgan that the Director and Assistant Director were asked to come there and present their case and as guests were entitled to courtesy befitting a guest which he did not feel they were getting.

After thinking over the proposals made by the Director and his staff and the evidence presented to them from the agriculture teachers, a committee was appointed from the faculty of the agriculture college to study the needs of the vocational agriculture teachers relative to a curriculum fitted to their needs. Many of the department heads were antagonistic to the plan but a few, such as Professor Wiley of the Dairy Department, took up the cause and after a few years of proposals, trial and error an acceptable course in agricultural education was provided suitable to both parties.

## VIII. VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHING AIDS

Probably, the first mention of any technical aid recommended to the teachers of agriculture was revealed in a letter written in 1919 by Clements to Fitzgerald immediately after his appointment as State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture (12). Clement asked if Fitzgerald had received his copy of Stimson's new book, "Vocational Agricultural Education by Project Work." He thought it was fine and that Fitzgerald should have a copy before he taught his short course. Clements further mentioned that he had written every teacher in the state telling them to get a copy at once.

Freeman pointed out the meager supplies and visual aids in the early years. He recalled that in the first school he taught they did not even furnish chalk. Transportation was not furnished and even the light bill was paid by the community. This situation forced early

teachers to go out in the field and seek their own visual aids. A picture, shown to the writer, of the agriculture laboratory at Cleveland in the early twenties revealed all sorts of specimens, including corn, grafts, insects, hay samples, soil samples and so on. Much of this material was collected by the teacher and students on field trips. It was bulky and because of its nature attracted dust, mice, weevils and was difficult to store.

The annual report of the Supervisor in 1921 stated that special attention had been given to visual instruction, farm shop and exhibit work (58). Visual aids such as stereopticans, charts, local slides and other material had been supplied to departments. Some of the old stereopticans can still be found in some of the older departments. The annual report of 1922 mentions that there were new publications out for that year including The Survey as a Means of Working Out a Course of Study in Vocational Agriculture which was worked out by the Department of Agriculture Education (59). In addition, A Bibliography of Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service Bulletins was compiled by the Department of Education. These early attempts at teaching according to the needs in the community formed the foundation for later concepts of teaching.

The 1922 report added that addition and changes in equipment included lanterns, moving picture machines, reference material, both books and bulletins, file cases and display cases. It mentioned that teachers had access of visual material of the Division of Extension

which was used a great deal. Offices were well equipped with desks, mimeographs, microscopes and supplies deemed necessary to teach agriculture at that time. Mention was also made of the laboratory of a model vocational agriculture department used at the University Department of Agricultural Education for teacher training.

In the annual report of 1926, the Supervisor reported the regular monthly Newsletter and Market Service Bulletin were the only two publications of the year and were very popular (63). Some of the vocational agriculture teachers interviewed who were teaching about that time mentioned the Market Bulletin. Its purpose was to help the boys sell their livestock and other items. Each teacher was to send in items to make up the bulletin. This was done for a short time but teachers got busy and neglected to send in items and the bulletin soon was dropped.

The 1928 annual report of the Supervisor listed publications for that year as Newsletter, Market Service Bulletin, and F. F. T. Newsletter (65). The F. F. T. Newsletter was a new publication started that year and it alternated with the teacher Newsletter. The F. F. T. Newsletter was the forerunner of the Rising Sun which was later changed to the Tennessee Future Farmer Magazine.

The descriptive report of 1938 states that no new publications were issued that year, but mentions that A. J. Paulus was subject matter specialist and that E. B. Knight was added to do research at the Department of Agricultural Education at The University of Tennessee (73).

Mimeographed materials used by students of vocational agriculture and carried home to the parents resulted in more adults coming to evening schools according to the 1941 descriptive report (76). The report further stated that Paulus was assembling subject matter in several fields; that studies were made by Knight and Rollins on out-of-school rural youth and the use of a local farm for teaching all day students. W. E. Robinson, vocational agriculture teacher at Karns, had made a study of evening class work in the Karns community. Knight had completed research work on supervised farming programs. All of the data were made available to teachers across the state for their guidance. This type of work became characteristic of the type of teaching aids given to teachers of agriculture in the field.

The descriptive report of 1941 further mentioned a farm placement study made of 15,000 individual farms and tabulated by the teacher training staff. Other teaching aids used that year were soil maps, farm surveys, studies of labor distribution, land use, economic studies, nutritional needs and individual farm needs. War clouds were looming on the horizon and such programs as the OSYA came into being to teach skills needed in the war effort. This logically fell to the vocational division to administrate. For the first time, teaching aids such as welding equipment, electricity and other new skills began to appear in vocational agriculture departments. Much of this material and the know-how became permanent segments of the vocational agriculture program. After the war many of these teaching aids were retained and used.

The Vocational Education Act of 1946, also known as the George-Barden Act of 1946, amended the Act of 1936 relating to vocational education to provide for the further development of vocational education in the states and territories. Insofar as visual aids and other teaching aids was concerned, the act stated that after June 30, 1951 not more than 10 per cent of the amount appropriated could be used for the purchase of equipment (42, pp. 605-606).

Dr. A. J. Paulus came to the Agricultural Education Department of The University of Tennessee in 1934 and has served from that date to the present as Research Materials Specialist. He had served longer than any other person in this capacity. Dr. Paulus stated in an interview that J. B. Kirkland made it a practice to write up the practice teaching work of the agricultural students and file this for future reference material. This was all the material that had been compiled in the way of research before Paulus' arrival at the University.

The first mimeo put out by Dr. A. J. Paulus was Mimeo 3 on hybrid corn (7). It was his purpose to secure information for teachers on this because there was very little known on this subject at the time. Dr. Paulus stated that there was a great deal of difficulty in getting the data for the publication due to the fact that many of the experiment station men did not understand the value and purpose of the mimeo.

The most difficult avenue of Dr. Paulus' job was to get the road paved for proper relationships and understandings between The University of Tennessee research personnel and the vocational

agriculture teacher. This had been the lifelong ambition of Dr. Paulus according to a statement made by him in an interview (48).

Through the years many teaching aids have been issued through the Agricultural Education Department largely by Dr. Paulus' efforts. Some of the more famous ones have been Mimeo 25 on soils, a hog mimeo and a recent one on pastures. The soils mimeo has since been revised. The popularity and value of these teaching aids is reflected in their ready acceptance and constant use by the teachers of agriculture in the field.

Field courses are rather recent in origin. Their value as a teaching aid should not be overlooked or minimized in a narrative of this sort. Some difficulty was experienced by the staff of the Agricultural Education Department in developing these courses. Some of the staff of the University doubted the advisability of having these courses away from the College of Agriculture campus. It necessitated the travel of members of the faculty into the field away from the teaching facilities of the campus. The cost could be questioned. Through the efforts of Dr. Paulus and others of the agriculture education staff permission was granted to hold the first field course on soils and farm mechanics in Columbia, Tennessee in 1950. Other field non-credit courses of limited scope had been offered before but this was the first course to carry full college credit. Many of these non-credit courses had little carry over into teaching. The Columbia course met with wide approval of the teachers in the field. This

sentiment, in turn, was shared by the University staff members who found that much of the material taught by them, to students who were to become prospective teachers, at the University was not in keeping with the needs of a prospective vocational agriculture teacher. They in turn revised their courses to meet the new needs as they found them to be with the teachers in the field. In succeeding years other courses based on teachers requests were offered including shop methods, crop pest control, farm management, feeds and feeding, farm mechanics and others.

There has been another teaching aid used by teachers of vocational agriculture that the author deems worthy of mention in a discussion of this subject. This aid was the use of local advisory councils otherwise known by such names as advisory committees, advisory groups and so on. The philosophy connected with advisory councils was that they furnish the teacher with local advice from members of the community from the farmers' viewpoint. This concept was sound and it seemed that such a group could be of invaluable aid to teachers of vocational agriculture. In some cases much success seemed to have been gained by such an advisory group. Other attempts have failed. The use of a formal advisory council had not been widespread in Tennessee. Guidance and advice from certain members in the community had been used by teachers in planning an effective program of instruction for many years.

Freeman stated in an interview that the idea of advisory committees had been used ever since there had been vocational agriculture

programs in Tennessee (35). These councils did not receive formal appointments as had been the case in later years, but were used for specific purposes and advisory counsel was sought when some specific problem presented itself. Freeman recalled that he used them at McLemoresville when he started teaching in 1917 to help him decide what to teach to adult farmers. These farmers were key farmers that were used to decide on how, what, when and where things were to be taught. To find the interests of the class, the whole groups was sometimes used in this capacity. Advisory councils were a must in Freeman's estimation. No teacher, according to him, could be successful in a community without one. He felt that it gave such people prestige value to serve on such a committee in a community. Not only that, but Freeman felt that this was the only subject in school that members felt that they had a say so in and a chance to be represented in the affairs of what was taught to their children.

The only official account that the writer was able to find on advisory councils in the early years was found in the state Newsletter of 1926 in which an item appeared from G. E. Freeman, then Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, in which he urged teachers to use five men as an advisory council (54).

Section III on page 6 of the 1947-52 state plan makes a very brief statement concerning advisory committees (89). It provides for representatives on local advisory committees, if any such are used, and states that teachers of vocational agriculture will be expected to

organize and make maximum use of local advisory committees in planning and evaluating the program of vocational agriculture in the school and community.

Bonard S. Wilson, Head of the Agricultural Education Department, did much to further the philosophy underlying the use of advisory councils. Many of the students trained under him successfully formed and used formal advisory groups. Some of these were Henry C. Colston at Mount Pleasant and A. O. Ramey at Hohenwald.

# CHAPTER VI

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION IN TENNESSEE

### I. EARLY PROGRAMS OF INSTRUCTION IN TENNESSEE

It will be remembered by the reader, that prior to the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in February of 1917, that a number of high schools in Tennessee had been offering courses in non-vocational agriculture. These schools were more nearly equipped to begin teaching vocational agriculture under the new Federal program. Early in April of that year, Grove High School of Paris, of which D. M. Clements was agriculture teacher and principal, a program of vocational agriculture was set up becoming one of the first in the nation to plan such a program (9).

The transition from non-vocational agriculture to vocational agriculture was slow. The school year 1917-18 saw five more schools qualify for the work. By the end of the year the enrollment in the six white schools showed 189 boys. The early 1920's showed steady growth, and by the end of the school year 1927, which made vocational agriculture ten years old, there were 122 white and twenty negro departments of vocational agriculture.

The Federal Bulletin 13 of the Federal Board of Vocational Education of 1918 outlined the regulations under which programs of instruction were to be offered (17, pp. 9-18). In general, schools

were to maintain a course of study of not less than one year and not more than four years in length. Schools offering one year must spend 50-75 per cent of the time on agriculture. A four year offering required 50 per cent of the time. This gave rise to the one-half day in agriculture and one-half day in other school subjects. Each student was to spend at least ninety minutes per day on practical learning by doing work.

It was further stipulated that these periods of agricultural instruction were not to be broken periods, but were to run continuously. This allowed time for field trips over the country for observation and demonstration, and allowed time for practical skill development by doing.

The bulletin outlined methods of instruction at length. Practical work, laboratory work, and theoretical instruction should be required. The instruction was to be practical and experimenting was to be avoided, since the student was to produce rather than to experiment. Functional agriculture was encouraged with the pupil having an opportunity to do some of the work rather than strictly class work.

Plans were also outlined by the bulletin in regard to supervised practice work. This practice work could be secured in two ways, either by working on the school farm under the immediate supervision of the vocational agriculture teacher; by working on the home farm under the supervision of the teacher; or the parent in the absence of the teacher.

The home project should consist of the productive enterprise along with the practices and records needed to efficiently and economically obtain the most from it. Other farm jobs should be learned along with the project.

It was of interest to note the schedule as recommended and outlined by Bulletin of the State Board of Vocational Education in 1917 (35). Agriculture was to be taught one-half day and science, mathematics, English, and history the other half. Agriculture was to be taught in the morning and related subjects in the afternoons. In this way, two years of agriculture were given each year by grouping first and third year agriculture together one year and second and fourth year together the next year. By so doing, the boy was able to get four years of agriculture. To the author this seemed to dictate the school program to a school, as was the case. However, there were more rural boys in schools at this time and many school systems were eager to obtain Federal aid for the school program and were willing to comply. This sort of schedule was revised soon after this to more nearly balance the time for each subject in school.

The author asked Freeman how early teaching compared with present day teaching of vocational agriculture. His reply was, "There is no comparison." He recalled that the early teacher taught agriculture on and out of agriculture text books. He knew nothing about analyzing a farm enterprise into teaching jobs as is more modern procedure. He had no plan for teaching except the one that he had

observed his professor in college using. The work was not vocational in the sense in more modern teaching. Most of the work of the teacher was directed at correcting certain farm practices. There was no thought given to farm management, economics, soil conservation and many other phases of the modern agricultural program. This sort of teaching, in Freeman's opinion, continued until three or four years after the birth of the Smith-Hughes Act. A change came about as a result of the efforts of N. E. Fitzgerald who brought C. B. Gentry from Connecticut to a teachers conference to present, a then new concept, of the job analysis method of teaching. There were twenty-seven agricultural teachers present for this conference and they greeted the radical idea with scorn and ridicule. None of them accepted the method at conference because they thought it a bit of theoretical nonsense and unworkable. However, many of them went home and secretly tried it out on one or two enterprises and found that it had merit. By the next conference many, although not ready to admit it for fear of ridicule by their fellow teachers, had given the job analysis a try. From this beginning the teachers and teacher trainers began to teach by analyzing a farm enterprise and dividing it into jobs and teaching these jobs as shown by a survey of community needs. This method continues to be used by teachers of vocational agriculture.

It is of passing interest to note an item appearing in a letter from N. E. Fitzgerald in 1919 to all vocational agriculture teachers concerning the visiting of project work (23). He requested that teachers

advise the state office as to the method of conveyance used in visting projects--whether auto, motorcycle, horseback, buggy, bicycle, and who owned it.

Mimeo 2 from the same source urged teachers to report exact hours and minutes spent in visiting projects. This was to encourage teachers to stay long enough at once place to do some good. A report was required on all projects by the end of each week. It recorded the labor involved, the condition of the crop, the production and sale. Present day teachers would rebel at such detailed reports if they were required.

In June of 1919, Fitzgerald advised the agriculture teachers of the appointment of D. M. Clements as a permanent State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture (22). He expressed the hope that the program of work would go more smoothly, and that he would aid the teachers with bulletins, letters and personal visits to get the work in the state on a firmer basis.

## II. THE ALL DAY PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Much has already been said concerning early programs of vocational agriculture in Tennessee. Early teachers did not teach functional agriculture to students. Much of the course content was based on text books written by so-called experts of the day. This was the way the teachers had been taught in college and was the only way they knew to teach students in high school. It was true that at first the

teachers had a half day to carry students on field trips, which they often did. Early students of vocational agriculture of the writer's acquaintance related incidents concerning activities in classes they attended. They often pruned grape vines, culled poultry, did veterinary work for farmers and selected field seed. Still most farm practices were taught from books. This type of program continued until Fitzgerald invited Gentry to come to Tennessee and educate the teachers on the method of teaching based on the needs of the various enterprises. This was slow to take shape in the departments, but as teachers tried the method they found it to have merit and began to use it.

The first courses in agriculture were text book courses which taught livestock one year and crops the next and so on until all general farm areas were covered. Teachers were apt to assign reading assignments in texts and then follow the question and answer procedure the next day.

The project method was generally conceded to have been introduced by Rufus W. Stimson while he served as Massachusetts State Supervisor of Agricultural Education (55, pp. 506-507). He wrote text books on project methods which were widely read and accepted by teachers of agriculture.

The problem method of instruction which is widely used by teachers of agriculture at present was introduced by W. H. Lancelot of Iowa State College (55, p. 508). Vocational agriculture teachers

use this approach based on the problems anticipated by students in their farming programs which include a wide variety of projects or enterprises.

The conference or discussion method came into being as a result of the work done by Charles R. Allen (55, p. 508). This method is incorporated in the teaching methods of agriculture teachers and coupled with the problem method provides a very satisfactory teaching procedure which enables the teacher and students to get at the real problems and their solution found in the students supervised farming program.

Early projects were apt to be thought of in terms of one pig, one acre of corn or a few chickens for home use. As time went on more diversified programs that were typical of a well rounded farming program came into being and became larger in scope. Improvement projects, approved farm practices, farm shop and farm records were later added to the program.

The annual report of 1924 serves to show vocational agriculture students' yields in various projects (61). When the reader compares these early efforts with modern day yields, he can visualize the giant strides made possible through research and education. Table VII shows the project yields for the year 1924. Table VIII shows labor income per capita and per unit for 1924.

Many of the early teachers such as G. E. Horn at Coleman-Brown High School taught students through the use of cooperative endeavors such as super baby beef shows, buying fruit trees cooperatively and setting them out, and buying fertilizer and using it on projects.

TABLE VII

AVERAGE PROJECT YIELDS AS COMPARED TO AVERAGE STATE YIELDS, 1924

| | White | | Negro | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crop | Project Yield | State Yield | Project | State |
| Corn | 40.5 bu. | 24 bu. | 36.7 bu. | 24 bu. |
| Cotton | 203 lb. | 189 lb. | 181 lb. | 189 lb. |
| Irish Potatoes | 96.4 bu. | 66 bu. | 41 bu. | 66 bu. |
| Sweet Potatoes | 137.2 bu. | 112 bu. | 92 bu. | 112 bu. |
| Strawberries | 1193 qts. | 1207 qts. | 2304 qts. | 1207 qts. |
| Tobacco | 1050 lb. | 810 lb. | | |

TABLE VIII

LABOR INCOME PER CAPITA AND PER UNIT COMPARISON FOR WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE, 1924

| Crop | White | | Negro | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Per Capita | Per Unit | Per Capita | Per Unit |
| Corn | $175.16 | $ 25.26 | $ 70.01 | $ 34.96 |
| Cotton | 130.11 | 44.07 | 141.33 | 52.26 |
| Tomatoes | 223.21 | 144.84 | 18.49 | 36.99 |
| Irish Potatoes | 73.47 | 48.13 | 22.45 | 44.90 |
| Sweet Potatoes | 144.66 | 126.57 | 35.27 | 64.97 |
| Strawberries | 81.83 | 49.10 | 104.51 | 116.12 |
| Tobacco | 245.95 | 177.62 | | |
| Dairy | 285.63 | 63.03 | 135.84 | 78.37 |
| Poultry | 107.83 | 1.43 | 43.78 | 1.60 |
| Hogs | 54.51 | 11.39 | 36.25 | 18.60 |

Horn recalled that he used to have a cooperative feeding and hatching chick project which was for the benefit of boys living in town who had no facilities for farming (44).

The annual report of 1925 was the first official account of the development of supplementary supervised practice and instruction on a job basis (62). The same report also mentioned that all departments of vocational agriculture had been inspected for filing systems, plans of work, community surveys, teaching schedules, adequate teaching equipment, properly catalogued libraries, and farm shops. Leaders felt that the time had passed when departments were not well equipped. The fact that the supervisory staff was aware of the necessity of the above items indicates the type of instructional program that was expected at this time.

The 1934 annual report gave some indication of the extent of the all day program in that year (69). It listed 9,717 total enrollment in projects, 292 day unit classes, 232 part-time classes with a total number of individuals carrying on improved practices of 3,220.

Prior to 1941 and the advent of World War II, much of the farm shop program was limited to rope and leather work, blacksmith work, and farm carpentry. Defense training focused on vocational training as never before. The vocational agriculture department became one of the logical units to carry on this war training work. The farm shop profited more than any other phase of the program. Perhaps, are welding and gas welding were introduced. Few of the teachers

knew the fundamentals necessary to teach these new skills and they sought the aid of experts in the industrial plants who served as instructors. Later teachers were able to obtain training at The University of Tennessee in these new skills, which became an important part of the training for students in agricultural education at the University.

Much of the instruction during the war years was based on maximum food production to aid in the war effort. Victory gardens and other programs were encouraged among all day students.

Part-time work became less needed due to the fact that young men were going into service, or the OSYA program was satisfying the needs of this program.

During the war years the quality of instruction suffered as many of the vocational agriculture teachers went into service or war work. Many teachers were lacking in the proper qualifications for teaching. When the war ended this situation was quickly changed, and by 1952, the situation was back to normal with new departments opening up and the work going forward in a normal manner.

By 1952 many economic changes were taking place that made wide changes in the program of vocational agriculture. Towns in Tennessee were becoming industrialized with the coming of factories such as the Murry Ohio Plant in Lawrenceburg.

Part-time farming was on the increase. Many young people who originally intended to farm found the factory wages more to their

liking. This was further strengthened by a bad drought, a period of falling prices, plus the high cost of farm operation.

At the same time farmers were more receptive to educational opportunities and youngsters were expanding their farming operations.

Sears Roebuck and Company formed "pig chains" and "bull chains" in an attempt to aid all day students. Vocational agriculture teachers were attempting to adjust the program to new farming concepts and labor requirements.

New cash crops such as strawberries, peas, okra, and pepper were tried in some areas such as Lawrence County under the direction of Zell King, vocational agriculture teacher.

The new program of vocational agriculture had to move rapidly to keep up with the fast changes taking place in the field of agriculture. At no time in history had there been greater strides made in the field of agriculture than in the period between World War I and the birth of vocational agriculture and World War II at which time it became of age.

The reader may trace the growth of the all day program of vocational agriculture, both negro and white, by consulting Appendix A which shows the number of teachers and departments from 1917 to 1956.

## III. SUPERVISED FARMING PROGRAMS

The first state plan drawn up in the year 1919 stated that each student taking vocational agriculture must complete at least six

months of supervised practical work (88). This practical work was to be secured in either of two ways. It could be obtained by work on the school farm, or on the home farm, and was to be under the direction of the vocational agriculture teacher, or the parents in his absence. The plan outlined the supervised work in a program of two parts: a home project which the boy accepted full responsibility for financing, doing the work, keeping books and the taking of inventories and making profit statements; in addition, the boy was to carry out any laboratory exercises, now called supplementary practices, in which he needed to develop skill in the successful completion of the project. It will be noted that the term project is used. The usual meaning in the early days was more often interpreted by the boy to be one pig, one acre of corn, or a few chickens for home use. Some time was needed over the years to change this concept and develop full rounded farming programs that students have today.

The first annual report in 1918 showed only a few hundred dollars pupil's labor income (57). The 1946 report, by comparison, showed $1,363,154.00 in pupil's labor income from 12,253 completed enterprises (80). This, a far cry from the one pig concept, showed the nature and development of a true farming program.

In 1921 it was assumed by the writer that no annual program of work was made by the teacher of vocational agriculture, since it was noted that annual project records served in this capacity as the later counterpart of an annual program of work.

J. T. Lovell recalled that in the first two years that he taught, it was necessary for him to visit the farms of the boys in a horse and buggy (45). It was his custom to leave home and stay out a week visiting the farming programs of the boys, and stay all night wherever he happened to be when night came. This was done during the summer months. He later got a Model T Ford to do his supervision on the farms.

Bulletin 2, an early report of the Tennessee Board of Vocational Education, gave a form for project agreements between the student, parent and teacher which outlined the plan by which the home project was to be carried out (57). It specified such things as scope, land, animals, equipment, time required, project profits, records and other facts pertaining to the program. All students were required to get the agreement signed after which it was mailed to the State Supervisor's office. Such agreements are still used but are not mandatory.

It has been generally agreed among early leaders in the field of vocational agriculture that John T. Wheeler most likely originated the idea of the present concept of farm projects and on-the-farm supervision program (19). One can see the likelihood of this by reading some of Wheeler's early books dealing with the subject.

Several of the teachers in Tennessee were of the opinion that N. E. Fitzgerald did much to originate this concept in Tennessee. Fitzgerald stated that this was not the case. He suggested that the concept of teaching on the basis of the needs of the students supervised

farming program came out of the deliberations of the Southern Regional Conference of the twelve Southern states in the conference. He did present this concept to the vocational agriculture teachers in the state for their consideration and trial and did much to promote the idea. This was the turning point which brought about a change from the old view of one pig project to the idea of a full rounded farming program.

Fitzgerald pointed out that this work originated from the efforts of the Regional Conference in 1927. Other educational leaders given credit for the movement by Fitzgerald were Eaton, Cornell, Stimson, Field and George A. Work.

The general situation of student's supervising farming programs and farming in general was described by the annual report of the Supervisor of 1931 (66). In that year the state suffered from one of the worst droughts in the history of Tennessee, along with the lowest prices for farm products in years. Financial returns from the practice programs for the year of 1929-30 showed an income of $468,466.16 and for 1930-31 $464,264.15 which was a decrease of $4,182.01. This period later became known as the depression years.

The types of farm practices carried out by students have undergone radical changes over the years as new practices developed in agriculture. This was evident when one observed some of the samples taken from the annual report of the supervisor in 1922 concerning practices carried out in the supervised farming programs as compared to practices in recent years (59).

The report lists such practices as pruning trees, hillside ditching, fly traps, carbide house, and installation of cesspools. It was also noted that some practices that are still carried out were evident such as farm records, making self feeders, fencing, gates, installing lights and other modern day farm practices.

The 1922 report also reported 2,200 poultry projects, five hog, and 417 acres cultivated in connection with part-time projects.

The annual report of the Supervisor in 1923 showed an enrollment in vocational agriculture of 2,807 all day white students with project profits of $224,703.33 (60). The supervisor noted that this gave a return of $4.45 for every dollar of Federal money spent on the program for that year.

The annual report of 1924 showed 3,094 persons engaged in supervised practice work and earnings of $365,168.00 (61). In 1925, 3,894 persons earned $554,905.97 which was a significant figure in that for the first time the farming program earnings had surpassed the half million dollar mark in the state (62). In this same year there were grown 11,569 acres of crops. Animal projects represented 3,521 head of livestock, 60,490 chickens and orchard work involving 28,971 fruit trees. These figures indirectly indicate the type of farming programs carried out at this period.

The need for the improvement of supervised practice work in the departments of vocational agriculture was indicated in a letter to E. D. Stivers from G. E. Freeman, then Assistant State Supervisor

in 1927, in which he indicated that it would be well to hold the teachers conference in Memphis to work on this phase of the program (38). He indicated that the entire time could be profitably spent on supervised practice work since many programs were not well chosen.

The annual report of 1928 mentioned that twelve group conferences were held consisting of two day duration and that the entire time was devoted to the keeping of project records which the supervisor felt was the outstanding accomplishment of the year (65). This would indicate that during the late twenties much thought and effort was given in all areas of instruction to developing and improving the supervised farming programs.

Supervised practice statistics for the all day enrollment in project work for 1928 showed a total of 5,704 students doing project work. The statistics for the following year, 1929, showed a sharp drop in enrollment from the above figure to 3,686 (85). One might assume that this was the beginning of the depression effects. The same report showed 8 per cent of all practices completed which was a creditable showing in view of the severe drought.

The outstanding development in supervised farming in 1932 programs involved the supplying of a new project record book and a major effort centered on getting all freshmen to set up four-year farming programs (67).

The 1933 annual report on supervised farming statistics showed a total enrollment in project work of 9,717 (68).

Most of the activities in supervised farming programs in 1933 were centered around the New Deal government program, but the Supervisor noted in his report that although an effort had been made by teachers to develop first class programs, they had fell far short of this goal.

The annual descriptive report of 1935 was more encouraging concerning the supervised farming program (70). A great deal of growth and recovery from the devastating depression was noted in the enrollment in projects in the amount of 11,526 students.

Conditions in agriculture in the years of 1942 and 1943 were centered on all-out war production and food and fiber for the war effort. The report of the Supervisor stated that enlargement of student's supervised farming programs would be developed along lines designed to produce more food and fiber (77).

With the return of many of the former vocational agriculture teachers from armed forces, 1945 was year of increased growth of both departments and students (79). Many of the old teachers who had taught before the war returned to the classroom and substantial growth through the next few years began. Records showed that in the period from 1945 to 1949 there was a 59.9 per cent increase. There were 177 white teachers teaching 8,991 students in 180 departments of vocational agriculture in 1945. By 1949 there was an increase of 249 teachers teaching 15,269 students in 243 departments. This showed a phenominal increase and revived interest in vocational agriculture.

The supervised farm practice program carried on by boys in vocational agriculture showed a greater increase brought about partly by increase in prices. The 1945 report showed 12,566 enterprises completed for a labor income of $1,175,912.73. The 1948 annual report showed 17,184 enterprises completed for a labor income of $2,483,922.85 (81). This then is the growth of farming programs from one pig project to large well-rounded farming programs involving large operations, capital, and machinery running into amounts shown above. Supervised farming programs had become big business!

## IV. THE ADULT EVENING SCHOOL PROGRAM

At the time that the Smith-Hughes Act was passed in 1917 it was not clearly defined, insofar as adult work was concerned, that such instruction could be carried on by teachers of vocational agriculture. Most of such work was carried on by the Extension Service. Their programs usually consisted of one night meeting on some subject of interest to the farmers at that time and usually there was no follow-up of other courses.

The years 1920-21 marked the beginning of evening schools when leaders in vocational agriculture began to realize that the clause in the Act referring to those over fourteen years of age included adults. According to Vocational Division Bulletin 217 the program had difficulties and failed to grow until 1929 when a specialist in adult education was appointed by the Federal Board for Vocational Education

(55, p. 508). After this appointment steady growth began.

There are different opinions by various individuals in Tennessee as to who taught the first adult evening class. It is generally thought that this honor goes to G. E. Freeman who was teaching vocational agriculture at McLemorsville. According to Freeman, this class was the first adult class of which there is any record of being taught in the state (35). The class was taught on terracing. Freeman was from a state that had long used terraces as a means of water control and he could not stand to see gullies in every corn middle because the rows ran up and down hill. Farmers did not seem to be aware of the damage being done. He later did work with the ginners in regard to changing the community to a one variety community. The requirements for numbers of students, meetings and so on were much smaller in scope in the early work than in modern day teaching.

The first adult evening class taught by Freeman was taught in the fall and winter of 1920. He wrote a letter to D. M. Clements, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, describing in some detail the methods used in teaching the course and before the end of the school year of 1920-21 Clements had encouraged other teachers to follow suit with the result that there were a number of courses offered to farmers attending evening schools according to excerpts from Freeman's study. These courses consisted of work in poultry, dairy cattle feeding, beef cattle, cotton production, propagation of plants, fruit growing, fertilizers and lime, swine production, vineyard, orchard, alfalfa, animal husbandry and others. The most popular

courses that year were poultry, soils, and fertilizers. It seemed that farmers would come out better to poultry courses than any other. The farmers were interested in soils and fertilizers in that period due to the fact that they were just beginning to make use of fertilizers and since they were new they did not know how to use and buy them efficiently.

Freeman mentioned that farmers in adult work actually carried on project work at first just as the all day students but much difficulty was experienced by the teacher in getting accurate project records. The teacher spent much time and effort in getting records and accounts of this work that could be reported.

The annual report of 1923 reported that there had been a noticeable improvement in the number of evening schools held during the year (60). Teachers met the classes daily, weekly, semi-weekly, and tri-weekly. They ran in length from 45 minutes to one and one-half hours with most of them being one hour in length. Some of the enterprises taught included those mentioned above with the addition of truck and tobacco, beans, general agriculture and veterinary work. The report stated that in that year twenty-five teachers taught evening schools which ranged from five classes per teacher to one class per teacher. The total number of classes taught for the year was forty-three. The size of the classes ran from forty-six adults to a low of two persons per class. The lessons taught ran from six to twenty. A class was reported regardless of how many there were in the

class. Sometimes the classes were only one farmer and a neighbor or two on individual farms.

The annual report for 1923 reported that the most important development during the year had been the evening class work. Sixty-six courses were conducted with farmers in thirty-nine schools and 1,264 were in attendance. In every instance the farmers carried projects and showed unusual interest. One high point of achievement given as an example in the report stated that in one community thirty-five farmers took work once a week for nineteen weeks and a result was that all kinds of livestock were standardized and only purebreds were being grown.

The progress of evening school work was mentioned only briefly in the annual report of 1924. It stated that evening class work was growing in popularity with eighty-seven courses given during the year.

It was assumed that early teachers were paid by the clock hour for evening class instruction. The basis for this assumption comes from an item appearing in the 1926 Newsletter edited by the State Office of Vocational Agriculture in which it stated that evening schools would be paid for on the basis of one dollar and a half per clock hour (54, p. 5).

In the annual report of 1925 were found statistics concerning evening school work (62). Fifty-four courses were given with a total enrollment of 1,119. Teachers who were doing evening work in 1925 were as follows: W. A. Schaeffer, Alpine; Frate Bull, Concord; J. J. Asher,

Coleman-Brown; G. B. Thackston, Celina; K. T. Hutchinson, Antioch; J. W. Lovell, Winchester; O. J. Mattil, Gatlinburg; C. F. Alden, Goodlettsville; R. S. Ward, Clarkrange; E. K. Schultz, Okalona; R. E. Bruner, Lynville; J. I. Bell, McLemoresville; W. S. Baldwin, Orlinda; J. C. Fitch, Palmersville; D. O. Segrest, Summerfield; J. B. Baker, Gallatin; J. B. Conry, Cookeville; J. D. Cliett, Tyner; T. L. Robinson, Concord; P. B. Stephens, Watertown; G. B. Roberts, Whitehouse; and A. F. Neubert at Burrville.

Little was mentioned about evening class work in the year of 1926 except to mention that emphasis was on part-time and evening work. The annual report also mentioned that the teachers were required to report jobs taught, enrollment and submit a plan for the jobs to be taught. For the year 1926, vocational agriculture teachers taught sixty-five evening classes with a total attendance of 1,160 in the classes.

Something of the importance of evening class work was indicated in the annual report for the year 1927 (64). In that year there were 6,355 projects in operation with 3,628 persons enrolled who earned $406,757.99. It will be noted that adult class members were still carrying projects somewhat along the lines of the type program carried on by the all day students.

The 1928 annual report placed evening class work first in importance as a part of the total program to be emphasized for the year (65). The State Supervisor set as a goal one-third of the teachers

in the state doing evening class work. A special feature of the 1928 program for adults was cooperative marketing schools for farmers eveing schools. Experts in the field were invited to do the teaching.

J. D. Cliett at Tyner High School explained that the taught his first evening schools in the year 1928 (15). He remembered that much emphasis was put on the evening class programs along about that time and a state-wide effort was made by all teachers to develop evening classes. Cliett related that the first teaching consisted of the teacher having the farmers come in and various experiments of the University Experiment Station were explained to them. This led to experimental plots developed by the farmers in the class. One such demonstrational plot developed by the adult classes at Tyner was a lespedeza plot. Cliett got one farmer to obtain ten pounds of seed and try them and the next year the farmer bought 1000 pounds and sowed them. Cliett remembered that over half of the class members were recruited by the boys who encouraged their fathers to attend the classes which met at night at the school.

When the writer pressed Cliett for his reasoning as to why there seemed to be a great deal of urging and pressure from the state office in 1928 to organize evening schools, Cliett replied that he thought it was "because the state was attempting to develop adult programs so as to obtain a desired rating in the Southern Region" (15). Whatever the reason, more emphasis was put on adult work in 1928 and 1929 than had ever been applied to them prior to that time. This emphasis

was no doubt due to the leadership of the Southern regional head mentioned in other parts of this study but whose name the author was not able to determine accurately.

One of the most prominent evening class teachers was a West Tennessee teacher by the name of Frate Bull. Bull had gained much respect and success with adult work in West Tennessee and as a result was asked to come to East Tennessee and aid the teachers there in developing the work. This he did in 1929 where he taught the first evening class at Concord in the Farragut community on dairying. An account of this class and other evening class work was given in a newspaper clipping in the Agricultural Education Department files at The University of Tennessee (2). The reference showed over one hundred Knox County farmers enrolled in night classes in 1929-30 school year at Farragut, Central, and Karns. This was the result of Bull's first class on the history of dairy cows in Tennessee at Concord. The whole theme of the series of classes was how to make more money with dairying. The clipping mentioned that in addition to the schools mentioned above, there were twelve other counties in East Tennessee offering night classes. These counties were Bradley with J. T. Lovell, teacher; Campbell County, C. E. Looney, Claiborne; T. L. Mayes, Powell Valley; D. E. Drinnon, Hamblen; J. S. Fish, Hamilton; E. M. Henry, McMinn; C. L. Harris, Englewood in Polk County; J. H. McCallie, Roane County; E. E. Hegler, Sullivan County; G. R. Price, Unicoi; R. W. McCleary, and Washington County, J. S. Irvine. In addition to the dairying courses there were courses in poultry, soil conservation and tobacco.

In addition to aiding in starting the adult work in East Tennessee Frate Bull wrote an outline on farm management which was widely used in evening class work.

In the early work in evening schools it was customary for several teachers in a given area to band together and each work out three or four jobs of the twelve that were to be taught in the course. They would each then teach the four jobs prepared at every school in the area. The last school lesson taught in the series was usually a joint one in which a special speaker was sometimes invited and the wives came along and a dinner meeting was planned. This resulted in much interest and wide publicity for the program. Several such closing meetings were disclosed in numerous clippings found in the files of the University Agricultural Education Department.

Mr. Freeman recalled one such joint meeting where several classes had gone together and bought purebred bulls in a cooperative effort resulting from adult class work. Freeman was asked to speak at one of these closing meetings and when he arose to speak he said, "I have often wanted to be in this position. I understand that this is a meeting of a bull class and since that is true I feel free to say anything" (35).

Freeman felt that there was more publicity given to evening class work in the early days of its inception than is the case today. He felt that this had a great deal to do with the importance and value given to it by the press in the early years.

Clippings from the files of the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee show that in 1930-31 that were rather large evening classes underway at Karns, Farragut, Gibbs, and Central high schools (3). Courses were offered by the teachers, Brimm, Rubin, Kirkland, Sedberry, and Kennard on pastures, terracing, lime use, and soil conservation practices. The classes met for twelve meetings and ranged from fifty to eighty-five adults per class.

The tenth annual report of the State Supervisor to the State Board in 1931 showed that evening class work had increased over 71 per cent (66). The enrollment had increased 144 per cent. The report stated that there were 107 classes in 1929 and 183 in 1930-31. The enrollment in 1929 was 2,560 adults and had increased to 6,221 in 1930-31. The report stated that the course in cooperative marketing in 1930 had done more to strengthen the program of vocational agriculture than any other effort put forth that year.

The eleventh annual report in 1932 stated that the evening classes carried on throughout the state on farm organization had added much to the value of the program as indicated by the fact that 89 per cent of the departments had carried on one or more evening classes during the year (67). One hundred per cent of all departments had carried on some type of adult class. The first record of cooperation between the Home Economics Departments and the Vocational Agriculture Departments in evening class work was mentioned in the 1932 report. About 10 per cent of the teachers had cooperated with the home economics teachers in evening class programs.

In the depth of the depression adult evening schools flourished as never before. The annual report of the State Supervisor mentioned that there were 152 night classes being conducted by 118 teachers with an enrollment of 4,511 farmers (69). In 1934 adult class work was the high point of the year according to the report of the Supervisor. In that year there were 582 emergency evening class meetings to give instruction in the new A. A. A. program inaugurated under the guidance of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. In these so-called emergency meetings there were 29,404 farmers present. In addition to the emergency meetings with farmers, the regular evening school enrollment was 5,808 farmers in attendance.

Even though the enrollment per teacher averaged 94.3 persons in 1934 and 1935, teacher morale was at the lowest ebb ever in the opinion of the State Supervisor. The reason for this was the depression and the decrease in vocational education funds. Many teachers sought other employment due to the low salaries and poor working conditions. The effect of the depression was exactly the opposite on farmers seeking information on farming. Evening classes reached all time peaks. In 1935 there was a gain in enrollment of all types including adult classes (70). During that year there were 164 evening schools conducted by 175 teachers with an enrollment of 5,853. The farmers in one county estimated that the evening schools were worth $6,470.00 to them. They planted certified seed, bred cows to registered bulls, terraced land, field selected seed corn, and planted

crimson clover for the first time in the community. The reader will notice that the improved practices are now outdated and superceded with newer practices. One should also remember how these earlier practices were started through evening class work. Farmers are slow to change and one must look back over the years to evaluate the true worth of the adult evening school movement.

Economic conditions showed vast improvement by 1936 and the annual report of the Supervisor stated that there were a total of 2,739 evening class enrollees (71).

In 1937 soil conservation and land use received more attention in the adult program (72). This was due, in part, to government programs involving soil conservation aid practices. The state vocational education staff worked closely with the Soil Conservation Service in mapping farms, making use findings and long time farming programs with adult farmers. The evening class enrollment for 1937 was 2,914 farmers.

Evening class enrollment increased almost three times over the previous year in 1938. The annual report stated that there were 6,257 enrolled (73). The vocational agriculture teachers were assigned C. C. C. camps as permanent assignments in working out and supervising the agricultural education of men in the camps. This was a new phase of the evening school work. This type of work on the part of the agriculture teacher resulted in better working relationships with the public and did much to further understanding concerning the program.

The evening class programs were greatly expanded during the depression days and the Federal government did much to encourage and

develop the program in an effort to better the position of the program. In a sense many of these programs were adult farmer education programs. Many experimental programs were tried in an attempt to bring farming back to the level it deserved to occupy after being plunged into the depths of despair during the depression years. Many farmers were bankrupt and despondent and needed educational programs to bring them back to a high level of efficiency and prosperity. From these experimental programs came techniques that developed the adult farmer programs and made them into their modern counterparts.

Enrollments in evening class work continued to climb. In 1939 the enrollment was 6,576 farmers (74). Soil conservation, farm mapping, soil uses and cover crops were emphasized.

With the coming of economic upheavals all phases of the economy were affected drastically. Farming was no exception. With war clouds beginning to loom in 1939 the evening school program began to undergo a change after its dramatic climb out of the gloomy atmosphere of the depression. Evening class enrollment began to decline. Many of the farmers went into war production work. After the war broke out evening classes dwindled as more of the vocational agriculture teachers took on war training jobs. The enrollment in farmer evening classes continued to decline through the war years of 1940 to 1946.

After the close of the war and a gradual return to normalcy got underway, the program again began to climb. The 1948 annual report showed 325 classes conducted with an enrollment of 12,628 members (81).

Again economic conditions dictated different educational needs. When the war was over many farmers found themselves faced with new needs and difficulties. There was a temporary shortage of machinery and materials, higher costs, high demands for full production of farm products, good prices and prosperity. Many returning veterans were eager to learn improved farming practices, research was hard at work to turn out new findings to feed to a hungry and eager public. Many of the returning veterans under the Service Man Readjustment Act of 1944, better known as the G. I. Bill of 1944, sought higher education and the agricultural educational agencies were hard put to supply the services requested. Many veteran classes were organized. This became a part of the adult program and was handled very much in the manner of the evening school programs in pre-war years. The vocational agriculture teacher was the man best equipped and ready to handle this booming adult program.

The U. S. Office of Education made a study of the needs for further training in agriculture for veterans (9). Twenty-five states participated in this study and nine of these were Southern states. Approximately 2 per cent of the total number of veterans enrolled were questioned as to their desires of further training after the veteran's program terminated. There were 94.6 per cent of this number that stated they were interested in further training. At the end of the program evidence of this desire was shown by many of the trainees enrolling in regular evening class programs for farmers. This necessitated the expansion of the adult program to absorb these men.

At the close of this study in the year of 1955 another change in the economic conditions appears imminent. The tremendous desire for education and the gratification of this desire had begun to bring about surpluses of farm crops. Overproduction had become a national headache. Farmers were outproducing anything the world had ever known. To be sure, there were many areas in which educational work needed to be done, such as in the fields of farm management, marketing, and new technological developments. The high cost of operation, the scarce supply of farm labor, rapid changes in machinery, soil conservation, lack of capital and credit were all problem areas to give adult education a challenge.

History has taught that economic changes bring new developments in farming and new needs for educational work. As in the past, the vocational agriculture teacher stands ready to face the challenge and through adult evening classes he will guide farmers to attack their problems and solve them.

## V. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FARM SHOP PROGRAM

L. M. Roehl, an early pioneer in farm shop work, in a meeting of the National Society for Vocational Education in the Agriculture Section of Teachers on February 19, 1920 in Chicago, Illinois, tried to define farm shop as applied to vocational agriculture (13). He read a paper to the meeting and in it he defined the farm shop instruction as taught in the high schools of New York.

The general opinion by that group was that farm boys should be taught the ordinary repair and construction work which arises on the farm. An opinion following these same lines is still prevalent today. Roehl and his associates classified the shop work under the headings of metal work, harness repair, rope work and belt lacing. Most of these were important and necessary in that time. Some of them, such as harness repair, have become less important with the disappearance of mules from the farm. Roehl further felt that such tools as forge and anvil, hack-saw, vice, file, taps and dies, metal drill, grinder and soldering outfits should be mastered by the students. Such jobs as sharpening saws, using drills, rope making, splicing and knot tieing were practiced. Some teachers taught repair of such hand tools as forks, spades, hoes, and shovels along with construction of hog houses. Since welding was a modern innovation, all the work done in forging rounded out the metal working and made it rather limited.

The general opinion of the teachers of 1920 was that the work should be functional and along the lines of activities and jobs that the boy was doing in his farming program. This attitude in regard to farm shop work still prevails in schools in Tennessee.

D. M. Clements outlined in Bulletin 4 the requirements for shop facilities in the case of new departments opening in the state (13). The bulletin stated that after the work had been in operation for two years a farm shop must be added and that there should be facilities for farm carpentry work and blacksmith work. Two dollars per student

was to be allowed for expenses and operation of the department.

J. W. Brimm, an early vocational agriculture teacher, stated that in the earlier stages of vocational agriculture it became evident that in order to train boys to become efficient farmers, it would be necessary to give them training in shop work such as would be of every-day use to them on the farm (7). The 1920's showed slow progress along this line. Lack of shop buildings, little or no equipment, and the agriculture teachers themselves had little training for shop work. Brimm stated that while he taught at Farragut High School in Knox County some interest in the early days was shown by the boys and teachers in the form of shop-made tools such as single trees, halters, and so on which were shown in competition at the fair in Knoxville. This got shop work before the students, teachers and the public and a feeble spark was started which later became the farm shop program in vocational agriculture.

Such professional shop teachers as Roehl and others aided by coming south and meeting with the teachers and teacher trainers and holding short summer courses in rope work, harness repair and carpentry work. Clements in his annual report of 1921 pointed out that shop work was sorely needed in Tennessee agricultural departments but that it was then the weakest segment of the teaching program (58). He pointed out that all the men who needed the work should spend six hours per day for one week at The University of Tennessee learning to teach ordinary repair, carpentry, tin work, forge and harness repair.

Clements and Fitzgerald realized the need for a formal shop training course in farm shop for graduating students who intended to teach vocational agriculture. In 1922 there was no one on the teaching staff at the University that had shop teaching experience. Fitzgerald got Clements to agree to provide money from the state vocational funds to set up a model farm shop at the University to be used as a laboratory for students who were to teach (19). Clements agreed to this and a shop containing the elements previously mentioned was set up in the Agricultural Engineering Building. In the same year Fitzgerald employed H. C. Graybeal, who was then teaching agriculture in the state, to come and act as an itinerant teacher in farm shop work over the state. He spent most of his time in 1922 and succeeding years in going over the state and helping the teachers in their departments with shop facilities and teaching methods. He later helped in setting up a shop program at The University of Tennessee.

Several of the beginning teachers in vocational agriculture provided facts concerning the early shop programs. G. E. Horn, who taught at Bellevue High School, formerly known as Coleman-Brown High School, stated that all the early work was carpentry, rope work and forge (44). Students taking agriculture under Horn were required to develop three articles in the shop that they needed on their farms. These projects had to be completed before the students got a credit. All work was strictly farm shop and no woodwork, furniture making or other shop work was allowed. Horn stated that during this time, which started at Coleman-Brown in 1927, he was allowed $75.00 for all

expenses of the shop and department operation.

J. T. Lovell, vocational agriculture teacher at Cleveland, Tennessee, stated that he had no place for a shop nor did he know anything about teaching shop work the first few years that he taught (45). Lovell was one of the original beginning teachers under the Smith-Hughes work in the state.

Lovell felt that he must have more training in shop methods and since there was no course offered in that area at The University of Tennessee, he went to Cornell to get shop training during the summer quarter. Shop work at Cornell under Roehl was then considered outstanding in this field. When he returned to Bradley County High School that fall in 1923, he and his boys dug a shop in the basement of the Vocational Agriculture Department. After setting up the shop, he taught carpentry, harness making, sheetmetal and blacksmith work. In addition to this the boys were taught to do toolfitting such as sharpening saws, handling hammers and other hand tools. He bought some tools which were financed by state and Federal funds. Lovell recalled that Graybeal visited him that year and aided in setting up the shop work.

R. E. Bruner recalled that Charles Alden, an early vocational agriculture teacher, taught the men rope work and knot tieing during some of the summer conferences of the teachers (10).

The first course in farm shop work was set up at The University of Tennessee in 1922. This course was described in the annual report

of the State Supervisor as course 8d, farm shop work (59). The objective of the course was to give methods of teaching and actual practice in the ordinary repair and construction work on the farm. It was designed to prepare men to teach the general farm shop work of the vocational agriculture course in the high schools. It included farm woodwork and correlated drawing, harness repairing, rope work, and farm metal work. The course was offered only to the last quarter seniors.

N. E. Fitzgerald pointed out some important differences in the farm shop program in Tennessee in the beginning years (19). Many states, particularly in the north, taught farm mechanics as a unit. Some of them continued this practice for many years. Fitzgerald, Graybeal and others differed with this concept. This form of farm shop teaching was never done in Tennessee. Farm shop work was correlated with whatever jobs were necessary in that field to solve the shop problems in the boy's particular enterprises carried in his farming program. Fitzgerald cited as examples that if the boy had a dairy enterprise he made milk barn stantions, milk cooling equipment and so on. This was more functional, Fitzgerald thought than teaching farm shop as a unit. The soundness of this view is strengthened by the general teaching all over the United States of the plan used in Tennessee in the early days.

After a slow start in 1920 the farm shop program in Tennessee began to widen in scope and more and more teachers took advantage of the summer courses offered in farm shop. Graduating seniors had a better background in farm shop methods.

In 1928 the Agricultural Education Department of The University of Tennessee initiated a study of the type of buildings for vocational agriculture (19). Most of the State Directors over the country were contacted for plans concerning the type of classroom and shop buildings and facilities needed for vocational agriculture. It seemed that in most of the states there was a decided trend toward separate buildings for vocational agriculture. Some indication of the type of buildings desired were outlined in correspondence between Fitzgerald and Ray Fife, State Supervisor of Vocational Education in Ohio which was dated February 10, 1928 (18). Fife stated that a separate building with a classroom twenty-two by thirty feet and another room twenty-two by thirty-six feet for farm shop was thought to be adequate. The farm shop room has either one-half concrete and one-half wood floor or else one-half wood and one-half block with a double door twelve feet in width into the shop room. In some of the schools, home economics and agriculture were combined. This trend continued and this accounts for separate buildings existing today in many of the school systems.

With the coming of the year 1930 many of the vocational agriculture teachers were given money to operate and equip special shops to train boys in woodwork, metal work, and electric and gas motors. This continued in various forms until the closing of the 1945 school year (9). The results of these shops were that thousands of rural boys, and later adults, took advantage of these special courses under skilled instructors and good equipment, thereby gaining much information

that has helped them with the many jobs on their own farms. Many communities, realizing the real value of such a good shop program, constructed separate buildings as mentioned above for the exclusive use of farm shop and were happy with the results obtained.

The story of the development of the electrical area in farm shops was related by G. E. Horn (44). Horn had, with the aid of a former student, Kenneth McPherson, set up a teaching area in electricity. Having experienced some success in this area, he was asked to present it to the annual conference of agriculture teachers then meeting at Camp Clements during the summer. When Fitzgerald, Head of the Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennessee, heard of the work he disagreed rather decidedly with Horn on the advisability of the need of such a course in vocational agriculture. With the coming of rural electricity under the TVA program, many farms quickly added electrical appliances and the following year Fitzgerald pointed out in a talk before the teachers that Horn was correct in his plan of teaching farm electricity and thus a new area was added to the shop program.

With the coming of World War II and the years just prior to the outbreak of the war, many war production programs resulted. John Carney related the following facts concerning the shop programs (11). There was a hue and cry for men in war production plants who could do shop work. The United States government realized that farm people could be of tremendous help in helping such a program and agriculture teachers and special teachers from industry were commissioned

to teach farm shop skills in welding and related shop skills. Vocational agriculture teachers for the most part did not know how to teach welding since this had not been offered to students preparing to teach vocational agriculture. Special funds were appropriated by the Federal agencies to form a program known as the OSYA. Under this program in 1930, the first farm welding was taught. Equipment and experience gained in this program aided the farm shop program to add this all-important shop teaching unit to vocational agriculture farm shops.

After the war was over, the institutional on-the-farm training program further aided in the development of farm shops since money was appropriated and channeled through the Vocational Agriculture Departments. Special instructors were employed for this program and many of these men were graduating veterans who were well trained in welding, electricity, concrete work and other recent additions to the farm shop program. As a result, supplies, equipment and trained shop teachers were available to increase the value of farm shop as a subject taught to all day students, adults and veteran trainees.

While this program did much to further the farm shop program, it had its drawbacks. Many of the teachers felt that in some ways the so-called G. I. farm training program was detrimental to the farm shop program. Many of the G. I. instructors were not well trained and lacked teaching experience. Some of the veteran trainees were there only to draw the money and that was about all they did. Much of the equipment was ruined by misuse and in the final outcome was carried

off by the trainees. Many of them felt that they had a rightful claim to the equipment since it was purchased through the veteran training program. In all fairness the teachers were quick to point out that many of the trainees did good work and profited by the program as well as improve the shop facilites. Many of the farm shops in schools at the present time have welding equipment which was purchased through the veteran training program.

Many of the vocational agriculture teachers with experience gained through the war years, and with veteran training programs, found that they were better equipped through shop materials and teaching techniques to teach farm shop work to adults. As a result many adult classes have been conducted in recent years on farm shop work. The success of this effort is to be seen in the enrollment in such work. Many of the communities such as those in Dickson County and Wayne County in the Collinwood School have developed community shops (56). These shops are built under the guidance of the vocational agriculture teacher and are financed through stock bought by the members in the shop. Regular scheduled classes are conducted on farm shop skills through evening schools by the teacher of vocational agriculture. Farmers also have access to the shops so that they may do repair and shop construction of various farm materials.

At the present time greater emphasis is being placed on farm machinery and its repair and maintenance. The importance of farm shop has been given greater impetus in recent years by the teacher

trainers at The University of Tennessee along with the Agricultural Engineering Department by teaching shop methods in the field to teachers. The author has attended such a course conducted by Dr. George Wiegers, Jr. at Franklin High School in 1950. Other such courses in the shop program have been conducted in succeeding years.

The importance of the farm shop program was well illustrated by a farmer friend of the author's acquaintance when he said, "If it was not for the welders and other tools in the farm shop, the farmer could not stay in business in this period of rising costs and expensive purchase and repair of farm equipment" (94).

So from the horse and mule days of the early vocational agriculture shops in 1920, we in the field of vocational agriculture have come to the field of highly skilled farm mechanization. One may wonder what the future holds but to be sure the farm mechanics program in vocational agriculture will increase by leaps and bounds in the years to come.

## VI. VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE AND THE C. C. C. CAMPS

In the year 1938 when the C. C. C. camps came into being, vocational agriculture teachers played a small part in the educational program offered in the C. C. C. camps.

This educational program preceded the National Youth Administration program. It was a relief program, of course, designed to get boys out of the crowded conditions in the cities where depression

economics had played havoc. These young men were given the job of re-forestation, soil conservation practices and park building. The Officer in Charge and Southern Regional Educational Adviser was Captain Morris E. Milner. District Five was made up of five southern states, of which Tennessee was one, and were in Captain Milner's charge. Milner asked the vocational agriculture State Supervisors of the five southern states for aid in carrying out an educational program. He wished to set up facilities for such things as setting trees, fire control, erosion control and skills in shop work. In addition, some of the camps wished aid in production of garden crops since some of them grew their own vegetables. Freeman related the circumstances relative to this program and the extent to which it was carried out (35).

It was the practice to hold classes just prior to going in the field and setting out trees or other conservation jobs. Some of the young men were from farms and were interested in farming and some part-time work was done by the agriculture teacher in the camps on this basis. Freeman stated that for the most part the job of the agriculture teacher was that of a technical adviser on such things as teaching methods, outlines for courses, sources of reference materials and so on. According to Freeman, not many of the teachers did much teaching. He showed the author a joint publication compiled by the U. S. Office of Education, vocational agriculture teachers, and the Forestry Service entitled "C. C. C. Forestry."

A few of the agriculture teachers had classes for young men in the C. C. C. who were interested in going back to the farm. These

courses were looked upon as part-time work.

The work of C. C. C. teaching was assigned to teachers in departments nearest the camps in the area. These became permanent assignments to the teachers as long as the program was in operation which was until the C. C. C. camps were disbanded a few years later.

The author discovered one small item related to the C. C. C. camp program in the Agricultural Education Department files at The University of Tennessee. In a letter to N. E. Fitzgerald, Eason Hendrix of C. C. C. Camp Pat Harrison, Company 499, Jackson, Tennessee advised Fitzgerald that several of The University of Tennessee boys were working there for the summer and that he wanted to stay there as long as possible until his practice teaching assignment came up (43). Boys in those days of the depression used all means to earn money to get through school. Eason mentioned also that he was doing some teaching of the men in the camps in agriculture, without pay, just for the practice and experience.

The program did not amount to a great deal according to Freeman, but an attempt was made to make the time spent in the camps by the young men of the country as interesting and profitable as was possible under the circumstances.

## VII. THE PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

By general consent of the vocational agriculture teachers in the profession in Tennessee, it has been admitted that the public

relations program in vocational agriculture has been weak. It should not be construed by the reader that because the section of this history devoted to this subject is of brief duration that there is little to be related in this area. This is not the case, and it is the opinion of the author that rich rewards could come to the research person who looked into this area of the vocational agriculture profession.

Neither is the reader to conclude that the author is trying to detract from the efforts of those who have made contributions to this program of public relations. It must be admitted, however, that they were often too few in number.

Some of the accomplishments of the early teachers in this area will be related here and matters relating to public relations will appear in other sections of this history.

One of the earliest records of any attempt to improve the relationship between vocational agriculture and the public was attempted by D. M. Clements soon after he became State Director of Vocational Agriculture. He made it a point to visit with as many departments, principals, and superintendents in each county of the state as possible. This he relates in the annual report of the Supervisor (61). At that time the program was new and many counties were eager to obtain Federal funds and new vocational agriculture departments.

Even before this time, in June of 1919, while acting as temporary Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in the state, N. E. Fitzgerald was aware of the need for public relation work in vocational

agriculture. This was evidenced by the fact that at the time mentioned above, he got out a mimeographed letter which he called Mimeograph No. 2 to all teachers then teaching and advised them that teachers should be able at any time to answer questions regarding the purpose and results of the Smith-Hughes money in the teaching of vocational agriculture (20). He told the men that they should be able to answer questions regarding money and the law governing the program. He indicated reading materials which he was making available to them to read in order to be able to inform the public.

J. D. Cliett, vocational agriculture teacher at Tyner High School in East Tennessee, is credited with having had the first radio program sponsored by a vocational agriculture department in Tennessee. Cliett stated in an interview with the author that this radio program began January 27, 1937 on a Chattanooga station (15). Tom Noble had used an agriculture teacher while working as farm editor in Arkansas and liked the idea so well he asked Cliett to do the same thing on the Chattanooga station when he became a member of the farm staff on that station.

Cliett stated that the program was on for one hour on Saturday of each week. The time varied due to the amount of time purchased by whatever chain might be sponsoring the show. At first the all day students of vocational agriculture were used and then later adult farmers who told of their experiences in their farming programs.

G. E. Freeman, while District Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in East Tennessee, directed a radio program over WNOX which

was inaugurated in the year of 1933 (35).

Freeman recalled an incident of one of the early radio programs in this series during which he awarded the Future Farmer Planter Degree to Dr. H. A. Morgan, then Dean of the College of Agriculture at The University of Tennessee. He awarded the degree with these words, "Dr. Morgan, you are indeed a planter in the South but the seeds you have sown have not been in the soil but in the hearts and minds of men" (35). Freeman said that for a time Dr. Morgan was so overcome with gratitude that he could not speak. The popularity of the broadcast was evidenced by the telegrams and phone calls by the score that descended on the station after the broadcast. This incident was typical of some of the efforts and their value as public relation instruments in the early years of the profession.

The program on WNOX was featured each noon with agriculture boys from the surrounding area coming in and telling about work in the county, in the Future Farmers of America, and their individual supervised farming programs.

Freeman felt that this radio program did much to aid in bringing about better understanding of the general public in regard to the work being done in vocational agriculture.

L. A. Carpenter later succeeded Freeman as District Supervisor and carried on the radio program for a number of years.

J. E. Moss, vocational agriculture teacher and County Supervisor in Davidson County, sponsored a radio program over WLAC in Nashville

for a few years (35). These programs were weekly in nature and featured the all day students and adult farmers and their activities in vocational agriculture work. These fifteen-minute programs were alternated so that each teacher in the county got the program in turn. G. E. Horn, then a vocational agriculture teacher in Davidson County, indicated that much good came of these programs in the WLAC listening area (44).

William A. Burnett, manager of Nashville Union Stock Yards, in cooperation with the local vocational agriculture teachers in the area sponsored a radio program at the noon hour over WSM. This program went on the air May 23, 1932 and was instrumental in promoting the Future Farmer program and enlightening the public concerning the activities of vocational agriculture in the area (44).

John MacDonald, a farm director for WSM, invites teachers of vocational agriculture and their students to appear on his radio program, "Noon-Time Neighbors," which is heard daily around the noon hour on WSM. Departments of vocational agriculture in Middle Tennessee alternate in their appearance on the program each Wednesday of every week. For a short time MacDonald directed a television show on WSM-TV on which vocational agriculture personnel appeared frequently. This show was known as "Farm Furrows." The program was discontinued after a short time.

The author did not obtain information of such radio programs in the western part of Tennessee but there were undoubtedly programs of this sort.

The reader should not get the idea that television and radio were the only mediums used in promoting the relationships between the general public and vocational agriculture; far from it.

Many teachers regularly write success stories concerning the students in their departments, both adults and all day students. These stories appear throughout the state and nation in newspapers, magazines and other written mediums. Joe Moore, Star Farmer of America from Tennessee, was the first Future Farmer to appear on the front page of Time Magazine (52). Each year there is wide coverage in the state newspapers concerning the activities of the annual state Future Farmer of America convention which is held in a major city in Tennessee.

S. L. Sparkes, State Executive Secretary of the Tennessee Association of Future Farmers of America, writes and publicizes the work of the Future Farmers in the state throughout the year. In addition he supervises the edition of a state Future Farmer magazine, The Tennessee Future Farmer (52).

Wide publicity and public relation value is received each year through various cooperative activities with other agricultural agencies in the state. Some of these activities are: Keep Tennessee Green, The Green Pasture Program, Cooperative activities with the Agricultural Stabilization Committee, TVA Ammonium Nitrate Program, Junior Livestock Show and Sales, Adult Livestock Shows, the West Tennessee Top Crop Banquet in which awards and publicity for the Future Farmers are obtained, a similar activity called the East Tennessee

Sweetheart Contest, plus county, district, and regional fairs.

From time to time, there are special programs which are sponsored by commercial companies which wish to pay tribute to vocational agriculture and the contribution that it is making to national efforts. Such a program was the "Fred Waring Chesterfield Pleasure Time" which paid tribute to vocational agriculture teachers for their contribution to the war effort during World War II. In 1944 Waring dedicated his program over a national hookup to vocational agriculture teachers (37).

The preceding facts relative to the public relations program indicate some of the activities of various individuals and their efforts to educate the public concerning the values of vocational agriculture. These facts, since they are meager, offers a fertile field for research.

## VIII. THE INSTITUTIONAL ON-THE-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

When the 78th Congress of the United States passed the Service Man's Re-Adjustment Act of 1944," better known as the G. I. Bill of Rights which provided training for veterans of World War II, it was vocational agriculture that was called upon to provide instruction in the field of agricultural training. It was not until late in 1945 that this program became a reality for farm boys and was known as "institutional on-the-farm training." Plans were underway for the veteran classes in agriculture to begin in February of 1946. The program got underway the following May of the same year.

John C. Carney was a vocational agriculture teacher at Joelton High School before the outbreak of World War II. Shortly after war

was declared, he entered the United States Army and attained the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, was discharged, and became Director of the new institutional on-the-farm program. He remained Director of the program as long as it was in operation in the state and later succeeded G. E. Freeman as State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture.

In an interview Carney outlined the development, progress, objectives and accomplishments, and finally the decline of the program in Tennessee (11).

According to Carney, the program started officially in the state in May of 1946. The vocational agriculture branch of education got the job for three reasons, according to Carney. First, it was an educational program and therefore a job for the school systems of the state. Second, it was agricultural in nature so it was logical to call on the educational services of schools that taught agriculture, namely the Vocational Agriculture Departments. Third, vocational agriculture had the teachers, know-how, facilities, and equipment to carry out the program.

The State Board of Vocational Education negotiated with the Veteran's Administration for a contract to carry out the requirements of the program. The agreement was worked out by the Board of Vocational Education and the Veteran's Administration jointly and a contract signed.

At first, the administration figured out a sum of $20.00 as an estimated cost per student for instruction and materials. This was an

estimate which was soon revised as the actual needs became known through experience, Carney recalled.

The cost of books was an additional cost and was paid on the basis of each individual veteran. These books were the property of the veteran but in some cases they were purchased out of funds that were not to be used for that purpose under the existing contract. In some cases the books were taken up by the government at the termination of the contract and period of training. This fact was often misunderstood and resulted in ill feelings on the part of some of the trainees when the books were reclaimed.

The instructions were first sent to the various superintendents in letter form. Later a booklet of instructions was made up by the administration which spelled out rather completely the rules and policies under which the program was to be conducted. In many cases these instructions were not followed because the superintendents did not understand the rules or because they did not go to the trouble to try to understand them. As a result there were many mistakes in administration and especially in the field of purchasing materials and supplies.

Some of the counties benefitted to a greater degree than others, Carney pointed out. Some were rather hesitant in declaring their needs and did not ask for as much money as other counties. As a result many of the counties were set up with lower financial requirements than others simply because they had indicated by their requests for funds

that they did not need any more money. Some soon realized that this had happened, after two or three years of operation of the program, and quickly revised their estimates upward. In some cases they were able to get more money but in many cases the program had run its course before the officials realized the situation. This resulted in many counties getting more supplies, equipment, and so on.

The program grew rapidly in 1946 and 1947. Political pressure was applied in many counties and in certain areas of the state for political favor in order to share in the funds made available under the program. Politicians in many cases wanted jobs for various individuals as teachers. It seemed, according to Carney, that many thought the only qualification needed was to be a World War II veteran. The program was set up with high standards and an attempt was made to get teachers for veterans with the same qualifications as vocational agriculture teachers. The supply of teachers for teaching soon ran out, however, and it became necessary for them to be vocational agriculture graduates from some accredited high school. These men were given special accelerated training in methods of teaching and program planning. They were under the direction of the vocational agriculture teachers and a county supervisor of veterans, who was under the vocational agriculture teacher and superintendent.

At about the height of the program there were 1,320 teachers of veterans employed in the state.

In August 1951 and 1952, the state records show that there were 16,484 students enrolled in the veteran on-farm training programs.

In Tennessee, in August of the following year, 1953, there were only 7,828 enrolled in the program.

Carney recalled that the maximum enrollment occurred in 1948 at which time it reached approximately 28,000.

The total number of students trained during the entire life of the program in Tennessee was approximately 74,000.

In 1952 the Veteran's Administration and the State Board of Vocational Education failed to negotiate a contract and thereafter the counties were dealt with directly. The Vocational Agriculture Departments dropped the supervision of the training.

Supervision of the program was done by the regular District Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture in the east, middle, and west grand divisions of the state. These men were H. N. Parks in Middle Tennessee; and soon after, T. J. Hendrickson; L. A. Carpenter in East Tennessee; and Horace Colvett in West Tennessee. The program was supervised on a statewide level by John C. Carney as was mentioned previously in this account.

Carney thought that the most important supervisors of the program were the vocational agriculture teachers themselves. The veteran teachers were supervised by the vocational agriculture teachers. Later on when the program had gained in scope, there were county Supervisors who were hired to ease the load on the agriculture teachers. Veteran teachers were known as assistant agriculture teachers for official purposes.

The prime objective of the program of veteran on-the-farm training was to aid the returning veteran to become established in the business of farming.

Many of the men went into farming and continued to farm afterwards. There were no studies made to show just how far this establishment in farming progressed. This offers an opportunity for research as records exist of those who took the training and sufficient time has elapsed to allow these trainees to be well established in the business of farming.

There were many men who had no intention of farming when they went into the program, Carney felt. They were interested only in drawing the "rocking chair money."

Carney was quick to point out that the value of the training to veterans in related lines of work was of immeasurable worth to the men in finding a vocation and becoming established in their life work.

The program had a "whip hand" in requiring the veterans to complete the practices and put in 187 work days on the farm in order to qualify for funds from the program. Carney felt that this was a motivation to carry out the practices but did not provide motivation for learning. It was more of a dictatorial program from beginning to end.

Carney also pointed out that many of the trainees bought and paid or partially paid for farms while on the program. This in many cases was a direct result of the instruction offered in choosing and buying land and in securing a loan.

Many times there were cooperative programs carried out by veteran classes. Such a cooperative enterprise was described by Carney that occurred in Obion and Robertson Counties. In these counties there were artificial breeding associations set up as a result of the veteran training program. Livestock improvement associations were outcomes of the veteran program in many areas. Many other programs in cooperation with other agencies were developed during this period.

The Agricultural Education Department at The University of Tennseee, under the direction of Dr. A. J. Paulus, with the cooperation of the technical people in agriculture at the University, published many materials that were a great help in teaching. Teaching methods were made possible through veteran funds and as an answer to some teaching material problems.

Other effects of the program were described by Carney. The shop programs received a great deal of equipment and supplies. Many of the shops were able to retain this material at the end of the program while others lost much of it to misuse and thievery. The state and vocational agriculture departments learned a great deal about operating farm shops and equipment. Many new skills were added to the curriculum of the vocational agriculture program. Some outstanding examples of this were welding, electricity, sheetmetal, and concrete work.

The author inquired of many of the vocational agriculture teachers who supervised the veteran on-the-farm program as to their

appraisal of the advantages and disadvantages of the program to the program of vocational agriculture in the state.

In many matters there was general agreement as to the disadvantages of some phases of the program. Some of these have already been mentioned. Many teachers felt that the program hurt the high school program of vocational agriculture. Many times it took the teachers away from their regular duties and this resulted in poor relations with the school administrators.

Many schools did not get as much material, equipment and money as others. This created discord among all concerned. Reasons for this have been related in other parts of this work.

Vocational agriculture teachers were paid for supervising the work, and some teachers felt that this tended to "spoil teachers." They later felt that they should be paid for all phases of work, such as teaching adult classes.

J. W. Brimm pointed out that in the school year of 1938-39 Tennessee had the largest enrollment of adults in evening classes that had ever been enrolled in the program (7). The veteran program caused this program to degenerate. The vocational agriculture teacher was too busy to teach evening classes.

G. E. Horn expressed dissatisfaction with the veteran's program and the farm shop program (44). A lot of the veteran teachers were inexperienced in shop techniques. Many of the trainees were there only to draw the money and that is about all a lot of them did.

Much excellent equipment was ruined by misuse and much more was stolen. Horn was quick to point out that many men did good work and for them the program was beneficial.

Most of the vocational agriculture personnel felt that although the program had its drawbacks, much was learned on how to teach adults. Many beginning teachers received valuable teaching experience which made them better teachers for the regular program of vocational agricultural training.

Vocational agriculture severed its relations with the veteran's program in 1952. This was in compliance with an opinion of the State's Attorney General to the effect that the State Board could not contract with the Veteran's Administration on the basis proposed. Vocational agriculture had trained 70,000 of the World War II veterans who had enrolled for the training and had completed one-half of the training of the remaining 5,000 trainees when the program terminated.

## IX. EDUCATION FOR RURAL FAMILY LIFE

The formal name for this program was education for rural family life but in Tennessee the program was referred to as the Obion County experiment where it took place.

When the author inquired about the program while interviewing G. E. Freeman, he found that the experiment was a cooperative effort between all the educational facilities in the state which conducted the experiment in Obion County (37).

The idea of the rural life education was advanced by Dr. Studebaker, then U. S. Commissioner of Education. The program was to foster the close cooperation of all educational facilities in the local county of Obion in an effort to unite their efforts in one large educational program.

The program was set up in four typical rural communities in the states of Kansas, Ohio, Utah, and Tennessee. Freeman stated that when he was first approached concerning the experiment that the general opinion was that the experiment should be set up in Shelby County. Freeman did not agree with this since Shelby was a rather rich county and he felt that many would feel that it was not a typical rural county. He felt that it should not provide additional personnel or other extra facilities since this could not be done in each county. This resulted in the choice of Obion County in Tennessee since it was felt that it was a typical rural county.

Miscellaneous publication 2112-5 of the U. S. Department of the Interior outlined the purpose of this experiment (92, p. 7). It stated that the controlling purposes were to provide cooperative effort of all agencies to develop an educational program for the betterment of home and family life which will be permanent in duration.

The publication further stated an outline of plans for the program. There was to be modification of the curriculum in elementary schools and setting up home units to enlist all members of the family. There was to be integration of all subjects in vocational instruction and guidance.

In the adult work classes of men and women centered on family living, school days were to be extended and the school faculty utilized in the instruction. There were to be laboratory and demonstration facilities for observation of young children and a nursery school in which young girls had charge of children while the parents were in classes.

There was to be guidance and counseling services on family life problems. Library facilities were to be improved. The aid of all agencies were to be solicited. These were the churches and ministers, civic clubs, courts, welfare, Extension, public health, teachers and others.

There was a comprehensive survey run in the county to determine the possibilities and needs of the community as to needs in rural family living.

The program was a joint activity between the U. S. Office of Education and the U. S. Office of the Interior. No additional funds were allowed for the program and success depended entirely on local people, interests, beliefs, understandings, and energy.

The annual report of the State Supervisor for 1940 listed some of the achievements of the program in that year (75). Under the combined efforts of all educational agencies in the county, there had been more emphasis on home living, increased visits to homes by teachers, better directed play school program, more use of radio in schools, increased use of film strips in schools, outdoor recreation

parties, county library, youth council, beautification of grounds, co-operation with tuberculin testing program, venereal disease clinics, dental clinics, sanitation precautions, first aid courses, community singing, and organization of Boy Scout and Girl Scout troops.

The vocational agriculture teacher cooperated in this program during the time it was in progress. The annual report of the Supervisor of 1939 pointed out that the program had gone far beyond a mere demonstration of family life education (74). Short units of instruction in agriculture were given in practically all elementary schools and many of these were being expanded into full yearly courses. The teachers of agriculture served as teacher trainers in this experiment and did no instructing in the day unit classes in the elementary schools.

In an interview with J. W. Brimm, former Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, some explanation was given as to the progress and final culmination of the project (7).

Brimm stated that the County Superintendent in Obion County was hopeful of becoming State Commissioner of Education in Tennessee and had been promised the job. However, this did not materialize and in the next county election the Superintendent of Schools of Obion County was unsuccessful in becoming reelected to office. The policies and plans of the experiment then became bogged down and public interest began to lag. The final result was that the program gradually died out.

# X. JUNIOR PROJECT WORK

Before giving a brief summary of the junior project work, the reader will find it easier to understand if an explanation is given as to how it came about.

The State Board for Vocational Education, in 1920, produced a report of the work of that year which was called Bulletin 4 (13). In this outline of the work a great deal was said concerning day unit work and the part that vocational agriculture teachers had in the conducting of this program. A Course in Agriculture for Elementary Schools was written by Dr. K. C. Davis, Professor of Agricultural Education at George Peabody College; C. F. Alden, vocational agriculture teacher at Goodlettsville; and D. M. Clements, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. The outline of the course designed by these men in the publication mentioned above was for elementary schools. They made out lesson plans and offered suggestions for teaching agriculture, sixth through eighth grades. They also gave directions for obtaining free literature and suggestions for projects the students might have which they called junior projects. They advised teachers to teach garden and poultry to the elementary grades one year while in sixth grade, dairying and field crops the second year while in the seventh grade, and hogs, fruit, and home beautification the third year while in the eighth grade.

Teachers of vocational agriculture taught these classes on the basis of one to two hours per week in the elementary grades in the outlying feeder schools of the high school.

The demand on the teacher's time with this day unit work interfered with the adult and part-time work, deemed more important, so this work was dropped from the program. The people in the communities surrounding the elementary schools were not willing to loose the work which had been popular with the students and so there arose a demand from the communities that the work continue.

Freeman stated that the work was not a part of the state program of work, but after the demand of the local communities for some sort of agriculture for the elementary grades was known, the vocational agriculture teachers at one of their annual conferences decided to do something about the community requests (37).

In the annual meetings of teachers in 1938, plans were made to do this. This gradually became known as junior project work. The name was derived from the grade students carrying projects.

One-half of a day of the bi-monthly county teachers meetings in the counties were given to vocational agriculture teachers to outline programs for the elementary pupils. Time was allowed for discussing methods of teaching. After outlines were made, they were mimeographed by the County Superintendents and given to the elementary teachers to use as guides for the work that vocational agriculture teachers had previously done and called day unit work.

Junior project work was a type of guidance program. Some of the vocational agriculture teachers interviewed felt that the main purpose of the program was to influence students to come to high

school and take vocational agriculture, thus bolstering their agriculture classes. This may be a blunt way of explaining the purpose of the program. Freeman explained the program as being one of a guidance nature for the boys in the outlying elementary schools. It helped the boy to see the type of program that he would follow if he elected to take vocational agriculture in high school. Another problem that the program helped to eliminate was one of drop outs in the elementary schools. This was a common occurrence during the time that the junior project work was in effect. Those who worked with the program felt that if the boy in elementary school did drop out the chances were that he would farm. In the event that he dropped out of school, the meager experiences that he had gathered while doing junior project work might prompt him to see the value of education in farming and cause him to have a desire to attend the part-time young farmers classes.

Most of the vocational agriculture teachers liked the junior project work since it was easier to get the in-school boys to do project work and keep records of the project. Part-time students were hard to keep interested since the vocational agriculture teacher was too busy to get around to see them often. Adult farmers did carry projects but it was hard to evaluate it since they would not keep records of their work.

The junior project work was to get student interest. The program was difficult for the teacher since the travel to outlying schools

was time consuming. Many of the elementary teachers resented being told how to teach. Some of them felt an attempt was being made to coax their best students away to the high schools. Many of these teachers had little interest in the realm of agriculture since they had no training in its value.

Regardless of the difficulties involved, the junior project work was profitable in reaching, to some extent, boys who would not have been able to get training in farming had it not been for the project work. Many boys who became interested in the work in elementary school were encouraged to stay in school and complete a high school education.

## XI. DAY UNIT WORK

According to N. E. Fitzgerald, day unit work was an elementary program set up to encourage grade students to continue their education by going on past the eighth grade (20). Many of the students in the outlying country elementary schools did not go further than the eighth grade. Students from the sixth through the eighth grade were taught agriculture, usually one day per week, by the teacher of agriculture at the nearest high school. The ideal situation was to get one vocational agriculture teacher in a central high school to teach one group of these students each afternoon five days per week. The students were encouraged to have a project which usually consisted of poultry, cotton, or a pig. This program had a high degree of success

and caused many students to go on to high school and made the agriculture work very popular in the areas where it was taught.

J. T. Lovell did some of the day unit work (45). In his opinion the work was started to compete with the 4-H Club for boys for vocational agriculture classes. He taught the seventh and eighth grade in outlying schools for two or three classes during the year and tried to get the boys to carry on a project. It worked very much as the 4-H Club program.

Day unit work dates back to an era before the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. Prior to that time a few counties in Pennsylvania were using day unit work. South Carolina later, under State Superintendent of Schools Swearinger, organized day unit centers (55, pp. 508-509). In the year 1939 there were 13,378 students enrolled in the work.

Some idea of the scope of the work may be gleaned from the annual statistical reports of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture for Tennessee (83).

In 1925 there was a total enrollment of 194 students in day unit courses. This was the first time that day unit classes were shown, so it may be assumed that this was the first year for the work in Tennessee. In 1926 there were 333 in unit courses. In succeeding years the number enrolled was as follows: 1927 showed no figures; this was also the case in 1928. In 1929 there were fifty-five classes with 636 enrolled and thirty-six teachers teaching the classes;

there was no record for 1930. In 1931 there were 194 enrolled and fifteen teachers teaching classes. In 1932 there were 304 enrolled with seventeen teachers teaching classes. In 1933 there were 252 enrolled with fourteen teachers reporting classes. In 1934 there were none reported. In 1935 there were 320 enrolled and twelve teaching classes. In 1936 there were 711 enrolled with twenty-eight teachers reporting. This is the last figures shown in the reports and the work was dropped after this due to the fact that it interfered with the adult program. Teachers did aid elementary teachers in preparation of outlines to continue teaching the work. This, too, gradually ceased in the coming years.

## XII. PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Part-time classes were those held for boys who had dropped out of school. Most of these boys were either poor students, not interested in school, or had reached the age that they dropped out of school to go to work to help support the family. This situation might have given rise to the expression found in the twelfth annual report of the State Supervisor of Vocational Education in 1933 when, under the heading of part-time classes, a short paragraph mentioned that the vocational agriculture teacher taught these "forgotten boys" agriculture, arithmetic, English and other things that will improve the civic and vocational intelligence of such boys (68).

The writer was unable to determine the exact date of the beginning of part-time classes since the early reports did not list this

work. It would seem certain that it originated during the time that day unit and junior project work was developed. It is known that the work was in progress prior to 1919 due to the remarks found in the state plan for 1919 (88).

Freeman stated in his thesis that the principal difficulty with part-time students was in getting them interested in the work and then being able to get them to do project work (41, p. 85). It was still more difficult to get them to keep records of their work. If the vocational agriculture teacher failed, in his busy schedule, to get around to supervising them they soon lost interest since they were not in school, and for that matter, not particularly interested in education anyway. Many of the classes had to be held in winter when the rush of crop season was not on. Many of the boys tended to want to stay at home by the fire since many of the schools were cold and uncomfortable.

Despite these handicaps, the teachers made steady progress with the work. The statistical report for 1921-22 showed twenty-eight part-time classes in progress with 646 students enrolled (82).

Maynardsville High School was mentioned as one of the early schools that were particularly successful in the part-time work. In 1923-24 there were fifteen students enrolled for three months in the part-time program. In the following year this enrollment had climbed to twenty-five students.

It was of interest to note that the negro schools were more successful in the part-time work than the white schools. This might

be attributed to the limited facilities of the colored schools and the high rate of drop outs in the negro schools.

The statistical report of 1925-26 showed an enrollment of 119 and all but eighty of these were negro students (84).

In the annual report of the State Supervisor of 1922, there was a record of special work accomplished for that year in which the part-time work was put on a unit course basis. G. B. Thackston, District Supervisor for Middle Tennessee, did much to further this phase of the part-time program. He developed an outline for a two-year course to be offered to part-time students. It will be noted that the work was fitted to the needs of the agricultural economy of that time. Basically it is still a sound teaching outline if adapted to present day needs. This fact needs to be kept in mind in order to appreciate the basic teaching cornerstones handed down by early teachers of vocational agriculture.

In order that the reader might better appreciate the work of early teachers a copy of a mimeograph of one of these early teaching outlines found in the files of W. E. Robinson at Karns High School is enclosed in this work as Appendix B.

The annual report of the State Supervisor for the year 1926 outlined some of the requirements for the part-time work in the state at that time (84). The report stated that more emphasis was to be placed on part-time work that year. The teacher of vocational agriculture was required to report jobs taught, enrollment, and plans for the work. The report also had a discouraging note in that two weeks

prior to beginning of the work the program was not up to expectations. There were four classes of white students and one completed. The negro departments had nine classes and all of them were completed. The part-time program in 1926 required that there be three months of instruction and that it meet for one and one-half hours for each of five school days per week.

The annual report of 1929 stated that there was little part-time work done. That year saw only one class of white students and four classes of negroes with a total enrollment of sixty-one.

The State Supervisor felt that the part-time program was beginning to find a place in the overall program in 1933 (86). The report stated that it was beginning to find its place and that the negroes were out-distancing the white students in the work. In 1933 there were altogether 169 students enrolled in the work.

By 1935 the classes had increased to seventy-seven classes and 2,362 students. In 1937 the enrollment reached 957 students.

The annual descriptive report of 1938 mentioned that the part-time work was growing steadily, both in quality of the instruction offered and the holding power of students in the work.

The 1939 descriptive report showed an enrollment of 1,217 students in the part-time program (74). The enrollment was off a bit for the following year and had dropped slightly to 1,083 students. This trend continued so that by the next year of 1941 there were only 186 enrolled. The report for 1941 mentioned that the tremendous demand

for war-time youth training left few students for the part-time program (76). This trend was proven in the enrollment figure for the year 1943. There were 142 practices carried out in the supervised farming program of part-time students and the report mentioned that the OSYA program was satisfying the needs for the former part-time students.

This change in world conditions became the death knell of the part-time program. It was not mentioned again after 1944. The war-time programs gradually did away with the program as it had existed before that time.

Table IX gives an insight in the rise and fall of the program. It will be noted that in the beginning years much work was needed to get the program under way. The depression years of 1933 caused increased interest in the program and then as it reached its height the war years caused its decline.

The annual statistical reports of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture provided a means of following the numerical growth of the part-time program. When the program was just beginning in 1922-23, negro and white eachers and enrollment was not shown separately. As the number of negro and white teachers teaching part-time work increased a breakdown was shown. However, this was not always consistent which accounts for the combined totals shown in the table.

TABLE IX

PART TIME ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL FROM 1922 TO 1944

| Year | Negro | | White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Teachers | Enrollment | Teachers | Enrollment |
| 1922-23 | 28* | | | 646* |
| 1923-24 | 1* | | | 15* |
| 1924-25 | 25* | | | 141* |
| 1925-26 | | 39 | (none given) | 80 |
| 1926-27 | 15* | | | 173* |
| 1927-28 | 8 | 95 | 7 | 44 |
| 1928-29 | | | (none given) | 61* |
| 1929-30 | 7 | 63 | 2 | 7 |
| 1930-31 | 18 | 551 | 1 | 13 |
| 1931-32 | 17 | 428 | 5 | 74 |
| 1932-33 | 20 | 584 | 15 | 252 |
| 1933-34 | 17 | 384 | 55 | 1949 |
| 1934-35 | 18 | 384 | 60 | 1949 |
| 1935-36 | 20 | 488 | 51 | 1498 |
| 1936-37 | 22 | 493 | 50 | 1210 |
| 1937-38 | | 652 | 68* | 1925 |
| 1938-39 | | | 70* | 1883 |
| 1939-40 | | 715 | 84* | 1214 |

TABLE IX (continued)

| Year | Negro | | White | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Teachers | Enrollment | Teachers | Enrollment |
| 1940-41 | | 815 | 33* | 564 |
| 1941-42 | | 355 | 26* | 237 |
| 1942-43 | | 551 | 22* | 142 |
| 1943-44 | | 332 | 21* | 77 |

*The Statistical Reports of the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, from which these figures were taken, varied in the method of reporting and unless another figure is shown in the proper column the figure is combined figure.

# XII. THE FORMATION, DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGES IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL CURRICULUM THROUGH THE YEARS

Immediately after the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 the Federal Board for Vocational Education undertook investigations of the course and organization of agriculture in secondary schools. This included courses of study and supervision, materials and methods in secondary school agriculture, and supervised practical work in agriculture, including home project method of instruction. This work was carried on with the Department of Agriculture through its division of instruction and subject matter.

True, in his historical study, mentions that outlined lessons on plant and animal production were prepared by E. H. Shipp and unit courses in poultry and swine husbandry by C. H. Schopmeyer were introduced (91, p. 373). This led to attempts to make job analysis of various agricultural enterprises.

Many specialists of note in the country at that time were brought together to work out a curriculum for vocational educations, according to True. Some of these men were L. S. Hawkins, a specialist in agricultural education in the State Department of Education in New York. He had done work on the state level in regard to developing a curriculum for the study of agriculture. He was familiar with the organization, equipment, and curriculum of instruction as related to agriculture.

Charles H. Lane transferred from the Office of Experiment Stations of the Department of Agriculture. He had for several years been

in charge of work relating to agricultural education. He was familiar with teacher training and training in agricultural instruction in secondary schools.

William G. Hummel, a graduate in agriculture at the University of Illinois and University of California, who had taught agriculture in high schools in California and had been for seven years teacher of agricultural education in the University of California was instrumental in setting up beginning policies relating to curriculum development on a national level.

It would require a long list to give credit to all of the men in the early days who participated in the curriculum development work that comprises the present day outline of study. Some of these men are mentioned here to show how men of recognized ability and specialties were employed to get vocational agriculture off to a good start. This early work was evident through the years in the curriculum of vocational agriculture programs.

The supervised farming program was recognized at the very beginning of the work as the central core around which all teaching should be done. This concept is still the controlling influence in molding a curriculum.

The fact that the farming program or project work was the central theme is shown in the comments by Dadisman (16, pp. 27-34). He said that pupils need the application of scientific principles which they are to learn. The home project is an enterprise undertaken by the pupil with full responsibility on his part both for financing

the project and doing the work. It should be a business enterprise involving keeping the books, taking an inventory, and making a final statement. In addition, the project should contain certain home laboratory exercises such as testing milk, propagation of trees, and so on. Thus, it was recognized early that the agricultural instruction was of little practical use unless the student could carry it home and use it.

It was true that many thought of the supervised farming program in the beginning as a pig or a calf of some small project rather than a total farm business venture. But be that as it may, it was the beginning.

Freeman and others said that there was no comparison between modern day teaching of vocational agriculture and the agriculture taught in the early days (41, p. 85).

First courses were textbook courses with livestock taught one year, crops the next year, and so on. Several widely accepted text books on agriculture were then in print and since the teachers knew of no other way of teaching, that is the method they used.

Methods of instruction were much the same. Students were assigned lessons in text books and then the question and answer method followed.

This method was later enlarged to include the project method introduced by Rufus W. Stimson, then Massachusetts State Supervisor of Agricultural Education.

Modifications of the above methods followed with the introduction of the problem method originated by W. H. Lancelot of Iowa State College. It is generally agreed that the conference or discussion method came into being as a result of the influence of Charles R. Allen. This method is still in greatest use with evening schools. All of the above methods with modifications are still in use by teachers of agriculture in Tennessee. Although text books are used as references there is little question and answer type of instruction any more.

At first the supervised farming programs were one pig, one cow, or a few hens. This was later enlarged to include record keeping, farm improvement projects and supplementary or approved farm practices.

Under the state plan for vocational agriculture in 1919 much more time was given to agriculture and the instruction of agricultural subjects (88). The early plans called for high schools to maintain a vocational course of agriculture of not less than two nor more than four years and that schools participating under the Smith-Hughes Act were to devote 50 per cent of the school time to instruction in vocational agriculture. This time was to include time devoted to vocational agriculture instruction and supervised practical work and the related instruction including such subjects as animal husbandry, dairying, horticulture, farm crops, and soils. In all cases where the supervised practical work is done at home, there shall be not less than ninety minutes of actual instruction at the school, and not less than an average of ninety minutes per day of supervised practical

work. This did not necessarily mean that the teacher would actually be present to supervise the practice ninety minutes each day, but that each pupil would spend ninety minutes per day on the practical work.

The plan for 1919 stated that the time which was set aside each day for instruction in agriculture would be a unit. It gave as an example that a school in session five hours per day would have one-half day given to instruction in agriculture. This two and one-half hours given to agriculture would be an unbroken period. It could not be scattered in broken periods of time throughout the day.

A course of instruction was outlined by the 1919 plan. A copy of this course of study will be found in Appendix C.

In order for one to visualize the intent of the early pioneers in vocational agriculture as to a typical day in the life of an agriculture teacher in 1919, the author has placed a copy of a letter written to teachers of vocational agriculture in June of 1919. This letter was from N. E. Fitzgerald who was acting Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture at the time. This was before D. M. Clements had been appointed the first regular State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Teachers of vocational agriculture and others familiar with the work will recognize many theories and principals that later were incorporated in the philosophy of teaching vocational agriculture. The letter is reproduced as Appendix D.

Bulletin 2 of the Supervisor's report in 1918 set some rather definite standards for teaching vocational agriculture. Much of the

following are facts taken from this report (14). The report cautioned those administering the program of the danger of confusing ordinary agriculture and vocational agriculture. Vocational agriculture was to fit for useful employment in farming and not for college. It was pointed out that more time was required for vocational agriculture and that it did not end with the termination of the school term but continued into the summer with project work.

A course of study for an agriculture student was to consist of agriculture one-half day and science, mathematics, English and history the other one-half day. Agriculture was to be taught in the mornings and the related subjects in the afternoon.

It was pointed out by the bulletin that any pupil who wanted to take vocational agriculture must be fourteen years old or over and expected to farm. He was to be fitted for production and useful employment. It was also required that he get a project agreement and take home and have it signed by his parents in which an agreement was made that he carry this project for six months or more. The teacher was to send this agreement to the state office when it was signed.

Other conditions required of the local school systems before they could share in Federal funds for vocational agriculture were that they spend $250.00 as a minimum for equipment. They were also to agree to spend $2.00 per pupil for maintenance during the year. Teachers were warned that this was adequate but to spend it wisely. A special room with movable chairs and desks was also required. A

suggested list of equipment included a good library, milk testing equipment, spraying and pruning equipment, budding and grafting materials, blacksmith outfit, egg incubator, poultry equipment for judging, doctoring and treating equipment, soil conservation equipment, concrete tools, soil auger, carpentry tools, specimen of grains, seed corn testing equipment, samples of fertilizer materials and a rotary mimeograph machine. Teachers were encouraged to build a library by subscribing to magazines and writing for U. S. Department of Agriculture bulletins.

The bulletin explained that supervised practical work could be obtained in either of two ways: by working on the school farm under the immediate supervision or by working on a home farm under the supervision of the teacher who would secure the cooperation of the parent to make the supervision effective in the absence of the teacher. The supervised practice was to consist of two parts: a home project as an enterprise undertaken by the boy who would have full responsibility on his part for both the financing of the project and the doing of the work. The project work would involve the keeping of books, the taking of inventories and the making of final statements. In addition to the project, any home laboratory exercises such as testing milk or the treatment of seed potatoes for scab, or the testing of the germinating powers of seed corn, or the grafting of fruit trees would be carried on. This provision of the plan was probably the basis for improved farm practices or improvement projects which were added to the program later on.

The reader is reminded that these plans and provisions for teaching vocational agriculture were formulated in the year 1919. Those familiar with the program of vocational agriculture will readily recognize principles that are still part of a good program of vocational agriculture with modern teaching methods.

The early teachers of vocational agriculture had no training in teaching methods. They were somewhat confused and demanded instruction and supervision in what and how to teach vocational agriculture. This led D. M. Clements, the new State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, to call on two people in the state to prepare materials for the guidance of the teachers. Dr. K. C. Davis, Professor of Agricultural Education at George Peabody College and C. F. Alden, teacher of vocational agriculture at Goodlettsville, together with Clements, wrote a book entitled Courses in Agriculture for Elementary Schools. This book was issued by the Department of Public Instruction in July of 1921 as a guide for teachers (13). The book contained lesson plans for elementary grades six through eight. They suggested projects, sources of materials, and other aids in teaching elementary grades in what was known as junior project work. This type of work was to lead students into the high school program of instruction in vocational agriculture.

J. T. Lovell stated that he had no knowledge of teaching methods because none was offered at The University of Tennessee prior to 1918 when he was in college (45). He set up his courses in agriculture in

1918 based on the Lippincott series of agriculture books and those written by Dr. K. C. Davis. He taught corn and hogs the first year, animal husbandry, beef and sheep, cereals and tobacco the second year, dairy and horticulture the third year, and farm management, bookkeeping, soils and terracing the fourth year.

More has been written about the early programs of instruction that seemed to the author to be the foundation for the curriculum in vocational agriculture. Later efforts in the years to come resulted in changes and teaching methods that were indicated by trial and error all over the United States. Conferences, regional meetings, agricultural education teacher training departments, supervisors, and in-service training programs gradually made changes as the need arose.

While teaching methods and content must be changed to fit the changing field of agriculture, it is a gratifying thought to realize the excellent foresight and vision of the early leaders and teachers in agriculture in developing a philosophy that still remains as the foundation for modern methods of teaching vocational agriculture.

# CHAPTER VII

## COMMUNITY SERVICE WORK IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

### I. THE COMMUNITY CANNERY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

The idea of helping farm families to can food for home consumption during the periods from late July to early August was not a new idea with the teachers of vocational agriculture. There were Extension home agents who carried cookers to rural homes and taught farm people to can their surplus food as early as 1914, according to J. D. Cliett, vocational agriculture teacher at Tyner High School (15).

Probably, the canneries were of most benefit to the farm people in 1933 during a period of economic depression. Farm families could grow food on the farm but could not make enough income to purchase food from stores. During this period, with government help, many requests were made by farm people for aid in canning programs. The cannery idea was devised to aid farmers and to instruct them in a co-operative effort to improve the food supply. They were important from the depression until after World War II. With the advent of frozen food lockers after the war they lost their importance.

Freeman stated that the cannery was an outgrowth of the war training program (35). There were two types of war training programs. One was the vocational training for war production workers through

which it was thought that workers might be trained to do some job in industry that could contribute to the manufacture of more war materials. The second phase of the war production program was known as OSYA or food production war training. This training was essential to getting adequate food and was the program giving birth to the canneries. The canneries were equipped, in part, by funds furnished through vocational education funds. The buildings were built by the counties and communities. After the war program ended, the title to the buildings were transferred to the counties.

Many reasons were given for the canneries being discontinued. Some felt that people no longer wanted to do the work after the economy provided people with more income. Many people preferred to pay for such service as a part of the food purchase price. Others felt that after the war there was an abundance of food and the cannery was no longer needed. Some felt that the cost of food in small lots was prohibitive. The advent of frozen food lockers was also a factor in the cannery movement coming to a close.

After the war a few of the canneries continued to be used for a few months of the year. Some of them were used for classrooms, storage rooms, stood empty, or were dismantled.

Fitzgerald stated that the cannery program was a cooperative project in its entirety (19). The Extension Service placed G. A. Shooey of that service in the field to aid vocational agriculture teachers and home economics teachers in the dehydration and chemistry

involved in the canning program. After the program was well under way the agriculture teacher was the supervisor of the total operation.

Freeman estimated that there were over eighty canneries in operation in the state at the height of the cannery movement. Some of the schools operating successful canneries were Dixon, Newport, Cookeville, Ooltewah, Hartsville, Gallatin, Carthage, and Hampshire. Of the ones named above the first four were still in operation in 1950.

In one instance noted by the author, the F. F. A. Chapter at Cookeville, prepared 1,400 cans of food that was shipped to UNRRA for overseas food relief (9). The food was donated by the chapter and processed in their modern cannery by members and people in the community.

Some of the canneries, after they were transferred to the county boards of education, were used for a short time to process food for the school lunch rooms.

The vocational agriculture teacher supervised the so-called "victory gardens," and then supervised the canning of the food for shipment for overseas relief. J. T. Lovell, teacher of vocational agriculture at Mount Pleasant, recalled that he and a group of F. F. A. members grew turnip greens, and picked and canned them to be shipped overseas for food relief (45).

The program was popular as long as it was needed and was a definite service to the people but it soon failed to provide a service and of necessity became one of the historic activities of the past.

## II. VETERINARY SERVICE WORK PROVIDED BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE TEACHERS

No account of community service work provided by the teacher of vocational agriculture would be complete without mentioning the public service rendered by these men in the field of veterinary science.

It was never the intent of such teachers to take over that professional field and, thus, incure the ire of the trained veterinarians. The agriculture teacher did have training in animal husbandry and the biological sciences and, also, some pre-veterinary science which gave him an elementary knowledge of the nature of the anatomy of animals.

Many of the early teachers armed with this knowledge went into communities where there were no trained veterinarians. When the farmers in their adult classes and boys in the all day classes brought their problems to the teacher, he was the natural one to help with the control of animal disease. The nature and prevention of livestock diseases were taught in the classes and, naturally, farmers expected a teacher of such subjects to be able to help them when such problems arose.

Veterinary supplies, instruments, and so on were many times supplied by the local Department of Vocational Agriculture. These were used in teaching and in case of a disease outbreak, used for treating farm animals.

Most of the teachers learned the skills and techniques of treating animals from other teachers and by actual practice. None of them

solicited veterinary business but chose to quickly turn such practices over to a veterinarian as soon as one located in the area. Many times a teacher urged one of his students to get a degree in veterinary science and return to do verterinary work in the service area.

In a number of cases of the author's memory, teachers of agriculture chose to return to college for a veterinary degree.

Early teachers of agriculture found much of their time spent in vaccinating and treating sick animals. In recent years this burden has eased somewhat due to the supply of trained veterinarians being more plentiful. The annual report of the Supervisor for 1922 reported that teachers of agriculture had treated 629 sick animals and vaccinated 4,584 hogs for cholera (59). Hog cholera itself did much to cause the teacher to be in demand for veterinary work. Often times the teacher started drives in the vaccination and control of cholera through his classes in agriculture.

Some examples will be presented here to give the reader a representative picture of the practices in operation among teachers relative to this subject.

It was a usual custom for the Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture to list testimonials by people outside of the field of the type of program carried out by the teacher of agriculture in a particular area. One such testimonial listed in the annual report of 1926 quoted Superintendent John W. Gallun of Wayne County as saying that a vocational agriculture teacher by the name of Bishop had spent all

day Saturday and Sunday vaccinating 1,500 hogs to stop an outbreak of hog cholera. He had paid his own travel expense to the area to do the work and the people had gratefully paid him in poultry and potatoes (63). This was a common practice as teachers never charged for their work as they were not practicing, licensed veterinarians.

Another case serves to present the picture along these lines as related by G. E. Horn, now retired, who taught vocational agriculture at Coleman-Brown High School for a number of years.

Horn stated that much of his time was taken up doing veterinary work (44). He felt that this individual service work was an aid in his public relations program with the farmers of the community. It became apparent that there was more demand for the services of the teacher than he could supply. His solution to this problem was organizing the farmers into classes which he called clubs. When he had determined the wishes of these clubs as to what was to be taught as a group, he found an eager demand for a course in veterinary science. This became his first adult farmer class to be taught.

When questioned as to how his training was received in the veterinary science field, Horn stated that he had done a lot of veterinary work under the direction of Dr. White who was then a member of the Animal Disease Control Board and later founder of the White Serum Company. He stated that Dr. White had many times urged him to take the exam for a state veterinary license since he felt that he was well qualified to do such work. He never did this as teaching was his chosen field.

Veterinary work was such a commonplace practice among early teachers that many of them became more widely known for this type of service than they did for teaching of agriculture. It was not unusual to hear the teacher referred to as "Doc."

As the years passed, more qualified veterinarians came into farm areas and the teacher was able to shed this burden as many of them came to view their work. In some cases practicing veterinarians obtained injunctions against the practicing of veterinary medicine by teachers. These cases were few, however. In most cases, the veterinarian was invited to appear as a guest teacher in adult class meetings. In many cases the teacher of agriculture was a contact point between farmers with veterinary problems and the local veterinarian.

The practice has not entirely died out of the teacher practicing veterinary medicine as it pertains to members of his classes. In a number of cases where preventative measures are needed, the teacher is able to save money for farmers in his classes on treatments that do not necessarily demand the cost of a veterinary trip.

It is still necessary for some teachers in counties where no veterinarian has located to be "Doc" when one of the local farmers had a sick animal. One such case in point caused a veterinarian in an adjoining state to remark, after traveling over fifty miles to treat a cow for a farmer, "that he was not acquainted with the local teacher of agriculture, but after following him on some treatments made on local farm animals, he was of the opinion that he was one of the best 'quack' doctors he had ever run across" (56).

Vocational agriculture students still turn to their teacher when they have a sick animal for advice on treatment. This usually results in a quick treatment by the teacher of the animal, or in a case beyond his ability and training, advises that the services of the local veterinarian be acquired.

This type of community service has steadily declined in most vocational agriculture departments and soon will be a story in history of the type of public service offered by the teacher of agriculture. In his place will be a well-trained youngster, who quite likely will be quick to relate that his agriculture teacher advised him to get a veterinary science degree.

## III. COMMUNITY FAIRS AND VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Freeman was not certain how the fair and contest idea got started (35). He was of the opinion that community fairs sponsored by the vocational agriculture departments fostered interest in such outcomes. He cited in his own experience where community fairs were held and exhibits of the vocational agriculture program was displayed. These were used by the teacher to teach boys what they should do and what they should not do. They were taught what to look for in an animal, good or bad, and the same idea prevailed for crops. This led to judging these items and having the boys judge them as a training measure. This fostered competition.

The first corn exhibits, and then later farm shop projects, gave birth to skill days and the present day skills contest.

Gradually, livestock judging teams came into being. These activities, of necessity, brought about a need for a community showcase to give recognition to the vocational agriculture students for the kind of work they were doing.

The first indication, officially, of community fairs was mentioned by State Supervisor Clements in his annual report of 1921 in which he stated that almost every community served by a vocational agriculture teacher would have a community fair (58). The 1926 report stated that nearly every teacher had a community fair totaling seventy-three fairs with 6,609 in attendance.

It is the opinion of G. E. Horn that the beginning of the community fair idea got its greatest impetus from the successful fair activities at Coleman-Brown High School under the supervision of James Moore. This fair was credited with being one of the most successful ever undertaken in the state at that time.

Freeman gives this account of the Coleman-Brown first annual fair held October 28, 1921 (41, pp. 102-103). It is quoted here because of the description of the activities involved which serve to indicate the beginning of fair activities that led to district and state events later.

> The Coleman-Brown Community held its first annual fair on October 28, 1921. Its success can best be judged by its effect upon the community. Wonderful progress was made from the time that it started with a poorly organized fair committee of five persons until the last committee meeting just prior to the fair when between forty and fifty persons were present to lend their assistance in whatever way possible.

Also the rapid decrease in the opposition to a fair was quite noticeable and very gratifying. It was, however, when viewed from the standpoint of a critic or a judge, a single product to exhibit, the people strived and worked until the collection of products of excellent quality, was swelled until there was no space left in the building in which to place them.

The fair association issued a very neat and attractive premium list offering only first, second and third ribbons with no cash prizes except those given in the athletic events on the program of the day. Ten carcasses were donated by the community fair. In addition all persons were invited to bring basket dinners. Sufficient funds were realized from the sale of dinners to defray all expenses. A band of twenty instruments furnished music thruout the day.

Entry books were furnished by the County Agent and were kept by school girls trained for the work. Entry tags were furnished by the State Fair. The livestock pens were made by men of the community. Forty head of livestock and thirty-eight coops of poultry were on exhibition outside the building. Inside the building one large room was given over to the display of agricultural products from the field and the garden, while the ladies department filled two rooms to overflowing. An idea of the number of products shown can be obtained from the fact that every class on the premium list was well represented with close competition in each, while in several classes there were fifty entries and in one there were seventy-nine.

Keen interest was displayed in the riding and driving contests between both boys and girls with their ponies, and the men and ladies with their saddle and road animals.

Messers Alden, Buck, and Thackston acted as judges for livestock and farm products, while the judging of the ladies department was in charge of Miss Shadow, County Home Demonstration Agent.

Soon after the fair a call was issued for a community meeting for the purpose of organizing a permanent fair association for the community.

This report on the Coleman-Brown Community Fair is given as it appeared in a number of Tennessee papers as being typical of the work that many agriculture teachers throughout the state are doing in their respective communities along this line.

The publicity given this community fair in 1921 evidently was used to promote more of the same type affairs because the succeeding

annual reported noted an increasing number of them.

It will be remembered that such affairs gave people a chance to demonstrate their products and animals and it gave them a chance to capture the holiday or circus spirit. None of the smaller communities had the opportunity to visit large fairs, held only in the larger cities, because of the horse and buggy type transportation prevalent in that day. It is thought, too, that other teachers of agriculture, as a result of the publicity given such events, quickly recognized the public relations value of such events and proceeded to organize them along the same successful lines as had Moore in the Coleman-Brown community. Moore continued to sponsor these events until leaving the school in 1927.

G. E. Horn, an early teacher in the work, recalls that the first fair exhibit he remembered was at the community fair at Whitehaven sponsored by the Men's Club there (44). The entrants were the Junior Farm Bureau members, vocational agriculture students and 4-H Club members. The Club gave $100.00 in prizes. Pigs and calves, as well as field crops, were shown. This was considered to be a community improvement type exhibit.

Some of these community fairs lasted as long as three days. To give some idea of the scope of some of them, Horn stated, that in a community fair in 1920 there were twenty hogs barbecued, had their own catalogues, and showed movies run from a projector operated on a 32 volt Delco system. So many people came that enough money was made from the food sold to pay all the prizes.

As related earlier in this narrative concerning community fairs, skill contests in shop work and judging contests were born. The first state-wide contest was held at the state fairs and these got to be so large in scope and participation that there had to be some sort of elimination down the line, and so district and sub-district competition came into being, according to Freeman (35).

Freeman recalled that the first district fair was at Jackson in West Tennessee.

Some of the fertilizer companies promoted corn contests. They wanted to use this for promotional work for their product. This would have invited criticism, in Freeman's estimation, because eventually we would have been an agency to promote the sale of a particular brand of fertilizer. To prevent this, Tennessee never permitted the contests to be based on anything but practices and yields. The fertilizer companies performed a service to vocational agriculture during this period and proper appreciation was always shown.

The above events will show some of the activities popular in the years when transportation and other needs were such that these community activities were successful. Today transportation is such that teachers prefer to participate in district, county and state fairs. County fairs may have been the outcome of previous local community fairs. These events were training grounds for popular contests, exhibits, cattle and hog shows, as well as crop exhibits seen on a state-wide basis.

The community fair like many other activities served its purpose in its time, gave birth to bigger and better things and faded into history.

## IV. THE FOOD PRODUCTION WAR TRAINING PROGRAM

Several references have been made in regard to this program and its connection to vocational agriculture, but it was felt that in order to get the complete picture of the types of public services rendered by vocational agriculture, it would be necessary to give a more detailed description of this war-time program.

Due to the wording of Public Law 812, under which this program was first authorized--"for out-of-school rural youth . . . and for non-rural youth" it was called the OSYA program (35). Later, as emphasis was put upon food production, it became known as the food production war training program.

The war production training program, since it was operated for the purpose of training industrial workers, was essentially an urban program. The rural counterpart was a food production war training program, initiated in October of 1940 and continued in operation throughout the period of World War II.

War production training was carried on by the regular trades and industrial vocational people while the food production and war training was carried on by agricultural education personnel.

The purpose of the program was to train farmers in methods of achieving production goals of those farm commodities designated by

the USDA as essential to the war effort, to train farmers in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment, to provide necessary farm labor to meet increased production demands, and to provide training in the production, processing, and conservation of food for family use.

Classes were taught by vocational agriculture teachers, home economics teachers, local blacksmiths, mechanics, expert dairymen, poultrymen, and specialists in other fields.

Freeman in a vocational education personnel letter dated January 17, 1944, advised teachers that the OSYA program had to be taught as one course. One phase required that the family enrolled plan a family food budget on paper. A second phase of the program required that problems in food production, including varieties, rates, dates of planting, fertilizers, cultivation, insect and disease control, be taught seasonally. The third phase required that instruction be offered in the processing and conserving of food for the family. This third phase brought in the canneries which were set up in a large part under this program.

In February of the same year Freeman wrote a directive to all school administrators in the state in regard to the division of responsibility for the supervision of the OSYA program between the home economics teachers and the teacher of vocational agriculture. There seemed to be questions as to who should do what and this led the Director to point out that since some extra pay was due each teacher

that they should share the responsibility jointly. This included the necessary supervision in the field.

The cannery program was operated under OSYA course No. 15 and as such made up the core of the program for food production for the war-time program (36).

H. N. Parks was brought to the state office of vocational agriculture to serve as supervisor of the food production war training program in 1942 (40). However, in 1944 he suffered a heart attack and it was necessary to transfer J. W. Brimm, then District Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in West Tennessee, to the state office to take over this duty in June of 1944. Ben Douglas, teacher of agriculture at Lexington, succeeded Brimm as West Tennessee Supervisor. Parks returned to his duties as Supervisor for Middle Tennessee vocational agriculture teachers.

The Tennessee Chain Stores Council sponsored a contest in 1944 in connection with the OSYA program. This contest gave rise to the farm victory gardens made famous during the war period. Many Future Farmers in various chapters across the state participated in this patriotic undertaking (37).

Another phase of the OSYA had to do with training of young people out of school for war production in industry. The author, a high school graduate, participated in one of the training schools in mechanics and shop skills offered at Elkton High School under the supervision of Allen English, teacher of vocational agriculture at that time.

The course offered training in skills then considered necessary for production in war plants devoted to the war effort. Such skills included gas and electric welding, engine overhaul and repair, concrete, metal work, and electrical skills. These skills were usually taught by local mechanics or people recruited from nearby industry that were proficient in the skills required. Many times the teacher of vocational agriculture did not have training in the skills. His responsibility was to recruit students, supervise teaching procedures, and procure equipment. He keeps records necessary for the operation and administration of the program.

This program was the beginning of new skills mentioned above which later make up a more modern shop program. Prior to this period, only such skills as rope, harness, blacksmith, and carpentry work were taught as part of the farm mechanics programs in high school vocational agriculture departments.

In the opinion of such teachers as J. T. Lovell, this modernized the shop program from one based on mule farming to the more modern tractor and mechanized type farming (45). It also made the teacher of agriculture an instructor more in keeping with the times.

Lovell pointed out that the funds received through the program for vocational training enabled teachers to go to industry and procure teachers to teach the courses and gave the teacher funds to buy welders and other equipment that teachers in the state had not known how to operate up to that time.

After the program was terminated with the close of the war much of the equipment was signed over to the schools for use in training all day and adult farmers in the school program.

The program also motivated the teachers to return to The University of Tennessee for training in the use of these new skills which had been incorporated in the University shop training courses.

So another phase in the growth and development of instruction of vocational agriculture was incorporated into the teaching program. The OSYA program probably will be remembered most for the modernizing of the farm mechanics program in vocational agriculture.

The program was the death knell of the part-time program as indicated in the annual descriptive report of 1942-43 which noted that the part-time program was decreasing due to the fact that many young men were going in service and the OSYA program was satisfying the needs of those out-of-school youth that remained (78).

Closing of the war production training program in the spring of 1945 came as suddenly as did its beginning in 1940. With the course of the war in Europe changing rapidly, the need for closing of war training diminished. The states were notified promptly of the closing of the program in a memorandum from the U. S. Commissioner of Education (42, pp. 605-606).

## V. OTHER COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

To list all of the miscellaneous activities of the teacher of vocational agriculture in his community service work would involve

much more space than can be given here. Many things done by the teacher as community service are outside the field of vocational agriculture in civic clubs, church, local government and other areas. Because of the training, willingness, and prominence of the teacher in the community, his services are eagerly sought for community activities. This type of service work is usually accepted by the teacher of vocational agriculture as part of his job.

Examples will be given through the years to give some indication of the type and scope of miscellaneous activities provided the teacher.

One such summary in the early years of 1922 is provided by Director Clements in his annual descriptive report (59). In this report he mentions that as a means of community service teachers helped in pruning 16,975 trees, spraying 7,809 trees, terracing 2,840 acres of land, draining 905 acres, culling 10,555 hens, treating 681 sick animals and vaccinating 502 hogs for cholera. They responded to 4,511 phone calls and 5,610 personal inquiries from farmers. There were 3,514 farmers exclusive of projects visited. The number of rural elementary schools visited was 292, and the teachers attended 335 teachers meetings. These figures are more meaningful when it is noted that there were relatively few teachers in the work at that time. It will also be remembered that the job of the teacher was one of individual service by the teacher for such activities as those listed above. This kind of approach became too much of a burden later and

resulted in organization of groups of people in classes for adult instruction.

Another community activity growing out of the vocational agriculture instruction program was the building, equipping, and instructing of farmers in community farm mechanic shops.

The beginning of these shops resulted from the desire on the part of farmers to do their own farm shop repair and maintenance work. Such needs resulted in the construction of community shops by the farmers under the supervision of the agriculture teacher.

The farm shops constructed at Dickson High School and the surrounding service area will serve as an example of this type of service. Kenneth Mitchell and James Clemmer, vocational agriculture teachers at Dickson, give the following account of the establishment and growth of these type shops (47).

In the beginning welders and other portable equipment were trucked to the various communities to provide the shop instruction demanded by farmers in the area. Then the idea was advanced that the needs could be met by construction of local shops owned by the farmers.

After clearance with the school authorities each farmer in the adult evening classes bought equal shares in the shop. This money was used to buy equipment and materials to construct the shop. The class members under the supervision of the teachers constructed six farm mechanic shops in this fashion. By buying war surplus equipment and doing the work themselves, these shops were well fitted to supply the

needs in such work as toolfitting, forge work, general repair of farm tractors and trucks and other farm equipment. Each member was charged a shop fee and issued a key for the year which entitled him to use the shop whenever needed. At the end of the year, new locks and keys were provided and an annual fee collected. The vocational agriculture teacher was responsible for the teaching of skills in the adult shop program.

As a result of these successful attempts, other departments followed in the footsteps of this venture.

Another activity of the local vocational agriculture departments over the years has been the operation of school farms by the teacher and vocational agriculture teacher.

One of the first of these type farms was located at Farragut High School under the direction of Adams Phillips (49). Demonstration plots on liming, fertilization, and crop varieties was carried on. The school owned workstock and tools and the janitor aided in doing the farm work and feeding of the animals.

The Dickson Chapter of Future Farmers of America purchased fifty acres of land for a demonstration school farm. This farm was purchased for $8,000.00 by the county and given to the chapter. The land belonged to the county and all livestock and equipment belonged to the Dixon F. F. A. Chapter.

Soil conservation practices, record keeping, and livestock improvement practices are featured on the farm.

Other schools such as Collinwood, Charlotte, Montgomery County, and others have similar farms in operation.

Many teachers have used rented land as teaching devices and money making ventures to support chapter activities.

One teacher indicated that he felt the values derived from school farms were the demonstration of value, stimulation of interest in F. F. A. members, publicity for the chapter, public relations, and helped make people educational minded (56).

Cooperative effort has always been one of the featured activities in every vocational agriculture department. This has taken many forms such as cooperative buying, bull blocks, heifer chains and gilt chains, cooperative selling, and others.

J. T. Lovell was a pioneer in the use of "bull blocks" (45). This was done in connection with evening classes at Bradley County Central High School. The bulls were swapped about to allow everyone to get service to unrelated animals. Lovell is also credited with organization of the first pig chain in Tennessee. He formed a cooperative chick hatchery at the high school and the boys brought in eggs to brood at school. They did this until the boys got electricity at home.

In 1927 G. E. Horn, in addition to a chick hatchery for F. F. A. members, ordered fruit trees and carloads of fertilizer through cooperative effort in adult classes (44).

In 1933 economic conditions were at an all-time low in the country. The rural rehabilitation program of the Federal Emergency

Administration used vocational agriculture teachers as supervisors in production of relief gardens, canning program, and other phases of the program (86).

Teachers were also used in the cotton districts of the state in rendering valuable service in matters pertaining to the Bankhead Act.

The above examples indicate the role played by the vocational agriculture teacher in his area in the explanation, administration, and conducting of various government programs. He is the Federal employee nearest and most familiar with the needs of the people in his service area and therefore most suited to community action programs.

# CHAPTER VIII

## SUMMARY

It was felt by the author that this attempt as a historical study was a beginning in preserving some of the history that was the development of vocational agriculture in Tennessee. Much more work remains to be done as a work of this sort could not hope to cover so vast a subject.

Many of the vocational agriculture teachers and other workers in the field of vocational agriculture are retiring from the work and a large number soon will follow. A number of those who have contributed much to the work have been claimed by death as will be the case of many more in the near future because of age. This work has been an attempt to preserve the many historical facts that might have been lost had a study of this type not been made.

Throughout the work the author has attempted to point out areas needing further study such as the negro in vocational agriculture, the history of the Tennessee Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, the history of adult education in agriculture in Tennessee, and other areas as well. Many individuals have contributed much to the philosophy and framework of the vocational agriculture program. Some would find fertile fields for study in exploring further the contributions of such men as N. E. Fitzgerald, G. E. Freeman, D. M. Clements,

and others in the field of vocational agriculture. A study in depth of all the contributions made by vocational agriculture teachers who are now retired would be a rewarding addition to the history of vocational agriculture.

This history has shown the types of agriculture instruction existing prior to the advent of vocational agriculture and some of its effects on present day programs. It has shown the entry of various programs, activities, people and places, and their effect on the development of a program of vocational agriculture education.

More emphasis was placed on the early years and the historical facts related to these years because it was felt that these were the formative years when the philosophy of vocational agriculture was developed. It was felt that these historical facts needed to be preserved while those connected with this era were still living.

It is the hope of the author that much satisfaction and enjoyment will result from the reading, reminiscing, recognition, and recall of events, persons, activities and places that have now become the history of vocational agriculture in Tennessee.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY


1. Agricultural Education Correspondence Files. File Copy of Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Conference Program, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1919.

2. Agricultural Education Correspondence Files. Newspaper Clippings on Evening Class Work, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1929.

3. Agricultural Education Correspondence Files. Newspaper Clippings on Evening Class Work, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1930-31.

4. Agricultural Education Correspondence Files. Newspaper Clippings of Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Conference, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1929-30.

5. Agricultural Education Correspondence Files. Printed Program of Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Conference, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1919.

6. Agriculture Teacher's Personnel Files. Division of Vocational Education, Tennessee State Department of Education, Nashville.

7. Brimm, J. W. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

8. Brimm, J. W. "Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee Since World War II." Nashville: Division of Vocational Education, Tennessee State Department of Education, 1946.

9. Brimm, J. W. "Vocational Agriculture Through the Years." Paper Prepared by Former Assistant State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee, 1945.

10. Bruner, R. E. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

11. Carney, John. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

12. Clements, D. M. Personal Letter, From Collection of W. E. Robinson, to N. E. Fitzgerald.

13. Clements, D. M. Requirements and Materials for Vocational Agriculture, Bulletin 4. Nashville: Tennessee State Board for Vocational Education, 1920.

14. Clements, D. M. Requirements Necessary to Qualify for Smith Hughes Aid in Agriculture, Bulletin 2. Nashville: Tennessee State Board for Vocational Education, 1918.

15. Cliett, J. D. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

16. Dadisman, Samuel H. Methods of Teaching Vocational Agriculture in Secondary Schools. Boston: The Gorman Press, 1921.

17. Federal Board for Vocational Education. Agriculture Education Organization and Administration, Bulletin 13, Agricultural Series No. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.

18. Fife, Ray. Personal Letter to N. E. Fitzgerald, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, February 10, 1928.

19. Fitzgerald, N. E. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

20. Fitzgerald, N. E. Mimeographed Form Letter to All Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Agricultural Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, June 3, 1919.

21. Fitzgerald, N. E. Mimeographed Form Letter to All Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, June 28, 1919.

22. Fitzgerald, N. E. Mimeographed Form Letter to All Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, June 30, 1919.

23. Fitzgerald, N. E. Mimeographed Form Letter to All Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, September 25, 1919.

24. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to A. S. Thomas, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1936.

25. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to C. D. Martin, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1931.

26. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to Charles Campbell, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1930.

27. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to D. M. Clements, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1921.

28. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to D. M. Clements, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1921.

29. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to H. B. Smith, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1938.

30. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to J. B. Kirkland, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1942.

31. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to James E. Tice, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1936.

32. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to John McDonald, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1931.

33. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to L. E. Barnes, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1926.

34. Fitzgerald, N. E. Personal Letter to S. E. Connatser, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1934.

35. Freeman, G. E. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

36. Freeman, G. E. Personal Letter to All Local School Administrators, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, February 10, 1944.

37. Freeman, G. E. Personal Letter to All Teachers of Vocational Agriculture, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, February 29, 1944.

38. Freeman, G. E. Personal Letter to E. D. Stivers, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, March 5, 1922.

39. Freeman, G. E. Personal Letter to Homer L. Laws, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1936.

40. Freeman, G. E. Personal Letter to N. E. Fitzgerald, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, May 15, 1944.

41. Freeman, G. E. "Vocational Agriculture in Tennessee." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1924.

42. Hawkins, L. S., et al. Development of Vocational Education. Chicago: American Technological Society, 1951.

43. Hendrix, Eason. Personal Letter to N. E. Fitzgerald, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files, Agricultural Education Department, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, July 1, 1938.

44. Horn, G. E. Information Received Through Personal Interviews.

45. Lovell, James T. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

46. McBride, Charles Harold. "The History of the Future Farmers of America in Tennessee." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1962.

47. Mitchell, Kenneth K. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

48. Paulus, A. J. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

49. Phillips, Adams. Information and Materials Collected Through Personal Interview.

50. Phillips, Adams. "The Farragut High School," The Ohio Farmer, (January, 1914), p. 17.

51. Robinson, W. E. Information and Materials Collected Through Personal Interview.

52. Sparkes, S. L. Information and Materials Collected Through Personal Interview.

53. Stark, Clifford N. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

54. State Department of Education. Newsletter to All Vocational Agriculture Teachers, Division of Vocational Education, Nashville, 1926.

55. Stimson, Rufus W. and Frank W. Lathrop. History of Agricultural Education of Less Than College Grade in the United States. Vocational Division Bulletin 217, Agricultural Series 55, Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942.

56. Story, T. C. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

57. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1918.

58. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1921.

59. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1922.

60. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1923.

61. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1924.

62. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1925.

63. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1926.

64. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1927.

65. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1928.

66. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1931.

67. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1932.

68. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1933.

69. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1934.

70. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1935.

71. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1936.

72. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1937.

73. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1938.

74. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1939.

75. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1940.

76. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1941.

77. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1942.

78. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1943.

79. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1945.

80. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1946.

81. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1948.

82. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Statistical Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1922.

83. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Statistical Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1925 to 1936.

84. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Statistical Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1926.

85. Tennessee State Board of Education. Eighth Annual Descriptive Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1929.

86. Tennessee State Board of Education. Annual Statistical Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1933.

87. Tennessee State Board of Education. First Annual Statistical Report, A Report Prepared by the State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1919.

88. Tennessee State Board of Education. Tennessee State Plan for Vocational Education. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1919.

89. Tennessee State Board of Education. Tennessee State Plan for Vocational Education. Nashville: State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, 1947-52.

90. Thaxton, G. B. "Part-Time Instruction Course Outline," Materials Prepared by the Middle Tennessee Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture and Received From W. E. Robinson, Vocational Agriculture Teacher, Karns High School, Knox County, Tennessee.

91. True, Alfred Charles. A History of Agricultural Education in the United States, 1785 to 1925. Miscellaneous Publication Number 36, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929.

92. United States Office of Education. Agenda for Conference on Community Programs in Home and Family Life Education, Department of Interior, Miscellaneous Publication 2112-5. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1938.

93. Vocational Agriculture Personnel Records. State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Nashville.

94. Yarbrough, Morrell. Information Received Through Personal Interview.

# APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

TEACHERS AND DEPARTMENTS OF VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE FROM 1917 TO 1956[1]

| | Teachers | | | | Departments | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White | | | | White | | | |
| Year | East | Middle | West | Negro | East | Middle | West | Negro |
| 1917-18 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 1918-19 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 10 |
| 1919-20 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| 1920-21 | 11 | 18 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 18 | 10 | 15 |
| 1921-22 | 11 | 19 | 14 | 16 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 16 |
| 1922-23 | 17 | 23 | 18 | 16 | 19 | 23 | 18 | 19 |
| 1923-24 | 18 | 29 | 19 | 15 | 20 | 28 | 19 | 18 |
| 1924-25 | 20 | 39 | 20 | 17 | 20 | 38 | 20 | 19 |
| 1925-26 | 25 | 52 | 29 | 20 | 25 | 50 | 29 | 22 |
| 1926-27 | 30 | 55 | 37 | 20 | 30 | 55 | 38 | 22 |
| 1927-28 | 29 | 52 | 36 | 19 | 29 | 53 | 40 | 21 |
| 1928-29 | 29 | 49 | 38 | 18 | 29 | 49 | 45 | 21 |
| 1929-30 | 35 | 52 | 47 | 23 | 35 | 54 | 55 | 27 |
| 1930-31 | 38 | 54 | 48 | 22 | 39 | 56 | 55 | 25 |
| 1931-32 | 39 | 59 | 52 | 24 | 40 | 62 | 55 | 27 |
| 1932-33 | 39 | 58 | 56 | 24 | 42 | 60 | 59 | 25 |
| 1933-34 | 41 | 58 | 53 | 22 | 44 | 61 | 56 | 23 |
| 1934-35 | 44 | 56 | 53 | 21 | 44 | 59 | 56 | 22 |
| 1935-36 | 45 | 53 | 49 | 21 | 46 | 54 | 51 | 22 |
| 1936-37 | 43 | 54 | 50 | 24 | 44 | 57 | 52 | 23 |
| 1937-38 | 53 | 64 | 54 | 27 | 54 | 67 | 54 | 26 |
| 1938-39 | 60 | 75 | 63 | 29 | 61 | 78 | 61 | 29 |
| 1939-40 | 67 | 75 | 68 | 35 | 68 | 78 | 65 | 36 |
| 1940-41 | 69 | 78 | 69 | 37 | 70 | 80 | 65 | 37 |
| 1941-42 | 70 | 78 | 68 | 36 | 71 | 79 | 65 | 36 |
| 1942-43 | 61 | 72 | 59 | 39 | 62 | 74 | 62 | 39 |
| 1943-44 | 62 | 66 | 57 | 36 | 64 | 68 | 60 | 36 |
| 1944-45 | 57 | 64 | 53 | 36 | 58 | 66 | 53 | 36 |
| 1945-46 | 55 | 63 | 57 | 33 | 57 | 64 | 57 | 37 |
| 1946-47 | 58 | 69 | 61 | 37 | 57 | 75 | 60 | 37 |
| 1947-48 | 68 | 84 | 68 | 38 | 66 | 87 | 67 | 37 |
| 1948-49 | 78 | 98 | 73 | 37 | 76 | 97 | 71 | 38 |
| 1949-50 | 86 | 101 | 79 | 42 | 83 | 99 | 77 | 40 |

[1]Personnel Records of Vocational Agriculture (Nashville: Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education. (93)

| Year | Teachers | | | | Departments | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | White | | | | White | | | |
| | East | Middle | West | Negro | East | Middle | West | Negro |
| 1950-51 | 86 | 104 | 82 | 43 | 83 | 100 | 81 | 40 |
| 1951-52 | 95 | 111 | 87 | 45 | 90 | 102 | 85 | 40 |
| 1952-53 | 95 | 112 | 88 | 43 | 89 | 105 | 85 | 40 |
| 1953-54 | 93 | 113 | 88 | 39 | 90 | 104 | 85 | 39 |
| 1954-55[a] | | | | | 90 | 103 | 85 | |
| 1955-56 | 94 | 114 | 86 | 40 | 91 | 105 | 84 | 34 |

[a]Figures not available.

## APPENDIX B[2]

### OUTLINE FOR PROPOSED TWO-YEAR COURSE FOR PART-TIME CLASSES

by

G. B. Thackston, District Supervisor of Middle Tennessee

| First Year | Second Year |
|---|---|
| I. Agriculture | I. Agriculture |
| II. Farm Mechanics | II. Farm Mechanics |
| III. Farm Business | III. Farm Business |
| IV. Farm Law and Civics | IV. Rural Health and Sanitation |

Note:--Courses may be inter-changed, or subjects within the course may be inter-changed to meet the needs of each particular class.

### OUTLINE

First Year

I. Agriculture:

Teach the production of those crops and types of livestock best suited to the community, and in which the members of the class are most interested. It is not necessary to teach all of the jobs of an enterprise, only those that need improvement in the community.

The enterprises to be studied should be selected by the class,--as indicated by their interest. The jobs within the enterprises should be selected by comparing the practices of the community with experiment station data and approved practices, and then deciding what jobs need improvement.

Ordinarily, strictly agricultural subjects should not take up more than half of the entire teaching time, that is, if you expect to teach twenty class periods, about ten should be sufficient for agriculture.

---

[2] "Part-Time Instruction Outline," Prepared by G. B. Thaxton, Middle Tennessee Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, Material Received From W. E. Robinson.

II. Farm Mechanics:

1. Care and Repair of Farm Machinery and Project Equipment.

Have members bring in plows, mowers, etc., and completely dismantle them and rebuild. If members of class do not own any farm machinery themselves, do this for some neighboring farmer. The owner of the machinery will pay for all new parts needed, paint, etc.

References:--Farm machinery catalogs.
John Deere Machinery book
Farm Mechanics--Cook, Scranton, McColly.
Farm Mechanics, Dr. Davis.

2. Rope Work.

(Use this on bad days when it is necessary to stay in close to fire)
Let members bring in the necessary lengths of rope to make rope halters, splices, simple knots, etc.

3. Tool Fitting.

Have each member collect and place together in some convenient place about the home or some outhouse,--all of the shop tools on his home place. Make an inventory of these. Then make a plan for gradually adding other tools that are needed.

Make work benches, saw horses, etc., for these home shops. Have members bring their own saws, chisels, hatchets, etc., from home and sharpen them. Also replace handles, etc. that are needed.

4. Lumber Measurement.

Go to a nearby lumber stack and actually measure, and estimate the content of, different pieces of lumber. Then calculate a bill of material for a hog house, chicken coop, wagon box, etc.

III. Farm Business

1. Letter Writing

Practice writing orders for bulletins, seeds, price quotations, farm machinery, tile, lumber, clothing, etc. Make application for a position. Write an advertisement offering farm products for sale.

2. Agricultural English

Read agricultural journals and newspapers in class and have members report on articles. Have them write out these articles in their own words. Debate current events. In every case, have fellow members check grammatical mistakes in the speeches and in the written work.

3. Agricultural Situation

Study the agricultural outlook, crops and markets, daily market reports, etc. Do not confuse students with too many tables, statistics, etc.

4. Farm Mortgages, Deeds etc.

Have a good lawyer discuss these things before the class, pointing out the things necessary to make a mortagage binding, and the difficulties likely to be met. Determine the things necessary to make a deed binding.

Study insurance papers, bank checks, deposits, notes, drafts, shipping bills and shipping rules (these can be had from your nearest railroad) farm contracts.

IV. Farm Law and Civics

1. Taxation

Have some county official (County judge, assessor, trustee, county court clerk, recorder, county superintendent) talk to the class in detail about his job. Determine how the public monies passing through each office are spent, what part of it goes for salaries for officials and what part for improvement of the county. (Outline exactly what information is wanted, else these men are likely to "wander" considerably in their discussion.)

2. Everyday Law

Have some good lawyer talk to the class on some of the most legal points which bother farmers,--as in line fences, wandering livestock, roads and right-of-way, seeds, drainage, streams, methods of renting, etc. (Again outline exactly what points the class wants discussed.)

Second Year

I. Agriculture

Follow the same procedure used in the first year, continuing on the same enterprises, but adding some new enterprises and some new jobs.

II. Farm Mechanics:

1. Terracing

Take the class to some member's field, lay out and actually construct a terrace. Then, in the class, teach the fundamental principles of terrace building, the different types of terraces, the proper fall, distance between terraces etc.

2. Repair of Harness

(For bad days) Have members bring in broken bridles, etc., and let the class repair them. Teach cleaning and oiling harness.

3. Wood Working and Project Equipment

Determine farm equipment needed by members, as hog houses, feeders, chicken coops, etc., if the members will bring in the necessary materials, let the class construct these pieces of equipment, if necessary, take the class to the homes of the members to do this work.

4. Electrical Work

If the class is in a community where power is available, teach them how to install wiring, connect switches, etc.

III. Farm Business

1. Calculations

Teach only practical forms of calculations. Practice calculating interest by the methods used at the community bank; go to a nearby corn-crib and calculate the contents; determine the amounts of material needed for a concrete structure; calculate bill of materials and cost of a barn; determine the amount of water available from a given spring, or other source, etc.

2. Land Measurement

Measure and calculate the area of different fields. Reference: "Mapping Fields with Traverse Board" by W. C. Pelton, Extension Division, The University of Tennessee.

3. Farm Organizations

Study the different national farm organizations,--their objectives and possible advantages to the community and to the individual members of the class. Have an official of same of these organizations talk to the class and invite members to ask him questions.

IV. Health

1. Personal Health and Hygiene

Have the director of public health or some physician of the community talk to the boys on the most common diseases and health problems of young men, together with methods of prevention and cure.

2. Public Health

Have director of public health talk on communicable and contagious diseases, public clinics, and community sanitation and control measures.

## APPENDIX C[3]

## A COURSE FOR THE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS OF TENNESSEE FOR THE YEAR 1918

### Two-Year Vocational Agricultural Course

Agriculture I

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English | 1 Period |
| 2. | Algebra | 1 |
| 3. | Biology, farm arithmetic and accounts | 1 |
| 4. | Agriculture (elementary) | 1 |

Agriculture II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English | 1 |
| 2. | Algebra | 1 |
| 3. | Livestock Production; Horticulture | 1 |
| 4. | Physiography | 1 |
| 5. | Home Project and Farm Practice | 2 |

### Four-Year Vocational Agriculture Course

Agriculture I

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English (Grammer, composition, classics | 1 Period |
| 2. | First Year Mathematics | 1 |
| 3. | Biology, including human physiology | 1 |
| 4. | Elementary Agriculture (Field Crops) | 1 |
| 5. | Farm Practice | 2 |

Agriculture II

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English (Composition and literature | 1 |
| 2. | Second year Mathematics | 1 |
| 3. | Livestock Production | 1 |
| 4. | Physiography | 1 |
| 5. | Farm Practice | 2 |

---

[3]The Tennessee State Plan For Vocational Education (Nashville: Tennessee State Board of Education, July 1919).

Agriculture III

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English (Composition and Literature | 1 |
| 2. | Farm Arithmetic Elementary Economics | 1 |
| 3. | Horticulture | 1 |
| 4. | Project Work | 2 |

Agriculture IV

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | English (Composition and Literature | 1 |
| 2. | American History and Civics | 1 |
| 3. | Chemistry | 1 |
| 4. | Farm Management and Farm Machinery | 1 |
| 5. | Project Work | 2 |

## APPENDIX D[4]

### ACTIVITIES TO BE CARRIED OUT BY VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURAL TEACHERS OF TENNESSEE DURING THE SUMMER

1. Supervision of project work:

   a. To visit every project at least twice a month during the growing season.
   b. Checking the records and accounts of all project pupils every time a visit is made.
   c. Holding a conference of a project pupils at least once a month. (This might take the form of a junior farmer's meeting.)

2. Community Service:

   a. Helping patrons of the school in any agricultural matters that they may ask information about
   b. Aiding community fairs.

3. Collecting material for next year's instruction:

   a. Of crops, insects and plant diseases, soils and fertilizers (This collection should include single and ten-ear samples of corn, head samples of wheat, oats, etc., samples of cotton balls and stalks if in a cotton section, and grain samples of all the leading farm crops for use in scoring and judging in the winter.)
   b. Equipping the laboratory by making some things that cannot be bought and by ordering all the things necessary to start the school year.
   c. Securing reference material--books, bulletins, and any other form of material that is available from the State Agricultural College or State Department of Agriculture.

4. Enrollment of Pupils for the next school year:

   a. Students should be encouraged to enter the high school course in agriculture.
   b. Parents should know what you intend to do this course. Urge them to send the older boys who are not in regular attendance.

---

[4]Mimeographed Form Letter to All Teachers of Vocational Agriculture from N. E. Fitzgerald, Agricultural Education Correspondence Files (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee, Agricultural Education Department, Morgan Hall, June 28, 1919).

c. Evening courses are possible under the Smith-Hughes law. You can get information about this from the State Supervisor.

5. Part-time instruction for all ages of people:

a. For pupils under twenty years.
b. For pupils over twenty years.
c. Evening courses for adults.
(Teachers cannot expect to use all of these courses. If there is a real demand in your community for some such improvement it will be well for you to help work this matter out)

6. Professional Improvement:

a. Summer school, one month unless adequately prepared in both training and experience.
b. Attendance at the regular annual Conference of Smith-Hughes Teachers to be announced by the New Supervisor.

Very Sincerely Yours,

N. E. Fitzgerald,
Acting Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture

June 28th, 1919.