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CHAPTER I

THE STUDY AND ITS SETTING

American agriculture is undergoing rapid and dramatic changes brought about by technological advancements and improved methods in producing the food and fiber essential for an expanding population. Vocational education in agriculture, therefore, faces a tremendous challenge if it is to continue to serve the occupational education needs of those who are engaged in or who are preparing for occupations in agriculture. Thousands of teachers of vocational agriculture and hundreds of state supervisors and teacher educators in vocational education in agriculture must provide leadership for the needed changes.

The influence of state supervisors of vocational education in agriculture can and should be a vital force in guiding these changes. This position is corroborated by the following statements: "The leadership of vocational education will determine both its quality and effectiveness."¹ "Supervision in vocational agriculture is perhaps the key job in the whole program. An improvement of supervision will directly effect improvements in the program."²


The numbers of people being served by vocational agriculture programs are constantly increasing. The President's Panel on Vocational Education reported that "during the 1950-1961 period, the total growth in enrollment was approximately 5 percent."\(^3\)

The recent passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided for further expansion of vocational education in agriculture. This legislation, which authorized the appropriation of additional funds and amended the present vocational act, permitted the use of present funds to serve a larger segment of the agricultural industry.

It appears reasonable then that improvement of supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture will contribute to the improvement of education for an increasing number of people in the immediate future.

As vocational educators make plans for facing the challenges ahead and for improving their supervisory programs, "nothing makes more sense than the proposition that self-study will reveal problems that will (or should) lead to self-improvement."\(^4\)

The major focus of this study then is aimed at achieving program modifications which meet the needs of rapidly changing conditions through self-evaluation.

---

\(^3\)Report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, p. 30.

\(^4\)Kenneth E. McIntyre, Selection and On-The Job Training of School Principals (Austin, Texas: The University of Texas, 1960), p. 79.
Need for the Study

The writer has believed for some time that a need existed for the development of an evaluation procedure which would assist state supervisors in appraising the effectiveness of their supervisory program. This felt need has been accentuated by the realization that rapidly changing conditions in agriculture and vocational education are creating a necessity for change in educational programs if these programs are to meet the needs of students.

The belief that "the basic justification for evaluation lies in its relationship to improvement" was the motivating force in the writer's efforts to develop a satisfactory procedure for evaluating state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

A review of the writings of well-known authors in the field of educational supervision revealed a lack of evaluative criteria for the various kinds of educational supervisory programs. This apparent dearth of evaluative criteria may be explained by the generalization that "supervisors and administrative officials seem, in general, to have been more interested in the development of programs of activities than in their evaluation." Burton and Brueckner further noted that "educational leadership today is decidedly hampered in many respects by traditional practices that would undoubtedly be eliminated with the

---


introduction of more effective means and methods of evaluation." They also point out that "if the methods of educational leadership are to be constantly improved, steps must be taken to develop more accurate instruments for the continuous evaluation of their effectiveness."^7

Another noted authority inferred a lack of evaluation of supervision when he suggested that "a supervisor needs to make more thorough and carefully planned evaluations of himself if he is to improve."^8 The more recent writing of Morphet, Johns, and Reller also confirms the need for more adequate evaluation in this statement: "A good part of the inadequacy of evaluation in schools stems from the failure to recognize the significance of such work."^9

Evidence of increased interest in and the value of evaluation of supervision is made even more apparent by statements, such as the following which appear in the literature: "One of the most significant trends in supervision today is the inclination of those in instructional leadership positions to establish procedures for evaluating their own effectiveness."^10

---

6Ibid., p. 656.
7Ibid.
The lack of suitable evaluation procedures was further emphasized in a recent letter from Dr. A. Webster Tenney, Director of the Vocational Agriculture Branch of the United States Office of Education, addressed to the writer which indicated that he knew of no sources where written criteria were available for use in evaluating state supervisory programs for vocational education in agriculture.

Further evidence of interest and need was identified by Taylor's study on the In-Service Training Needs of State Supervisors of Vocational Education in Agriculture which revealed that the supervisors considered evaluation of the supervisory program as their greatest need for in-service education among sixteen major areas of professional competency.

State supervisors of vocational education in agriculture in a recent national conference acknowledged the need for greater emphasis on evaluation when they recommended that "the head state supervisor and members of his staff should recognize the importance of evaluation and accept responsibility for it . . . by: (1) Developing and carrying out a comprehensive state program of evaluation, (2) Encouraging the initiation of evaluation at the local level, (3) Evaluating the program and activities of the state supervisory staff." They further stated

---

11Letter written to Author, November 1, 1962.

12Robert E. Taylor, "In-Service Training Needs for State Supervisors of Vocational Education in Agriculture" (Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School, Ohio State University, 1961).

that "the evaluation of the state program might be accomplished if the supervisory staff is to: (a) Give attention to devising ways and means for evaluating supervisory activities as a part of planning a program of supervision, (b) Encourage teachers, administrators, teacher educators, other staff members, lay people, and others to participate in the evaluation of the effectiveness of supervision, (c) Use the results of evaluation in revising and improving supervisory programs."

The need for and value of evaluation are well documented in the literature. There appears, also, to have been some thought given to how the evaluation of educational programs might be conducted. However, printed material describing the evaluation of state supervisory programs is obviously lacking. This paucity is even more evident in the area of evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture. It would seem apparent that the development of evaluative procedures and instruments to guide the evaluation process would prove to be a valuable addition to the profession of vocational education in agriculture.

**Purpose of the Study**

The central purpose of this study was to develop a guide for the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

---

14 Ibid., p. 70.
Specific Objectives of the Study

The following specific objectives were identified to provide further direction to the study.

1. To design an instrument to assist state supervisors in self-evaluation of their supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

2. To develop a procedure for self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

Basic Assumptions

The following statements, which are believed to be consistent with the opinions of leaders in the profession, are assumed to be true for the purposes of this study.

1. It was assumed that the sixteen guiding principles of state supervision identified by Taylor's study constitute the basic elements of a state supervisory program for vocational education in agriculture.

2. It was assumed that the writer assisted by juries of experts could synthesize from the literature and other sources the main indicators which demonstrate the implementation of each guiding principle.

3. It was assumed that the use of the self-evaluation instrument and suggested procedures in four states was sufficient to provide the writer with a basis for formulating recommendations.

**Scope of the Study**

The self-evaluation instrument and procedures were designed to assist in the evaluation of the total state supervisory program in vocational education in agriculture. The study was not directed toward the evaluation of the efforts of individual state staff members. The self-evaluation instrument was designed for use by any state supervisory staff in vocational education in agriculture. Since the primary emphasis was on self-evaluation, it was not intended that the instrument and procedures developed in this study should be used as a means of "scoring" a state's program or as a basis for comparing state supervisory programs.

**Limitations of the Study**

The writer recognized the following limitations in conducting this study.

1. The selection of jurors with sufficient expertness in the evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

2. The degree to which the jurors accurately interpreted the survey instrument.

3. The influence of the juror's differing perception of the role of the vocational agriculture supervisor.

4. The judgment of the writer in reacting to the comments and suggestions of the jury.

5. The limitations of time and the geographic locations of jury
members and trial states which made it impractical to visit personally with those involved in the study. This may have limited the accuracy of the conclusions drawn from the study.

**Method of Investigation**

Several distinct steps were carried out in conducting this study. Each step is briefly described in the remaining portion of this section.

The writer's experience as a state supervisor of vocational education in agriculture, and a preliminary review of a number of books and articles, including a survey of all articles on supervision written in *The Agricultural Education Magazine*, suggested that a study in this area would be of value.

An outline of the proposed study was reviewed by graduate classes in agricultural education, staff members of the Agricultural Education Department at the Ohio State University, and the writer's graduate committee. A number of helpful suggestions were received and included in the research design.

An extensive review of the literature concerning evaluation of supervisory programs was made. Special emphasis was given to state level supervisory programs.

From this review, the writer developed a set of statements which were designed to be indicators of implementation of the guiding principles for state supervision of vocational education in agriculture.

After the indicators had been formulated, they were submitted to a nationally recognized jury of experts. These experts were asked to respond to the suggested indicators in terms of their importance in
relationship to each guiding principle. They were also asked to suggest changes and additions which they felt should be made.

The suggestions of the jury were incorporated into a revised set of indicators. This set of indicators was submitted to a second nationally recognized jury of experts. This jury was asked to rate the indicators under each guiding principle in terms of its importance to the implementation of that principle.

Those indicators which were rated highest by the second jury were included in a self-evaluation instrument designed to evaluate state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

Procedures for using the instrument were developed in accordance with accepted evaluation procedures found in the literature.

The state supervisory staff of vocational education in agriculture in Colorado evaluated their supervisory program using the suggested instrument and procedures. As a result of the trial evaluation in Colorado, minor modifications were made in the procedures.

The self-evaluation instrument along with the suggested procedures for using the instrument was submitted to four head state supervisors and their staffs of vocational education in agriculture for use in evaluating the supervisory programs in their respective states.

A questionnaire designed to secure information on the use of the self-evaluation procedures was prepared. Each of the head state supervisors in the trial states returned the questionnaire, and each responded to a personal interview to review his reactions regarding the use of the self-evaluation procedures.

A review of literature, the aid of the two juries of experts,
and the trial use of the self-evaluation procedures in the four states formed the basis for the development of a procedure for the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

Major correspondence used in carrying out this study may be found in the Appendix. Lists of persons who made up the juries appear in Chapter II.

**Definition of Terms**

**Indicators.** Subjective or objective evidences of supervisory activities which implement the guiding principles for state supervision in vocational education in agriculture.

**Self-evaluation of supervisory programs.** The process of a state staff appraising their progress toward their own specific goals.

**Guiding principles for state supervision.** The sixteen principles developed in Taylor's study on *In-Service Education Program for State Supervisors of Vocational Education in Agriculture*.\(^{16}\)

**State supervisors.** The individuals who are responsible for the supervision and administration of the state-wide program of vocational agriculture, including the head state supervisor and the professional members of his staff.

**Supervisory program.** All professional activities in which state

---

\(^{16}\)Robert E. Taylor, "In-Service Training Needs for State Supervisors of Vocational Education in Agriculture" (Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School, Ohio State University, 1961).
supervisors engage to improve vocational agriculture in their state.

**Rationale for the Study**

This study was undertaken to develop a self-evaluation instrument and suggested procedures to assist state supervisory staffs of vocational education in agriculture evaluate their state supervisory programs.

In developing this study, the writer was frustrated by an obvious lack of written material in the area of evaluation of supervision at the state level. It was found that the majority of what has been written about supervision was concerned with supervision at the elementary level. Bartky in his discussion of secondary school evaluation deplored the lack of written material on evaluation at the secondary school level. This void in the literature was even more apparent at the state level. The limited writings in state school administration were emphasized by John Guy Fowlkes when he wrote, "So far as is known to the writer, no overall, basic treatise on state school administration has been presented since Cubberley's work on this subject appeared in 1927."^18

Peterson and Swanson, in their discussion of in-service training needs of state supervisors of vocational agriculture, reported a similar lack of written material in state supervision in this manner: "There has been a wealth of material developed in techniques of

---


supervision at the local level, but very little has been developed in
terms of state supervision.”

These observations are made here in explanation of the repeated
references the writer makes to supervision in general and supervision at
the local level throughout this dissertation.

It is believed, however, that it is logical to apply what is known
about supervision and evaluation in general to the evaluation of state
supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

Any discussion of evaluation is incomplete without considering that
which is being evaluated. It seemed appropriate then to discuss in
order—in the remaining part of this section—the general nature and
scope of evaluation in education, the implications of evaluation for
state supervision, and finally the implications of self-evaluation for
state supervision.

The general nature and scope
of evaluation in education

Evaluation has been defined in the Dictionary of Education as, "the
process of ascertaining or judging the value or amount of something by
careful appraisal." 20

Burton and Brueckner, in their writings on supervision, directed

19 Milo J. Peterson and Gordon I. Swanson, Functions of State
Supervision in Agricultural Education, Publication of the Central
Regional Research Committee (Indianapolis, Ind.: State Department of
Education), p. 28.

20 Carter V. Good (ed.), Dictionary of Education (New York:
their definition more specifically toward educational programs when they said, "Evaluation, in the true and effective sense of the term as currently applied, is a process of making value-judgments on the basis of pertinent information than can be gathered about any significant aspect of the educational program."21

Wrightstone, writing in the second edition of the Encyclopaedia of Educational Research, referred to evaluation as "a relatively new technical term, introduced to designate a more comprehensive concept of measurement than is implied in conventional tests and examinations."22

Ten years later, the third edition of the Encyclopaedia of Educational Research referred to the same subject in this manner: "Evaluation in education signifies describing something, in terms of selected attributes, and judging the degree of acceptability or suitability of that which has been described."23

An analysis of these various definitions reveals to some extent the historical development of evaluation. Wrightstone's definition, referred to earlier, obviously reflects a "reaction against the relatively narrow information-and skill-centered educational measurements of the previous decades."24 The other definitions referred to have


24Ibid., p. 482.
continued to emphasize a broadened concept that would include subjective, as well as, objective judgment in the evaluation process.

Although it was not the intent of the writer to develop a self-evaluation instrument which ignored the importance of either objective or subjective evidence, there appeared to be an over-emphasis in the early writings on objective and quantitative measurements in education. Adams and Dickey illustrate this point in their warning that "perhaps too often the evaluation of the effectiveness of educational programs has been based upon those factors which could be measured quantitatively and objectively."\(^{25}\) This warning seems to be especially appropriate when one considers the development of self-evaluation guides whose primary purpose is to direct effective change rather than measure individual competency.

Reasons for evaluation

It has been said that "evaluation is one of the basic aspects of modern education."\(^{26}\) For a number of years, leaders in education have expressed their confidence in evaluation as an effective tool of their profession. The American Association of School Administrators in their Thirty-fifth Yearbook expressed a sound reason for their belief in evaluation when they said, "Evaluation is the 'quality control' of


the educational program. It is more—evaluation is the means by which quality may constantly be improved."²⁷ Educators have recognized the influence of evaluation on change. Bebell describes this feeling with these words: "Changes can legitimately be made in an instructional program only when careful evaluation demonstrates the strengths and weaknesses of such adjustments."²⁸

Although the purpose of the evaluation instrument developed by this study is aimed primarily at the evaluation of programs rather than individuals, it is expected that benefits will accrue to individuals as they become involved in the evaluation of their programs.

Wiles recognized this value of evaluation when he pointed out that "few people do the type of work they are capable of doing. They work at less than full efficiency because they have not analyzed their position and evaluated their work in terms of the requirements."²⁹

The growth and development of the individual were also recognized by the American Association of School Administrators as an important contribution of evaluation to those who are in leadership positions. They also emphasize in the following quotation the value of continuous evaluation: "If growth is not static, sporadic, or unilinear, then the appraisal of what is happening becomes more important than what has


²⁹ Wiles, p. 270.
happened. If this is true, then evaluation is an integral part of the whole process of becoming."\textsuperscript{30}

Business and industry emphasize the economic reasons for evaluation, but their concern for efficient use of time is no less important in educational leadership positions, such as the state supervisor. One leader in the business world expressed his concern for evaluation in this manner: "There are various tricks which help managers relieve their time worries, but the only actual cure comes when an executive re-thinks his total function and its relationship to his company's objectives and then breaks his job down into its integral parts."\textsuperscript{31}

In summing up the various reasons for the use of evaluation techniques as a part of educational programs, a trio of writers compiled the following list of important purposes for conducting appraisals:

1. To secure the basis for making judgments at the end of a period of operation.

2. To insure continuous, effective, and improved operation.

3. To diagnose difficulties and avoid destructive upheavals.

4. To improve staff and citizen ability to develop the educational system.


Evaluation a continuous process

Evaluation in education is a continuous process concerned with all aspects of an educational program. Desirably, it is conducted "in terms of its philosophy of education, its individually expressed purposes and objectives, the nature of the pupils with whom it has to deal, the needs of the community which it serves, and the nature of the American democracy of which it is a part." There appears to be no reason why the evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture cannot be conducted in a similar manner.

Evaluation is a process which should not be taken lightly by those who are involved. Neither should the process be carried out without the aid of well-planned procedures. Evaluations should follow accepted procedures in an orderly manner if they are to secure maximum benefits to people and programs. In discussing the evaluation process in education, Burton and Brueckner suggest the following basic steps which seem as

---


appropriate for the evaluation of supervision as for any other aspect of education:

1. All major goals and values of the educational program must be determined and accepted. These reflect the ideals and wishes of the community.

2. The objectives should be based on a systematic analysis of individual and community needs. They should be clarified and formulated in terms of desirable behavior on the part of the individual and groups concerned.

3. Steps must then be taken by appropriate procedures to collect evidence of growth with respect to the established goals and values as revealed by changes in the behavior of the learners, in the work of the school, and in community life.

4. There should also be an examination of the school environment and practices which are used to achieve the goals, including the experiences of children both in and out of school.

5. The synthesis and interpretation of all of the findings concerning pupil growth and educational practices is the final step, leading to redefinition of goals and values, the setting up of new goals and objectives, and the planning of improved ways and means to attain the modified objectives and new objectives.

6. The schools should act to secure the cooperative participation of parents and all community agencies concerned with the growth and development of children and youth in evaluating the total educational program and in planning its improvement.

The scope of evaluation varies according to the purposes of the specific areas of education being evaluated. In general, however, it can be said that evaluation is concerned with

1. The scope and quality of the goals, purposes, and functions of the total educational program and the extent to which

---

they meet the needs of the various individuals and are in line with the desires and needs of the community as a whole.

2. The progress being made in the achievement of these goals as measured not only by the present status of the achievement, characteristics, and behavior of the learners, but primarily by the growth that they have made in attaining socially desirable objectives both as individuals and as members of the larger social group.

3. The appraisal of all elements of the total teaching-learning situation that contribute to effective and economical learning, with view to their improvement.  

For the purposes of this study, we are concerned primarily with a small portion of the total scope of evaluation in education. It is believed, however, that the evaluation of the supervisory program will have a beneficial effect on the improvement of educational goals and purposes, pupil growth and development, and the total teaching-learning situation.

Types of evaluation

Selecting the type of appraisal or evaluation which is best suited to specific purposes and needs of a given situation is a problem which faces the evaluator.

Morphet, Johns, and Reller, in their discussion of types of appraisals, point out that the types of appraisal are varied, and some are not easily classified. Furthermore, there are many which may belong in two or more classifications.

36Morphet, Johns and Reller, pp. 527-530.
One of the more obvious groupings of classifications appears to be those that pertain to a geographical or governmental unit, such as, the state or local educational system. A second grouping might include those which are either comprehensive or limited in scope. The entire educational system might be appraised or one specific service of the system could be appraised. A third classification would include the range from continuous to irregular. The more desirable is the continuous type which is well-planned and becomes an integral part of the educational program. The irregular type too often is the result of a pressing need which ends when the problem is eliminated. In a fourth category decisions are made as to who will evaluate. The choices are members from inside the organization, outside the organization, or a cooperative approach which involves both. Each has its merits. Those from inside the organization should have a better understanding of the problem, but it is possible that the internal structure would be void of certain specialized competencies needed. The disadvantage of evaluation solely by an outside expert or group of experts could be the development of antagonisms brought about by the lack of sufficient insight into the reality of the situation. It appears that a combination of the two groups might off-set the weaknesses of each and lead toward the cooperative approach. A fifth type could be described according to whether the purpose is status, diagnostic, or implementative. Status studies simply arrive at a valid description of existing conditions. Diagnostic studies not only describe existing conditions but attempt to discover cause. The implementative studies go a step further and suggest action, since action or change is one of the ingredients
usually sought in any evaluation. This method usually is the most defensible.

The evaluation procedures developed by this study might be geographically classified as state-wide. They may also be described as being limited in nature since their purpose is to evaluate only a small portion of the total state educational program. In describing the continuity of the evaluation process, it could be said that it is both continuous and irregular. It is continuous because it is designed to be carried on from year to year, but it is also irregular since there are times of the year when the process receives more emphasis than it does at other times. The evaluation process described in the study may be said to be self-evaluation since it is initiated and carried on by those involved rather than by outsiders. It may also be described as implementative evaluation since the purpose is to change supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

The complexity of evaluation procedures is not all centered in selecting the type to be used. There are certain complexities in the educational structure itself which cause concern for the evaluator in selecting the type of evaluation to use in a given situation. Hughes makes three broad generalizations which illustrate the point:

1. It has become evident that the educational activities of an educational organization are so complex and so all-inclusive that no one aspect can in reality be evaluated with recognition of all other aspects . . . In evaluating the success of the high school curriculum or subject materials the teacher and the pupil must also be evaluated.

2. It has been a common and disappointing experience, in every educational organization, that the results of such evaluating
in all areas has not culminated in expected action ... Evaluation, as an organizational technique, justifies itself only as it contributes to directing growth.

3. The ... generalization growing out of common experience in evaluating various features of the educational organization involves the basic understanding in terms of which the evaluation proceeds. Unfortunately, much educational evaluation has proceeded without general acceptance by the personnel of the philosophy basic to the evaluation, or perhaps despite general disagreement with the basic philosophy. 37

Principles of evaluation

Evaluation like any other educational activity is built on basic principles which provide guidelines for implementation. The following principles appear to be appropriate for any evaluation program:

1. Effective appraisal is dependent upon clearly defined educational objectives.

2. Appraisal must be valid. This requires that the appraisal be what it purports to be. It implies consistency or reliability as well as soundness or truthfulness.

3. Bases or standards for the appraisal must be established. An appraisal must be made with consideration of some base or standard.

4. Appraisal must be comprehensive.

5. Appraisal must be continuous.

6. Appraisal must be cooperative.

---

7. Appraisals must be integrated and interpreted into a portrait.

Although the writer attempted to incorporate each of these principles into the final evaluation instrument, only the use of the evaluation instrument by a number of states over a period of time will reveal how effectively these principles are implemented in the self-evaluation instrument and procedures developed by this study.

Relationship of pupil progress and the evaluation of supervision

Spears believes that the following three laws should be followed in measuring pupil progress: (1) know what you are trying to measure, (2) choose the most promising means of doing the job, and (3) apply the results.

These three laws appear to be applicable to supervision as well as pupil progress. In discussing the basis for evaluating supervision, Burton and Brueckner confirm the close relationship between supervision and pupil progress when they say:

The effectiveness of supervision may be evaluated by measuring or describing in specific terms the changes and improvement that take place over a period of time in the total educational program, or in any phase or element of it, as an apparent result of the leadership provided by those who are responsible for the improvement of learning and instruction. The areas in which these changes can be identified are the same as those that must be considered in evaluation of the effectiveness of the

---

*Burton and Brueckner, pp. 530-534.

total educational program, namely (1) growth and development of the learner toward accepted educational goals and objectives, (2) improvement of curriculum, (3) improvement of instructional practices as well as in general teacher personal development, (4) improvement in the quality and use of instructional materials and aids to learning, and (5) improvements in school community relations. \(^{40}\)

The ultimate goal of evaluation of supervisory programs is the increased efficiency of supervisory programs.

There appears to be little doubt that the improvement of supervisory programs will result in improved education for students. It logically follows then that in the increasingly complex and rapidly changing world in which supervision functions, the evaluative process becomes more significant. The changes taking place in education and more specifically in agricultural education make it seem essential that change be based upon sound evaluation procedures. "We can visualize program evaluation as consisting of four procedural elements: (1) a statement of specific educational objectives; (2) an inventory of whatever was done in the name of the program to achieve the objectives; (3) an appraisal of the situation before the start of the program—that is, benchmark determination; and (4) subsequent measurement of the situation to determine progress and accomplishment." \(^{41}\)

A fifth step, program planning, appears to be an appropriate addition. Some would argue that program planning is not part of the evaluative process. The writer believes, however, that little can be

\(^{40}\)Burton and Brueckner, p. 656.

gained from the implementative approach to the evaluation process unless that which is learned as the result of evaluation is applied in the form of improved programs.

**The implications of evaluation for state supervision**

The states' responsibility for educational programs is clearly, if not specifically, set forth in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively or to the people."42 With this law of the land as a basis, the various state departments of education have developed, in varying degrees, from statistical and clerical offices to the more comprehensive agency which provides leadership for the various educational agencies within the state.

"Many factors have contributed to the expanding role played by the state in providing for public education. Among these factors are: (1) The maturation of the state-local partnership; (2) The growing demand for improved educational opportunities; (3) An increasing acceptance of the ideal of universal free public education for all; (4) An increasing emphasis upon equality of educational opportunity; (5) A continuing trend toward shifting the tax base for school support from almost exclusive dependence on locally collected property tax to substantial portions of state-collected taxes; (6) The developing recognition that the state must assume its share of the responsibility for providing

---

42The Constitution of the United States, Bill of Rights, Amendment X.
for public education if all children are to be assured an equitable educational opportunity.\(^{43}\)

The expanding role of the state government in education brought about by these and other factors has been instrumental in creating a new image of the state department of education. The following statement from a recent report of the American Association of School Administrators illustrates their image of the state department: "The central point of responsibility for public education in every state is the state educational agency. The prime responsibility of the state educational agency is improvement of the schools and the total educational endeavor."\(^{44}\)

There is ample evidence throughout the literature that the feeling expressed in the preceding quotation reflects the general consensus of professional educators. The expansion of state department of education staffs reflects a similar feeling on the part of the general public for these staffs could not be expanded without permission of the various state legislatures.

The state department's responsibility for the total educational endeavor of the state makes it appear reasonable to assume that any improvement of individual component parts of the state educational

---

\(^{43}\)Thurston and Roe, pp. 75-76.

agency will contribute to the improvement of the total educational pro-
gram in the state.

One can best appreciate the role that the supervisor plays in edu-
cation today if he understands how and why this role developed over the
years. Burton and Brueckner describe four concepts of supervision which
have evolved since the early 1700's:

Supervision as inspection
Supervision as inspection combined with laissez-faire
Supervision as coercion
Supervision as training and guidance 45

They suggest, however, that even the most modern concepts of "training
and guidance were focused on the teacher and were confined to the
(supposed) improvement of this group and their techniques. The curric-
ulum, the materials, the pupil, and worst of all the community were
completely overlooked."46

Spears saw four distinct periods in the development of super-
vision, each characterized by a varying role of the supervisor.

During the first period, prior to the civil war, supervision
was performed mainly by laymen for the purpose of inspecting schools
and classrooms to maintain order and existing standards.

The second period was during the nineteenth century. Supervision
was still considered to be an inspection of school and classroom for
the sake of maintaining control and existing standards, but the

45 Burton and Brueckner, pp. 5-7.
46 Ibid., p. 7.
responsibility had moved from lay persons to professional school officials at local, county, and state levels.

The third period, between 1910 and 1935, saw the responsibility for supervision being delegated to principals, helping teachers, and special supervisors. It was during this period that emphasis was focused on improvement of instruction through direct classroom observation and demonstration. Attention was given to the elimination of teacher weaknesses.

The fourth period, that since 1935, has seen the development of the concept that the supervisor performs the function of providing cooperative educational leadership. The supervisory program is program centered and is aimed at curriculum development and in-service teacher training. The responsibility for today's supervision is shared by coordinators, superintendents, principals, curriculum directors, special supervisors, and educational consultants.47

Modern supervision emphasizes the leadership function as opposed to earlier emphasis on inspection and coercion. Taylor in his study to determine the in-service training needs of state supervisors of vocational education in agriculture concluded that "supervision has changed from direction and prescription to assistance, encouragement, and permissiveness. It has changed from coercion to the cooperative pursuit of group goals."48

47Spears, pp. 36-96.

This changing concept of supervision is apparent at the state level, as well as, at the local school level. The National Council of Chief State School Officers noted as early as 1952 that "leadership functions constitute the major responsibility of state departments of education."[49]

The acceptance of the leadership concept of supervision appears to be wide-spread. The implications for state supervision are obvious. In a very few instances does the state department have direct control over the local school program. The activities of the state supervisor must emphasize leadership rather than direction. A report of the American Association of School Administrators emphasizes the value of such an approach to supervision in their observation that

Even a casual review of the leadership activities of state departments of education clearly shows that a multitude of activities are carried on year after year which, in one way or another, add to the professional competencies of school administrators and strengthen the whole process of school administration. This, indeed, is a major purpose of the state department of education, for it is through this whole complex process of planning, organizing, operating, managing, and evaluating the educational program that school administration functions.[50]

We have emphasized in the discussion to this point, the trend of supervision away from prescription towards leadership. It should be noted that although the trend is in this direction the functions of a state department of education are more inclusive. It should be sufficient to point out that in addition to the leadership functions, the state


department of education still has responsibilities for a variety of other activities which may be described as regulatory, data gathering, and reporting. Many believe, however, that the leadership function can contribute to each of the others. Thurston and Roe have supported this concept in these words:

Without it the deadening pall of bureaucracy, regulation, red tape, and restrictions can stifle creativity. Leadership can mobilize, unify, and coordinate all the positive forces concerned with education for the dedicated purpose of its improvement. It can give common direction to the efforts of all. It can analyze the nature and future direction of education and communicate with the public in this regard. It can foster local initiative by discovering and publicizing improved practices and encourage others to follow suit. It can utilize all possible resources for experimentation and improvement. It can provide opportunities and stimulate all persons engaged in educational work to grow and create professionally.

Leadership has been defined in a number of ways in the volumes of material written on the subject. Jensen sums it up in this manner:

It is estimated by some that no less than one hundred printed pages per day are being produced on some phase of leadership. There are many definitions of leadership from the simple one, "One who leads," to the more complex such as, "A man's ability to take the initiative in social situations, to plan and organize action, and in so doing evoke cooperation." 52

The latter definition carries a more democratic connotation, and in the opinion of the writer describes most accurately the modern concept of educational leadership.

As we consider the means of carrying out the supervisory functions of the state department of education, we recognize that these

51Thurston and Roe, p. 82.

52"Report of Workshop for State Supervisors of Vocational Agriculture" (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Department of Agricultural Education, 1962), p. 144-145. Speech given by Theodore J. Jensen, Chairman, Department of Education, Ohio State University.
responsibilities are assigned to people. In discussing the functions of state supervisors, one authority indicated that "in the organization of a State Department of Education, each field of endeavor should be well represented with a supervisor to provide the leadership, guidance, supervision, and promotion of programs to be practical in meeting the needs of the people of the State." 53

If state supervisors are to provide the kind of leadership for educational programs that we have described, it seems essential that we recognize the importance of evaluation in education. Elsbree and McNally, in their discussion of elementary supervision, suggest that "one of the foundation stones of the emerging philosophy and practice of supervision is the belief that current practice should always be questioned, examined, evaluated, and placed upon the searching light of critical analysis, and that such analysis should be applied to supervisory practice itself." 54

There is little doubt that this statement is as applicable to state supervision as it is to local supervision at the elementary level. "Few thoughtful educators would deny that improving supervisory practices is one of the most important professional educational imperatives." 55

The need for improvement of supervisory practice is illustrated by this statement from Lucio and McNeil: "The common dimension


of supervision—found in all positions of leadership—is the ability to perceive desirable objectives, and to help others contribute to this vision and to act in accordance with it.\textsuperscript{56}

The accusation that "the qualifications of state department personnel have not generally speaking been notable for meeting high standards"\textsuperscript{57} is further evidence that emphasis should be given to the improvement of supervisory programs, especially at the state level.

Evaluation of state supervision can and should improve the total educational program of a state. Adams and Dickey, in their defense of evaluation as an integral part of the educational process, wrote, "It is a recurring process involving the formulation of objectives, their clearer definition, and continued efforts to interpret the results of appraisals in terms which throw light on the educational program and on the individual problems. The procedure goes on as a continuing cycle."\textsuperscript{58}

A common method of defining objectives and their successful achievement is the development of annual plans or programs of work. Such a plan becomes not only a guide for activity but provides a basis for evaluation of successful implementation of supervisory objectives. One leading educator reminds us that

An annual plan of work seems essential for supervisors. Such a plan might include identifying what we as supervisors hope to accomplish during a year. This may be


accomplished by defining for the current year the problems we feel need to be solved, the objectives we have for meeting those problems, and some plans and procedures or ways and means for accomplishing these objectives.59

Not only does evaluation contribute to the growth and improvement of the supervisory program, it also contributes to the growth and development of the individual supervisor. This fact takes on additional significance when one realizes that

No supervisor comes to his task fully equipped to meet all the challenging situations which will confront him in his work. If he is to become increasingly effective as a key educational leader, he cannot assume a self-satisfied and omnipotent attitude toward his responsibilities or his fellow workers. He must possess the necessary attitudes and capacity for further growth himself, and demonstrate to his associates his willingness to learn with them.60

Burton and Brueckner have suggested that there are several reasons for developing procedures for evaluating leadership through supervision. They suggest:

1. The need for justifying the establishment and maintenance of various services having supervisory functions.
2. The need for evaluating the services rendered by members of the supervisory staff.
3. Planning for the continued improvement of supervisory personnel, procedures and services.
4. The recruitment, training, and selection of principals and supervisors which cannot proceed effectively unless the desirable qualities, skills, and abilities such individuals should possess are determined and can be evaluated.61


61 Burton and Brueckner, p. 656.
When these reasons are added to the individual and program benefits discussed earlier, it appears that it is not a question of whether we should evaluate supervision—the question is how do we proceed?

Implications of self-evaluation for state supervision in vocational education in agriculture

The decision to develop a self-evaluation instrument rather than another type of instrument was based on several reasons. Some of the reasoning has been expressed generally in the preceding sections. Specifically, it was felt that as an educational leader the supervisor has a responsibility to "practice what he preaches." Wiles said it well in his discussion of the local supervisor when he said, "The supervisor must set the pattern in a school. If he wants the staff, as a group and as individuals to evaluate its work, he must be the first to be evaluated. He must practice self-evaluation and secure group evaluation of his work."

The reasoning expressed in this statement appears as sound for the state supervisor as it does for one whose responsibility is centered at the local level. Corey expressed a similar philosophy when he said, "The point is that change or improvement is not apt to be undertaken by an individual unless he diagnoses his failure as a consequence, in part at least, of his own ineptitude."}


A second reason revolves around the belief that few if any persons in a state are as familiar with the supervisory program of vocational education in agriculture as is the state supervisor. Peterson and Swanson build a case for this point as they defend the merits of self-evaluation for teachers when they say, "The importance of self-evaluation is dramatically illustrated by a consideration of the limitations of observation and reports as a basis for supervision. Assume, for example, that 2000 hours constitute a minimum year's work for a teacher and that he is visited by a supervisor twice a year for one-half day each visit. This provides a sample of 1/250 of the year's work and a basis for drawing conclusions—surely a rather scant measure."64

Although it is not the intent here to play down the importance of other forms of evaluation, it does appear logical that external evaluation would at best provide little more than a superficial look at a total state-wide program unless great amounts of time and money were expended over extended periods.

A southern regional study concluded that "realization and growth of local school personnel seems dependent in large measure upon their willingness and ability to appraise their own progress. Doing this is made more difficult when they are evaluated by some one else and then expected to perform in accordance with the 'foreign' yardstick. Improvements

64Milo J. Peterson and Gordon I. Swanson, Functions of State Supervision in Agricultural Education, Publication of the Central Regional Research Committee (Indianapolis, Ind.: State Department of Education, 1953), pp. 32-33.
usually come more quickly and lastingly on the basis of evaluations made by those directly concerned with the responsibility of the school pro-
gram.65

Another important value of a self-evaluation technique is the in-
dividual growth of the supervisors who participate. A recent report of the American Association of School Administrators expressed this thought in some detail as follows:

Every individual caught up in the process of learning through self with other selves concurrently will sense his need to see a wide range of individualized techniques and evidence to evaluate both himself and what is happening to him in the process of his learning. Almost unconsciously, he will begin to seek (a) original definition and repeated restatement or clarification of his objectives; (b) an assessment of his own knowledge and skills both before and after embarking upon a course of becoming something new, different, and better, and he will do this not only within himself as an individual but outside himself in contrast or comparison with others involved in the same processes; (c) further insights and understanding into his own motivations as self-growth evolves, which is simply another way of saying that evaluation is really an integral part of the growth or learning process; and (d) formal and ritualistic standards or criteria by which he can measure what is happening beyond him in the school system, this to estimate the effectiveness of the motivations radia-
ting from his own self-growth.66

Self-evaluations conducted by state supervisory staff members are not unlike any other group discussion. The values to each individual of the group are a recognizable learning experience in democratic pro-
cesses. An authority on the subject describes group discussion as an

65"What About Services of State Departments of Education?", XXVII (June, 1955), No. 4, Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, College of Education, University of Kentucky, p. 24

on-going process when he writes, "It is the group mechanism by which the raw materials of subject matter, stated problem, information, and suggestion are integrated, sorted, and refined so as to produce an end product of solution, decision, or learning." These same end products are apparent in the kind of group self-evaluation proposed in this study.

There, also, appears to be value in involvement. It has been said that "as teachers become clearer about their objectives, they are likely to become serious about them and to attempt to implement such objectives in their teaching." Supervisors who have the opportunity to look critically at their own efforts periodically should respond in a similar manner. As they study their program objectives during the evaluative process, they, too, are likely to become more serious about them and attempt to direct their individual efforts more efficiently in implementing program objectives.

Adams and Dickey suggest that there is power in numbers in the following statement:

The secret of group approach to the solution of problems is to develop group power that will enable the participants to achieve the desired goals. The conclusions reached and the agreements made in supervisory group conferences must actually be the product of the thought and effort of the members of the group if decisions are to become stimulants to the action which the participants themselves must take to achieve objectives.

---


Only then will directions for action be derived from the situation rather than supplied by the (Italics by writer) supervisor. By such means a group develops self-direction and self-control.

Involvement in the group process of staff self-evaluation can be a means of in-service training. This value of self-evaluation is described by Kemp in these words:

Self-evaluation by the group trains the members to become more sensitive to the difficulties in interaction and discussion which exist in the group, their causes, and some techniques for avoiding them. In truth, this increased awareness is a learning which can be generalized, a new or improved skill which the individual person can utilize when he enters new group situations. As he gains this skill he begins to mature as a productive group member.

Burton and Brueckner summarize well the benefits of involvement or group action in their discussion of supervisory practices. They write that

Group process is not merely another "trick" in administration or supervision. It is the basic method of democracy. Participation and interaction do far more than develop good solutions to problems; they affect profoundly the individuals themselves. Each person in contributing affects not only the problem and its setting, not only other persons; each affects himself as no other experience can. He develops the personal-social-moral traits of the socialized individual.

"Climate" is another important characteristic of a self-evaluation program. State supervisory staff members, like all professional employees, need to feel free to make decisions concerning their program of activities without the feeling that someone is looking over their shoulder.

---

69 Adams and Dickey, pp. 158-159.
70 C. Gratton Kemp, p. 171.
They, also, need to feel free to contribute to the planning of programs and policies which affect them.

Wiles makes the point that "when a person is not represented in the inner circles where decisions that affect his welfare are made, he becomes distrustful of the leaders and those in positions of power."\(^{72}\)

He, also, contends that "if a staff member has a part that he accepts in planning purposes and procedures, he will feel responsibility."\(^{73}\)

Both of these activities, planning purposes and planning procedures, are characteristic of sound self-evaluation procedures. Consequently, it can be generally said that "the principle of self-evaluation is acceptable to most groups interested in an improvement program."\(^{74}\)

Finally, it is the belief of the writer that "every person with leadership responsibility should be expected to furnish tangible evidence of the effectiveness of the improvement programs that he proposes and puts into operation."\(^{75}\)

The writer, also, believes that "much valuable information can be had about the quality of the educational leadership in any given areas of responsibility by examining the character of the program of activities provided by it."\(^{76}\)

\(^{72}\)Wiles, p. 270.

\(^{73}\)Ibid., p. 271.


\(^{75}\)Burton and Brueckner, p. 131.

\(^{76}\)Ibid., p. 656.
The self-evaluation instrument described in the next chapter illustrates one means of assessing educational leadership in vocational education in agriculture by examining the state staff's program of activities. Although it is believed that self-evaluation is one of the most promising means of program evaluation, it is recognized that many other kinds of evaluation procedures can make similar contributions to improved educational programs.
CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR SUPERVISORY PROGRAMS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE

It was noted in the preceding chapter that little has been written about self-evaluation for state supervisory programs. It then follows that little has been done to develop instruments or guides which would assist state supervisors in the self-evaluation of their programs.

This chapter was designed to report the development of an instrument for the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture. The reader will find in the remaining portion of this chapter the complete instrument which was developed as a result of this study. Following the completed instrument is a description of how the instrument evolved.

The writer has attempted to describe in a chronological order the steps and procedures taken, beginning with the design of the instrument and proceeding through the selection of a first jury to assist in the development of indicators of supervisory accomplishment; an analysis of the responses of the jury; the selection of a second jury to assist in the further refinement of the instrument; the presentation of the responses of the second jury in table form; and, finally, a brief summary of the chapter.

The final instrument which follows is complete with the exception of one minor detail. In the interest of saving space and avoiding many blank pages, the summary page which normally would appear opposite every page of indicators has been printed only once. It may be found on Page 48.
AN INSTRUMENT FOR USE IN THE SELF-EVALUATION
OF STATE SUPERVISORY STAFF PROGRAMS
IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF THE SELF-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The procedures described here for the use of this instrument are predicated on the belief that self-evaluation is a preliminary step to the development of annual and long-time programs of work.

It is intended that this instrument be used by state supervisory staffs in agricultural education as a means of identifying strengths and deficiencies in state supervisory programs. This instrument then becomes a tool to use in assessing staff activities for the purpose of developing an improved supervisory program.

If this instrument is to serve its purpose, it will not be used to secure a comparative rating of individual supervisors or a comparative rating of the various state supervisory programs. The rating scale described later is designed solely to assist state staffs in identifying priorities.

Who Should Participate in the Evaluation Process

It is recommended that representatives of the teacher education staff, the state director of vocational education, a representative of the vocational agriculture teachers' association, and a representative of the state vocational agriculture advisory committee meet with the state supervisory staff annually for the purpose of consulting with the state staff as they evaluate their efforts of the past year.

When and Where Should the Evaluation Be Conducted

It is recommended that two consecutive days be set aside annually, preferably during the summer months, for the purpose of evaluating the total supervisory staff effort. A suitable atmosphere which is free from office formality, telephones, and other interruptions should be selected for the formal evaluation process. The room should be comfortable and arranged in a manner that is conducive to group discussion. The head state supervisor and the director of vocational education, if he is present, should make every effort to assure that a climate exists which encourages staff members to discuss freely their opinions concerning the supervisory activities.

An additional day immediately following, or as soon thereafter as possible, should be used by the staff to prepare an annual program of work and to revise long-time goals and objectives.
How Should the Evaluation Be Conducted

1. Several days in advance of the agreed upon date for the staff evaluation, the head state supervisor should assign each staff member the responsibility of gathering "evidence" of supervisory accomplishment as it applies to one or more sections (PRINCIPLES) of the evaluation instrument.

2. The assigned staff member should describe, in the space provided after each question, the activities of the local staff during the year. He should then evaluate the effectiveness of the staff's efforts by circling the appropriate number in the recording column in the right hand margin using the following values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. After each staff member has completed the evaluation of his assigned portion of the program, the total staff should meet as a group with the state director, members of the teacher education staff, and representatives of the state advisory committee, and the vocational agriculture teachers' association. At this time the total staff will review and revise, if necessary, the evaluation made by individual staff members.

4. During the time the group evaluation is in process, one staff member should be assigned the responsibility of recording the group's composite rating for the activities listed under each question. He should also record, on the blank pages provided, all suggestions for improving staff activities. Each staff member should make notes concerning activities for which he is primarily responsible.

5. As soon as possible after the evaluation session, staff members should meet to develop their annual program of work. Plans should be made which will correct the deficiencies noted in the supervisory program during the evaluation process and attention should be given to priorities which were identified.

6. Following the development of a new program of work, the supervisory staff should set dates for at least a quarterly review of progress.

7. In order to assure that future evaluations are conducted in the most efficient and effective manner and to assure that self-evaluation becomes a continuous process, it is suggested that at the time a new program of activities is drawn up each staff member be assigned the primary responsibility for seeing that certain activities are accomplished on or before an agreed upon time. Staff members should continuously gather evidence of program accomplishment in order that such evidence may be considered during future evaluations. Such evidence, if compiled continuously should also be valuable in presenting suggested program modifications to the state board, the state legislature, and the general public.
GUIDING PRINCIPLE I

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN APPRAISING THE NEEDS FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the socio-economic trends affecting vocational agriculture?
   b. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the present agricultural situation?
   c. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the agricultural situation of the foreseeable future?
   d. To assist the general public, including school personnel at the local and state level, understand the role of vocational agriculture in public education?
   e. To determine the state-wide need for vocational agriculture?
f. To assist local school personnel determine the need for vocational agriculture in local communities?

4 3 2 1

g. To provide consultative services to other groups who are studying the local needs for vocational agriculture?

4 3 2 1

h. To assist local school personnel in determining needed adjustments in local vocational agriculture programs?

4 3 2 1

i. To cooperate with other state vocational education services in determining the total vocational education needs of the state?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is providing leadership in appraising the needs for vocational agriculture?

4 3 2 1
LIST ON THIS PAGE IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING THE STATE SUPERVISORY PROGRAM OF WORK FOR NEXT YEAR
GUIDING PRINCIPLE II

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND INVOLVE IN THE PLANNING PROCESS REPRESENTATIVES OF GROUPS INTERESTED IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To make use of professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the state program of vocational agriculture?

   4 3 2 1

b. To cooperate with teacher educators in developing annual and long-range goals and objectives for the state supervisory and teacher education programs in agricultural education?

   4 3 2 1
c. To develop a written program of supervisory activities for the state supervisory staff?

   4 3 2 1
d. To assist local school personnel in establishing realistic, immediate, and long-time goals, objectives, and ways and means for implementing all phases of the vocational agriculture program?

   4 3 2 1
e. To assist local school personnel establish and utilize professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the local vocational agriculture program?

   4 3 2 1
f. To utilize local vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in the development of the state-wide program of vocational agriculture?

g. To encourage and assist the teacher education staff in developing an annual written program of their activities?

h. To assist other vocational education services in developing comprehensive vocational programs?

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is providing leadership in educational planning and involving in the planning process representatives of groups interested in the vocational agriculture program?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE III

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD AID IN COORDINATING THE EFFORTS OF AGENCIES, GROUPS, AND ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED IN IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To identify agencies, groups, and organizations that are interested in and concerned with the vocational agriculture program?
      4 3 2 1
   b. To acquaint themselves with the functions, responsibilities, and programs of other educational agencies?
      4 3 2 1
   c. To utilize an inter-organization structure among the state's agricultural groups to coordinate common educational efforts?
      4 3 2 1
   d. To assure that the educational efforts of the vocational agriculture program of the state harmonize with the acceptable educational efforts of other educational and agricultural organizations, groups, and agencies?
      4 3 2 1
   e. To assure that the activities of the state vocational agriculture teachers' association contribute to improved vocational agriculture programs?
      4 3 2 1
f. To assure that the activities of the teacher education staff and the state supervisory staff are complementary?

4 3 2 1

---
g. To influence the administrative policies and decisions of groups, organizations, and agencies interested in agricultural education so that their efforts will contribute to improved vocational agriculture education programs?

4 3 2 1

---
h. To assure that "vested" interests of various groups, organizations, and agencies do not unduly influence the vocational agriculture program?

4 3 2 1

---
i. To assist teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents in developing a proper perspective of the vocational agriculture program and its relationship to the school and community?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is aiding in coordinating the efforts of agencies, groups, and organizations interested in improving vocational education in agriculture?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE IV

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD STIMULATE LOCAL INITIATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY AND COORDINATE THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS INTO A UNIFIED STATE PROGRAM

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To assure that state and local supervisory policies are developed and administered with sufficient flexibility to encourage local initiative in program development?

   4 3 2 1

   b. To develop state reimbursement plans and policies which promote local school initiative?

   4 3 2 1

   c. To encourage local educational innovations and utilize them in the state-wide program of vocational agriculture?

   4 3 2 1

   d. To encourage and assist local school personnel design experimental and demonstration programs in agricultural education?

   4 3 2 1

   e. To assure that state regulations allow maximum freedom and responsibility to local schools consistent with the state's obligation for effective education?

   4 3 2 1
f. To cooperate with local school personnel in determining and maintaining the elements of a quality vocational agriculture program?

4 3 2 1

---

g. To encourage creative thinking on the part of local school personnel?

4 3 2 1

---

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is stimulating local initiative and responsibility and coordinating the various elements into a unified state program?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE V

SUPERVISORY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD EXEMPLIFY DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assist themselves in understanding and utilizing the techniques of democratic leadership?

   4 3 2 1

b. To develop a common understanding of the role of the state supervisory staff among local school board members, administrators, and teachers?

   4 3 2 1

c. To assist local school personnel in understanding and assuming their responsibilities in the democratic processes of educational leadership?

   4 3 2 1

d. To assist state supervisory staff members develop the ability to utilize group processes effectively?

   4 3 2 1

e. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members to participate in the solving of problems related to the educational profession?

   4 3 2 1
f. To become sensitive to the attitudes, beliefs, and opinions of vocational agriculture teachers and local school administrators?

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is exemplifying democratic processes?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE VI

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE DYNAMICS OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS BY DETERMINING SUPERVISORY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES BASED ON THE NEEDS OF EACH SITUATION

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To determine the kinds of consultative services that local school personnel need and desire?
      4 3 2 1
   b. To assure that the activities of state staff members reflect an understanding of the differences in individuals and situations?
      4 3 2 1
   c. To assure that state supervision is a cooperative effort between the supervisor and the supervised?
      4 3 2 1
   d. To diversify the techniques of supervision to meet the needs of the different persons and groups to be served?
      4 3 2 1
   e. To assure that human concerns and needs take precedence over material needs and other external factors during the supervisory process?
      4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is recognizing the dynamics of human relationships by determining supervisory procedures and techniques based on the needs of each situation?
   4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE VII

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD FACILITATE COMMUNICATIONS AMONG ALL PARTIES PARTICIPATING IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To assure that all communications to and from the supervisory office are promptly handled and correctly interpreted by the intended recipients?

      4 3 2 1

   b. To acquaint themselves with the new methods and techniques in communications?

      4 3 2 1

   c. To assist vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members in knowing and using official channels of communications among their own and cooperating groups, organizations, and agencies?

      4 3 2 1

   d. To assure that important policies and procedures of the state staff are clearly written and made available to all affected?

      4 3 2 1

   e. To establish a state staff organizational structure and staff operational procedures which facilitate effective communications?

      4 3 2 1
f. To assure that all parties participating in the vocational agriculture program are provided significant information influencing administrative decisions and program development?

4 3 2 1

g. To aid vocational agriculture teachers in establishing effective communications with all individuals, groups, and agencies concerned with the local vocational agriculture program?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is facilitating communications among all parties participating in the vocational agriculture program?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE VIII

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To determine professional and technical educational needs of vocational agriculture teachers?
   
   How well is the state staff doing
   4 3 2 1

   b. To provide technical and professional in-service educational programs for teachers and administrators of vocational agriculture programs?

   4 3 2 1

   c. To utilize local vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in designing state-wide programs to improve instruction?

   4 3 2 1

   d. To involve other divisions of the state educational agency and agricultural agencies in the improvement of instruction in vocational agriculture?

   4 3 2 1

   e. To develop certification and personnel policies which encourage individual professional growth on the part of the local teacher?

   4 3 2 1
f. To effectively and economically distribute their time between group and individual supervisory techniques?

4 3 2 1

g. To design state FFA activities so they will contribute to the teaching-learning process and the educational objectives of the vocational agriculture program?

4 3 2 1

h. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers to participate in technical and professional in-service training programs?

4 3 2 1

i. To encourage more effective use of teaching resources found in the local community?

4 3 2 1

j. To assist vocational agriculture teachers in improving their courses of study?

4 3 2 1

k. To assist vocational agriculture teachers in procuring and using appropriate methods, media, facilities, and equipment in teaching?

4 3 2 1

l. To obtain and prepare appropriate instructional materials for distribution to vocational agriculture teachers?

4 3 2 1
m. To assist vocational agriculture teachers with vocational agriculture curriculum development which is in harmony with the total curricular program of the school?

n. To encourage local school administrators to provide adequate supervision of the local vocational agriculture program?

o. To encourage and assist in securing higher professional standards in teacher education programs preparing vocational agriculture teachers?

p. To assist in recruiting prospective vocational agriculture teachers of promise?

q. To secure maximum benefits from required reports for program development and improvement?

r. To assist beginning teachers make a satisfactory entry into the business of teaching?

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is contributing to the improvement of instruction?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE IX

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD HARMONIZE WITH MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To organize and conduct the state supervisory program in vocational agriculture to harmonize with the total educational program in the state?

   Number: 4 3 2 1

   b. To engage in educational activities apart from vocational agriculture?

   Number: 4 3 2 1

   c. To keep up-to-date with new developments in educational theory and practice?

   Number: 4 3 2 1

   d. To assist teachers to become acquainted with new developments in educational theory and practice?

   Number: 4 3 2 1

   e. To encourage the adoption and use of modern theory and practice in education which is applicable to the teaching of vocational agriculture?

   Number: 4 3 2 1
f. To encourage the development and utilization of educational leave policies for state staff members?

4 3 2 1

g. To assure that the vocational agriculture program complements and enhances other vocational education services and programs?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is harmonizing with modern educational theory and practice?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE X

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD OPERATE WITHIN A FRAMEWORK OF FUNCTIONAL WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHICH HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To involve those who are affected by state vocational agriculture policies in the development of these policies?

   How well is the state staff doing:
   
   4 3 2 1

   b. To develop policies and procedures which effectively utilize the special abilities of state staff personnel?

   4 3 2 1

   c. To assure that written policies are comprehensive, current, and available to those affected by them?

   4 3 2 1

   d. To provide written policies and procedures which give general direction and guidance to state staff activities?

   4 3 2 1

   e. To involve school personnel and representatives of agriculture in the development of a state plan for vocational education in agriculture which stimulates desirable educational outcomes?

   4 3 2 1
2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is operating within a framework of functional written policies and procedures which have been developed cooperatively?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XI

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD ASSURE THAT VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE LEGAL PROVISIONS OF THE STATE PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assure that local school personnel understand the minimum standards and flexibilities inherent in the state plan?

   4 3 2 1

b. To assure that the reporting system is functioning effectively?

   4 3 2 1

c. To assure that sufficient and valid data are available on each local program to determine its compliance with the legal provisions of the state plan?

   4 3 2 1

d. To assure that the state office maintains a system of records which provides evidence of the state's compliance with the legal provisions of state and federal regulations?

   4 3 2 1

e. To assist local school personnel develop a written plan for the operation of their vocational agriculture program?

   4 3 2 1
2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is assuring that vocational agriculture programs are consistent with the legal provisions of the state plan for vocational agriculture?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XII

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD COOPERATIVELY DEVELOP A PROGRAM OF PUBLIC RELATIONS WHICH ADEQUATELY INTERPRETS TO THE PUBLIC THE PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMPLETE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To ascertain and improve the public image of vocational agriculture education?

      4 3 2 1

   b. To provide leadership which stimulates and mobilizes the talents and efforts of state staff members, local school personnel, and citizens in a coordinated public relations effort?

      4 3 2 1

   c. To make use of the talents and abilities of the various social and economic groups in interpreting the vocational agriculture program?

      4 3 2 1

   d. To make effective use of all news media in reporting comprehensively the vocational agriculture program in the state?

      4 3 2 1
e. To assure that the state's public relations program:

(1) Takes the initiative with a positive approach?
(2) Is honest?
(3) Is planned and purposeful?
(4) Is continuous?
(5) Is designed to reach many publics?

4 3 2 1

f. To assist local schools in conducting effective programs of public information?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is cooperatively developing a program of public relations which adequately interprets to the public the purposes, procedures, and accomplishments of the complete vocational agricultural program?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XIII
SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROMOTE, CONDUCT, AND UTILIZE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To assist in analyzing and interpreting research data to local school personnel?
      How well is the state staff doing
      4 3 2 1
   b. To cooperate with local school personnel and teacher educators in identifying needed research studies in agricultural education?
      4 3 2 1
   c. To make known to researchers present and prospective needed research studies in agricultural education?
      4 3 2 1
   d. To secure adequate time and finances necessary to develop and conduct an effective research program?
      4 3 2 1
   e. To assist local school personnel in implementing research findings in action programs at the local school level?
      4 3 2 1
   f. To refine research findings through pilot or experimental programs in local schools?
      4 3 2 1
g. To assist in coordinating the research efforts of graduate students in approved teacher education institutions?

h. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers to conduct and utilize educational research in their instructional programs?

i. To make effective use of research data in their supervisory activities?

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is promoting, conducting, and utilizing educational research?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XIV

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND ASSIST IN THE EVALUATION OF LOCAL VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To assist local schools in selecting and developing instruments for evaluating the important outcomes of their efforts?
      
      4 3 2 1

   b. To assist local schools in interpreting and utilizing evaluation results in projecting and improving their vocational agriculture program?
      
      4 3 2 1

   c. To encourage the group problem solving approach in evaluating local vocational agriculture programs by including those involved?
      
      4 3 2 1

   d. To stimulate teachers to make use of self-evaluation instruments as a basis for program improvement?
      
      4 3 2 1

   e. To assure that local evaluations are concerned primarily with the improvement of local programs and not with the comparative ratings of individual teachers?
      
      4 3 2 1
2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is encouraging and assisting in the evaluation of local vocational agriculture programs?
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XV

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR EVALUATION OF THE SUPERVISORY PROGRAM

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To collect and summarize annually evidence that supervisory goals and objectives are being met?
      4 3 2 1
   b. To determine the influence that state supervision has on the effectiveness of the vocational agriculture program in the state?
      4 3 2 1
   c. To utilize in the evaluation process those affected by supervision?
      4 3 2 1
   d. To utilize available criteria and techniques for state staff use in formal and informal evaluation of supervisory effort as a basis for the development of the supervisory program?
      4 3 2 1
   e. To develop continuous evaluation procedures which provide for subjective judgment as well as objective evidence?
      4 3 2 1
f. To provide an instrument or set standards upon which the state staff members can engage in critical self-evaluation on a planned, periodic basis?

4 3 2 1


g. To develop a climate of financial and professional security among state staff members to encourage greater interest and participation in evaluation procedures?

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is providing for evaluation of the supervisory program?

4 3 2 1
GUIDING PRINCIPLE XVI

SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION PROFESSION

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To assist teachers and state staff members in developing individual professional improvement programs?

   

   b. To identify and develop prospective state and local vocational education leaders?

   

   c. To develop policies and procedures for a comprehensive in-service education program for state staff members?

   

   d. To encourage state staff members and teachers to belong to and participate in local, state, and national professional organizations?

   

   e. To encourage teachers and staff members to contribute to the literature of agricultural education and other fields of education?

   

   How well is the state staff doing:

   4 3 2 1
f. To involve themselves in educational activities other than those of vocational agriculture?

4 3 2 1

4 3 2 1

4 3 2 1

2. What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is making a contribution to the improvement of the educational profession?
Design of the Instrument

At the onset of the study, it was decided to adhere as closely as possible to proven evaluation concepts in the field of education. The idea behind this reasoning was to take advantage of the familiarity which educators had with these instruments. It was also believed that the merit of the common features of present evaluation instruments had been proven by the test of time and popular usage.

In reviewing the evaluation instruments developed by Dull, Logan, Brunner, Christensen, The National Study of Secondary Schools, and a number of others developed by universities, state departments of education, and the U. S. Office of Education, it was noted that generally they included the following common characteristics.

1. The instrument is usually divided into appropriate sections.
2. Each section is usually preceded by a guiding statement of principle or philosophy.
3. Each section contains (a) a set of statements which describe appropriate activities or (b) a set of questions which when answered describe an activity or condition.
4. Opportunity is provided for the evaluator to place either a quantitative or qualitative value on the activities or conditions described.
5. Opportunity is provided for the evaluator to summarize his findings for each section.
6. Opportunity is provided for the evaluator to make observations concerning activities or conditions which are not included in the evaluation form.
7. Opportunity is provided for the evaluator to make recommendations or suggestions for program projection or improvement.

8. A suggested procedure for using the instrument was included.

Each of these common features is contained in the instrument developed in this study. However, modifications were made as they seemed appropriate to the specific purpose of this study.

**Use of guiding principles**

Ideally, evaluation instruments have been designed to measure progress toward the accomplishment of specific goals and objectives of the program to be evaluated.

In discussing the availability of state goals and objectives for vocational agriculture programs with head state supervisors, it was learned that few states had written material which described their objectives.

Since it appeared impractical to base the design of this instrument on a survey of state goals and objectives, it was decided to base the design on a recent doctoral study by Taylor in which the following sixteen guiding principles of state supervision of vocational education in agriculture were developed and validated.

1. Supervision in vocational agriculture should provide leadership in appraising the needs for vocational agriculture.

2. Supervision in vocational agriculture should provide leadership in educational planning and involve in the planning process representatives of groups interested in the vocational agriculture program.

3. Supervision in vocational agriculture should aid in coordinating the efforts of agencies, groups, and organizations interested in improving vocational education in agriculture.
4. Supervision in vocational agriculture should stimulate local initiative and responsibility and coordinate the various elements into a unified state program.

5. Supervisory procedures and techniques in vocational agriculture should exemplify democratic processes and contribute to a climate which stimulates creativity and professional growth.

6. Supervision in vocational agriculture should recognize the dynamics of human relationships by determining supervisory procedures and techniques based on the needs of each situation.

7. Supervision in vocational agriculture should facilitate communication among all parties participating in the vocational agriculture program.

8. Supervision in vocational agriculture should contribute to the improvement of instruction.

9. Supervision in vocational agriculture should harmonize with modern educational theory and practice.

10. Supervision in vocational agriculture should operate within a framework of functional written policies and procedures and develop cooperatively policies and procedures for systematic and efficient administration and supervision.

11. Supervision in vocational agriculture should assure that vocational agriculture programs are consistent with the legal provisions of the state plan for vocational agriculture.

12. Supervision in vocational agriculture should cooperatively develop a program of public relations which adequately interprets to the public the purposes, procedures, and accomplishments of the complete vocational agriculture program.

13. Supervision in vocational agriculture should promote, conduct, and utilize educational research.

14. Supervision in vocational agriculture should encourage and assist in the evaluation of local vocational agriculture programs.

15. Supervision in vocational agriculture should provide for evaluation of the supervisory program.
16. Supervision in vocational agriculture should make a contribution to the improvement of the educational profession.1

It was believed that these guiding principles described the basic objectives and procedures of state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture. Although these guiding principles were general and philosophical in nature, they were broad enough to encompass the entire range of supervisory programs. Since the guiding principles were validated by a majority of the head state supervisors of agricultural education in the nation and other leaders in supervision and administration, it seems reasonable that they reflect the basic goals of the supervisory community as a whole—if we think of the community in this case as the various state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture. Furthermore, the literature justifies such an approach.

Adams and Dickey support this concept by their statement that "self-evaluation by the supervisor will be more likely to result in the improvement of the supervisory program if the criteria employed are as broad as the goals of the program itself. These criteria should cover, in so far as possible, all phases of the supervisor's activity."2

Burton and Brueckner point out that among other things "evaluation is concerned with the scope and quality of the goals, purposes, and functions of the total educational program and the extent to which

---


they meet the needs of the various individuals and are in line with the
desires and needs of the community as a whole.3

The same two authors lend further support to the use of guiding
principles in this statement: "The most satisfactory basis for evalu­
ating an educational program is to study it 'in terms of its philosophy
of education.'"4

Franseth, in the following quotation, also, illustrates her
belief that evaluation should be in accord with accepted principles:
"Common to most good evaluation programs is an attempt to determine the
extent to which existing supervisory practices are in accord with ac­
cepted principles of educational leadership."5

In a speech presented to the National Center Seminar on Agri­
cultural Education, Benjamin C. Willis, a noted educator, summed up the
argument briefly in these words: "Broad principles must form the foun­
dation for any (Italics by writer) educational program."6

3William H. Burton and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision A Social

4Ibid., p. 205. As quoted from "The Evaluation of Secondary

5Jane Franseth, Supervision as Leadership (Evanston, Illinois:

6Speech by Benjamin C. Willis, General Superintendent of Schools,
Chicago. Given to the National Center Seminar on Agricultural Education,
on Agricultural Education, A Design for the Future" (Columbus, Ohio:
The Ohio State University, 1963), p. 75.
Divisions of the instrument

The divisions in this instrument coincide with the sixteen guiding principles of state supervision in vocational education in agriculture. Traditionally the job of the state supervisor in agricultural education has been discussed in the literature under fewer headings. Peterson and Swanson described the functions of supervision in vocational education in agriculture under the following headings: Administration, public relations, improvement of instruction, and evaluation.  

A number of years ago, an evaluation instrument developed in Pennsylvania for evaluating programs of county or area supervision in vocational education in agriculture used the following six divisions: Administration, supervision and up-grading, Future Farmers of America, qualification of area supervisors, instruction, and office facilities. Each of these groupings was undoubtedly appropriate for their time and purpose. It was the belief of the writer, however, that a broader and more comprehensive base which was philosophically oriented would provide more direction for creative thought. There also appeared to be some advantage in providing divisions which in themselves could be kept brief and to the point. It was also believed that the guiding

7Milo J. Peterson and Gordon I. Swanson, Functions of State Supervision in Agricultural Education. Publication of the Central Regional Research Committee (Indianapolis, Ind.: State Department of Education, 1953), pp, 11-32.

principles represent a more modern interpretation of the supervisor's job.

**Identifying indicators**

The guiding principles form the foundation for the instrument, but they in themselves do not make nor were they intended to be an evaluation instrument. One of the important factors considered in the development of the evaluation instrument was the identification of those activities thought to be pertinent to successful program operation and which were thought to implement the guiding principles.

A number of techniques have been used to identify the practices or activities which were pertinent to the responsibilities of supervisors. An extensive study developed by the Louisiana School Supervisor's Association in cooperation with the Louisiana State Department of Education and the Louisiana State University determined the activities of supervisors in that state by:

1. Asking supervisors and principals to keep a time log of their activities at designated times during the year 1955-1956. Each participant described briefly a supervisory incident which occurred during each half day of the designated time period.

2. Noting and compiling the recurring practices.

3. Checking the recurring practices against educational literature and research studies to determine which of the practices were considered good supervisory practices.\(^9\)

---

The writer chose a similar approach except that he elected to go directly to the literature since Taylor's study, referred to earlier, had in essence established the broad, general purposes and procedures of supervision in vocational education in agriculture. The next essential step in developing the instrument was to identify those activities which would implement the guiding principles. A study of the literature pertaining to supervision revealed that the practices and activities recommended by leading writers in the field logically grouped under one or more of the guiding principles. In grouping these recommended practices, each one was tested by the writer by asking the question: Would the successful completion of this activity assist in implementing one of the guiding principles? When a positive answer could be given to the question, that practice or activity was listed under an appropriate principle. Since each of these practices or activities was believed to be an indication of supervisory accomplishment of the guiding principle, it was decided to refer to these activities as indicators.

The decision to use indicators instead of criteria or statements of standards in the body of the instrument was based on the reasoning that it would be difficult and impractical to attempt to spell out adequately the standards for state supervisory programs which would be applicable in all states. Buddemeyer, in his study, concluded that one of the principles of evaluation should be that "evaluation should take into account differences among individuals being evaluated." It appears

just as important to take into account the differences among states and the various state programs.

It was believed that by asking the question, "What are you doing" in specific areas would permit the freedom necessary to encourage individuality, creativity, and flexibility in the various state programs. It was not the intent of this instrument to define rigid standards to be adhered to by every state. Admittedly, this approach to evaluation emphasizes thinking and self-analysis more than it does exact measurement. It is believed that herein lies one of the major strengths of the instrument.

To further test the accuracy of the writer's judgment, a complete list of indicators was sent to a national jury of experts. The jury was asked to react to the following specific items:

1. Suggest additional indicators which were examples of desired supervisory practices or activities for each principle.

2. Indicate vagueness in wording of any indicator and suggest a more appropriate wording.

3. Point out indicators which would be more appropriately listed under a different guiding principle.

4. Suggest other indicators of supervisory competence which do not appear to fit under any of the guiding principles.

**Selection of the First Jury of Experts**

In the proposal for this study the writer, with the approval of his doctoral committee, agreed to ask twenty-four national leaders in
the field of educational supervision to assist the writer in developing a list of statements which would be indicative of implementation of the guiding principles.

An effort was made to select leaders to serve on the jury from the following educational areas: (a) general education, (b) state supervision in other vocational education fields, (c) U. S. Office of Education, Agricultural Education Branch, (d) teacher education in vocational education in agriculture, (e) teachers of vocational agriculture, (f) state supervision in agricultural education, and (g) state directors of vocational education. The selection of the jury members was based on the following considerations: (a) a known interest in evaluation and supervision, (b) recognized leadership in the field of education which they represented, and (c) geographic location and, in the case of state level vocational staffs, the size of the state staff.

The following persons were selected to serve on the first jury.

**General educators**

Dr. Henry Brunner......Research and Program Specialist, Division of Higher Education, U. S. Office of Education. Formerly, Professor and Chairman of Agricultural Education at Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Lloyd W. Dull......Assistant Superintendent in charge of Curriculum and Instruction, Canton City Schools, Canton, Ohio. Formerly, Social Science teacher and Secondary School Coordinator in the Ohio Public Schools. Author of "Criteria for Evaluating the Supervisory Program in School Systems."
Dr. W. R. Flesher......Director, School Survey Service, Columbus, Ohio. Formerly, Professor, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, The Ohio State University

Dr. W. W. Savage......Dean of the School of Education, University of South Carolina. Formerly, Associate Director, The Midwestern Administration Center, University of Chicago; Assistant State Supervisor of Guidance and Counseling, State of Virginia. Author of Consultative Services to Local School Systems

U. S. Office of Education. Agricultural Education Branch

Mr. H. N. Hunsicker....Program Specialist, Agricultural Education. Formerly, State Supervisor of Vocational Agriculture, West Virginia

Mr. R. E. Naugher......Assistant Director, Agricultural Education Branch. Formerly, State Supervisor of Agricultural Education, South Carolina

Teacher educators

Mr. S. S. Sutherland...Head, Department of Agricultural Education, University of California, Davis, California

Dr. C. W. Hill.........Professor, Department of Rural Education, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Vocational agriculture teachers

Mr. James Durkee.......Teacher of Vocational Agriculture, Laramie, Wyoming. Vice President, National Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association

Mr. Verdine Rice......Teacher of Vocational Agriculture, Williston, North Dakota. Vice President, National Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association.
Head state supervisors
agricultural education

Mr. A. G. Bullard......Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, North Carolina

Mr. Ralph Edwards......Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Idaho

Mr. W. E. Gore........Head, State Supervisor Agricultural Education, South Carolina

Mr. Hampton T. Hall....Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Iowa

Mr. Byron J. McMahon...Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education, California

Mr. Harry E. Nesman....Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Michigan

Mr. Jesse A. Taft......Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Massachusetts

Mr. Cola D. Watson.....Head, State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Vermont

Head state supervisors
other vocational education

Mrs. Eva Scully........Head, State Supervisor, Home Economics Education, Arizona. Formerly, President, American Vocational Association

Mr. John Waldeck.......Head, State Supervisor, Distributive Education, Colorado. Formerly, Distributive Education Coordinator in the Denver, Colorado schools

State directors vocational education

Mr. John Bunten........State Director, Vocational Education, Nevada

Mr. Gerald B. James....State Director, Vocational Education, North Carolina
Responses of the First Jury of Experts

Each of the twenty-four jury members responded to the writer's request for assistance in the development of the indicators. Their suggestions for editorial changes and additional indicators were evidences of the great amount of serious thought that each had given to the task requested of them.

The extent to which the jury assisted in developing the indicators is evidenced by the fact that they suggested as a combined group 378 changes or additions to the list of indicators submitted by the writer. Since a number of their suggestions were duplications or in a few instances not appropriate, the writer incorporated sixty-nine editorial changes to the indicators which he had submitted to the jury and added twenty-one more indicators to the list.

The specific changes which were incorporated into the instrument as a result of the jury's suggestions are noted in the appropriate sections of the revised instrument which follows.

PRINCIPLE I: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN APPRAISING THE NEEDS FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the socio-economic trends affecting vocational agriculture?
b. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the present agricultural situation?

c. To assure that the public, including school personnel at the local and state level, understands the role of vocational agriculture in public education?

*Editorial Change:* Substituted "assist" for "assure that".

d. To determine the state-wide need for vocational agriculture?

e. To determine needed adjustments in local vocational agriculture programs?

f. To assist local school personnel determine the need for vocational agriculture in each school district?

*Editorial Change:* Changed "each school district" to "local communities".

g. To provide consultative services to other groups who are studying the local needs for vocational agriculture?

h. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the agricultural situation of the foreseeable future?

i. To cooperate with other state vocational education services in determining the total vocational education needs of the state.

**PRINCIPLE II:** SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND INVOLVE IN THE PLANNING PROCESS REPRESENTATIVES OF GROUPS INTERESTED IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

**INDICATORS**

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To involve professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the state program of vocational agriculture?

*Editorial Change:* Changed "to involve" to "make use of".

b. To cooperate with teacher educators in developing annual and long-range goals and objectives for the state supervisory and teacher education programs in agricultural education?
c. To develop a written program of activities for the state staff?

Editorial Change: Added the word "supervisory" to describe activities and "supervisory" to describe state staff

d. To assist local schools in establishing realistic, immediate, and long-time goals, objectives, and ways and means for all phases of the vocational agriculture program?

Editorial Change: Changed "To assist local schools" to "To assist local school personnel" and inserted "for implementing all phases" after "means"

e. To assist local schools establish and utilize professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the local vocational agriculture program?

Editorial Change: Changed "To assist local schools" to "To assist local school personnel"

f. To involve other interested groups and individuals in planning state-wide programs for vocational agriculture?

Editorial Change: Deleted indicator—duplication of "a"

g. To involve local teachers and administrators in the development of the state-wide program of vocational agriculture?

Editorial Change: Changed "involve" to "utilize" and added "vocational agriculture" to describe teacher

Additions

h. To encourage and assist the teacher education staff in developing an annual written program of their activities?

i. To assist other vocational education services in developing comprehensive vocational programs?

PRINCIPLE III: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD AID IN COORDINATING THE EFFORTS OF AGENCIES, GROUPS, AND ORGANIZATIONS INTERESTED IN IMPROVING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN AGRICULTURE

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To identify agencies, groups, and organizations whose purpose
and activities are closely related to the vocational agriculture program?

**Editorial Change:** Reworded as follows: To identify agencies, groups, and organizations that are interested in and concerned with the vocational agriculture program?

b. To acquaint the state supervisory staff members with the functions, responsibilities, and programs of other educational agencies?

**Editorial Change:** Substituted "To acquaint themselves" for "To acquaint the state supervisory staff members"

c. To initiate an inter-organization structure among the state's agricultural groups to coordinate common effort?

**Editorial Change:** Substituted "utilize" for "initiate" and added the word "educational" to describe "efforts"

d. To assure that the efforts of the vocational agriculture program of the state harmonize with the efforts of other educational and agricultural organizations, groups, and agencies?

**Editorial Change:** Added the word "educational" to describe efforts and changed "harmonize with the efforts" to "harmonize with the acceptable educational efforts"

e. To assure that the vocational agriculture program complements and enhances other vocational education services and programs?

f. To assure that the vocational agriculture teachers' association's activities are a logical outgrowth of the state vocational agriculture program, and supplement the state supervisory program?

**Editorial Change:** Reworded as follows: To assure that the activities of the state vocational agriculture teachers' association contribute to improved vocational agriculture programs?

g. To assure that the activities of the teacher education staff and the state supervisory staff are complementary?

h. To assure that the administrative policies and decisions of each group, organization, and agency interested in agricultural education are in harmony with the goals and objectives of the statewide vocational agriculture program?
**Editorial Change:** Rewarded as follows: To influence the administrative policies and decisions of groups, organizations, and agencies interested in agricultural education so that their efforts will contribute to improved vocational agriculture education programs without needless duplication of effort?

i. To assure that "vested" interests of various groups, organizations, and agencies do not unduly influence the vocational agriculture program and its relationship to the school and community?

j. To assist teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents to develop a proper perspective of the vocational agriculture program and its relationship to the school and community?

**PRINCIPLE IV:** SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD STIMULATE LOCAL INITIATIVE AND RESPONSIBILITY AND COORDINATE THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS INTO A UNIFIED STATE PROGRAM

**INDICATORS**

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To assure that supervisory policies are developed and administered with sufficient flexibility to encourage local initiative in program development?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "state and local" to describe supervisory policies

   b. To develop a reimbursement plan which promotes local school initiative?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "state" to describe reimbursement plan

   c. To encourage local innovations and utilize them in the state-wide program of vocational agriculture?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "educational" to describe innovations

   d. To assure that state regulations provide maximum responsibility to local schools consistent with the state's obligation for effective education?

   **Editorial Change:** Substituted "allow" for "provide" and added "freedom and" after the word "maximum"
e. To maintain the basic common elements of a quality vocational agriculture program?

**Editorial Change:** Reworded to read: To cooperate with local school personnel in determining and maintaining the basic common elements of a quality vocational agriculture program?

**Additions**

f. To encourage and assist local school personnel design experimental and demonstration programs in agricultural education?

g. To encourage creative thinking on the part of local school personnel?

**PRINCIPAL V: SUPERVISORY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD EXEMPLIFY DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES**

**INDICATORS**

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assist state staff members and local school personnel to understand and utilize the techniques of democratic leadership?

**Editorial Change:** Substituted "To assist themselves" for "To assist state staff members"

b. To develop a common understanding of the role of the state supervisor among local school board members, administrators, and teachers?

**Editorial Change:** Substituted "state supervisory staff" for "state supervisor".

c. To assist local school personnel understand and assume their responsibilities in the democratic processes of educational leadership?

**Editorial Change:** Changed "personnel understand and assume" to "personnel in understanding and assuming"

d. To assist state staff members develop the ability to utilize group processes effectively?

**Editorial Change:** Added "supervisory" to describe staff members
e. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members to participate in the solving of problems related to the educational profession?

Additions

f. To become sensitive to the attitudes, beliefs, and opinions of vocational agriculture teachers and local school administrators?

PRINCIPLE VI: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD RECOGNIZE
THE DYNAMICS OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS BY DETERMINING SUPERVISORY PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES BASED ON THE NEEDS OF EACH SITUATION

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To determine the kinds of consultative services that local schools desire?

Editorial Change: Substituted "local school personnel need and desire" for "local schools desire".

b. To assure that the activities of state staff members reflect an understanding of the differences in individuals and situations?

c. To assure that supervision is basically a cooperative effort between the supervisor and the supervised?

Editorial Change: Eliminated the word "basically".

d. To diversify the means of supervision to meet the needs of the different persons to be served?

Editorial Change: Substituted the word "techniques" for "means" and substituted "different persons and groups to be served" for "different persons to be served".

e. To assure that a balance is maintained in the use of various supervisory techniques?

Editorial Change: Deleted indicator—duplication of "d" and "b"

f. To assure that human concerns and needs take precedence over material needs and other external factors during the supervisory process?
PRINCIPLE VII: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD FACILITATE COMMUNICATIONS AMONG ALL PARTIES PARTICIPATING IN THE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assure that all communications to and from the supervisory office are promptly handled and correctly interpreted by the intended recipients?

b. To assist teachers and state staff members become aware of official channels of communications among their own and cooperating groups, organizations, and agencies?

Editorial Change: Added "vocational agriculture" to describe teacher and state staff members and substituted "in knowing and using" for "become aware of"

c. To assure that important policies and procedures of the state staff are clearly written and made available to all affected?

d. To establish a state staff organizational structure and procedures which encourage effective communications?

Editorial Change: Added the words "staff operational" to describe procedures and substituted "facilitate" for "encourage"

e. To assure that all parties participating in the vocational agriculture program are provided significant information influencing administrative decisions and program development?

f. To aid teachers in establishing effective communications with all parties concerned with the local vocational agriculture program?

Editorial Change: Added "vocational agriculture" to describe teacher and substituted "individuals, groups, and agencies concerned" for "parties concerned"

g. To maintain effective two-way communications with all parties involved in the vocational agriculture program?

Editorial Change: Deleted entire indicator--duplication of all others in this section and actual rewording of the principle
h. To acquaint themselves with the new methods and techniques in communication?

PRINCIPLE VIII: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To provide technical and professional in-service training programs for teachers of vocational agriculture?

      **Editorial Change:** Substituted "educational" for "training" and added "and administrators" after the word "teachers" and added "programs" at the end of the sentence.

   b. To involve local teachers and administrators in state-wide programs designed to improve instruction?

      **Editorial Change:** Reworded as follows: To utilize local vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in designing state-wide programs to improve instruction.

   c. To involve other divisions of the state educational agency and agricultural agencies in the improvement of instruction in vocational agriculture?

   d. To develop certification and personnel policies which encourage individual professional growth on the part of the local teacher?

   e. To balance the state staff's time between group and individual instruction?

      **Editorial Change:** Reworded: To effectively and economically distribute their time between group and individual supervisory techniques.

   f. To design state FFA activities so they will contribute to the teaching-learning process and the educational objectives of the vocational agriculture program?

   g. To develop a state plan which stimulates desirable educational outcomes?

      **Editorial Change:** Deleted entire indicator -- duplication of indicator under Principle X.
h. To encourage and to permit vocational agriculture teachers to participate in technical and professional in-service training programs?

   **Editorial Change:** Deleted "and to permit"—wording inferred authority over local teachers

i. To encourage more effective use of teaching resources found in the local community?

j. To assist teachers to improve their instructional program?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "vocational agriculture" to describe teachers

k. To assist teachers to secure and modernize appropriate teaching materials?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "vocational agriculture" to describe teachers

l. To assist teachers in procuring and using appropriate methods, media, facilities, and equipment in teaching?

   **Editorial Change:** Added "vocational agriculture" to describe teachers

m. To assist teachers with vocational agriculture curriculum development which is in harmony with the total school curricula?

   **Editorial Change:** Reworded: To assist vocational agriculture teachers with vocational agriculture curriculum development which is in harmony with the total curricular program of the school?

   **Additions**

n. To determine professional and technical educational needs of vocational agriculture teachers?

o. To encourage local school administrators to provide adequate supervision of the local vocational agriculture program?

p. To encourage and assist in securing higher professional standards in teacher education programs preparing vocational agriculture teachers?

q. To assist in recruiting prospective vocational agricultural teachers of promise?

r. To secure maximum benefits from required reports for program development and improvement?
s. To assist beginning teachers make a satisfactory entry into the business of teaching?

PRINCIPLE IX: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD HARMONIZE WITH MODERN EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To organize and conduct the state supervisory program in vocational agriculture to harmonize with the total educational program in the state?

   b. To provide opportunity for state staff members to engage in educational activities apart from vocational agriculture?

      Editorial Change: Reworded: To engage in educational activities apart from vocational agriculture?

   c. To keep up-to-date with new developments in educational theory and practice?

   d. To assist teachers to keep up-to-date with new developments in educational theory and practice?

      Editorial Change: Substituted "become acquainted" for "keep-up-to-date"

   e. To develop policies and procedures which encourage the adoption of modern theory and practice?

      Editorial Change: Reworded: To encourage the adoption and use of modern theory and practice in education which is applicable to the teaching of vocational agriculture?

      Additions

   f. To encourage the development and utilization of educational leave policies of state staff members?

   g. To assure that the vocational agriculture program complements and enhances other vocational education services and programs?
PRINCIPLE X: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD OPERATE WITHIN A FRAMEWORK OF FUNCTIONAL WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHICH HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assure that written policies are comprehensive, current, and available to those affected by them?

b. To involve those who are affected by state policies in the development of these policies?

    Editorial Change: Reworded: To involve those who are affected by state vocational agriculture policies in the development of these policies?

c. To provide written policies and procedures which give general direction and guidance to state staff activities?

d. To develop policies and procedures which effectively utilize the special abilities of state staff personnel?

e. To secure maximum benefits from reports for program development and improvement without being burdensome to those preparing the reports?

    Editorial Change: Deleted the entire indicator

f. To involve local school board members, administrators, teachers, and state staff members in the development of policies which affect them?

    Editorial Change: Reworded: To involve school personnel and representatives of agriculture in the development of a state plan for vocational education in agriculture which stimulates desirable educational outcomes?
PRINCIPLE XI: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD ASSURE THAT VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE LEGAL PROVISIONS OF THE STATE PLAN FOR VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To limit state reports to those which are essential to determine compliance with legal provisions for the state plan?

Editorial Change: Deleted the entire indicator -- conflicted with indicator "e" and duplicated indicator "h"

b. To assure that local school personnel understand the minimum standards and the flexibilities inherent in the state plan?

c. To assure that local programs are operated in harmony with the legal provisions of the state plan?

d. To develop a reporting system that contributes to the teacher's evaluation of his program?

e. To develop a reporting system that reflects evidences of student growth?

Editorial Change: Reworded, to combine "e" and "d:" To assist local school personnel develop a written plan for the operation of their vocational agriculture program?

f. To assure that the reporting system is functioning effectively?

g. To assure that sufficient and valid data are available on each program to determine its compliance with the legal provisions of the state plan?

h. To assure that the state office maintains a system of records which provides evidence of the state's compliance with the legal provisions of state and federal regulations?
PRINCIPLE XII: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD COOPERATIVELY DEVELOP A PROGRAM OF PUBLIC RELATIONS WHICH ADEQUATELY INTERPRETS TO THE PUBLIC THE PURPOSES, PROCEDURES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COMPLETE VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAM

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:
   a. To ascertain and improve the public image of vocational agriculture education?
   b. To maintain a program of instruction in vocational agriculture that merits the respect and support of the public?

   **Editorial Change:** Deleted entire indicator—duplication of indicator "a".

   c. To assure that students of vocational agriculture programs are aware of the objectives, organizational procedures, and benefits of the vocational agriculture program?

   **Editorial Change:** Deleted entire indicator—duplication of indicator "a".

   d. To make use of the talents and abilities of all social and economic groups in interpreting the vocational agriculture program?

   e. To make effective use of talents of individual staff members in interpreting the vocational agriculture program?

   **Editorial Change:** Deleted entire indicator—duplication of the Guiding Principle

   f. To make effective use of all news media in reporting comprehensively the complete vocational agriculture program in the state?

   g. To assure that the state's public relations program:
      1. Takes the initiative with a positive approach?
      2. Is honest?
      3. Is planned and purposeful?
      4. Is continuous?
      5. Is designed to reach many publics?
h. To assist local schools to conduct an effective program of public information?

i. To provide leadership which stimulates and mobilizes the talents and efforts of state staff members, local school personnel, and citizens in a coordinated public relations effort?

**PRINCIPLE XIII: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROMOTE, CONDUCT, AND UTILIZE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**INDICATORS**

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To analyze and interpret research data to the state staff and local school personnel?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded, to eliminate reference to the state staff which was inferred: To assist in analyzing and interpreting research data to local school personnel?

b. To identify needed research studies in agricultural education?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded, to include the concept of cooperative action: To cooperate with local school personnel and teacher educators in identifying needed research studies in agricultural education?

c. To make known to researchers present and prospective needed research studies in agricultural education?

d. To provide state supervisory personnel with the time and finances necessary to develop and conduct an effective research program?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded, to eliminate the inference that time and finances were readily available: To secure adequate time and finances necessary to develop and conduct an effective research program?

e. To implement research findings in action programs at the local school level?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded, to imply joint responsibility of local and state agencies: To assist local school personnel in implementing research findings in action programs at the local school level?
f. To refine research findings through pilot or experimental programs in local schools?

g. To coordinate the research efforts of graduate students in approved teacher preparation institutions?

Editorial Change: Reworded, to imply a joint responsibility of teacher education and supervision: To assist in coordinating the research efforts of graduate students in approved teacher education institutions?

h. To encourage local schools to conduct and utilize educational research at the local level?

Editorial Change: Reworded, to narrow the responsibility to the vocational agriculture program: To encourage vocational agriculture teachers to conduct and utilize educational research in their instructional programs?

Additions

i. To make effective use of research data in their supervisory activities?

PRINCIPLE XIV: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD ENCOURAGE AND ASSIST IN THE EVALUATION OF LOCAL VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

   a. To assist local schools select methods and materials for evaluating the important outcomes of their efforts?

      Editorial Change: Expanded as follows, to add the developmental concept: To assist local schools in selecting and developing instruments for evaluating the important outcomes of their efforts?

   b. To assist local schools to interpret and utilize evaluation results in projecting and improving their vocational agriculture program?

   c. To encourage the group problem solving approach in evaluating local vocational agriculture programs by including those involved?
d. To stimulate teachers to make use of self-evaluation procedures as a basis for program improvement?

*Editorial Change:* Substituted the word "instrument" for "procedure"

e. To assure that local evaluations are concerned primarily with programs and not individuals?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded as follows, to clarify: To assure that local evaluations are concerned primarily with the improvement of local programs and not with the comparative ratings of individual teachers?

**PRINCIPLE XV:** SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR EVALUATION OF THE SUPERVISORY PROGRAM

**INDICATORS**

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To collect evidence that supervision goals and objectives are being met?

*Editorial Change:* Reworded as follows, to expand the thought: To collect and summarize annually evidence that supervisory goals and objectives are being met?

b. To determine the influence that state supervision has on the effectiveness of the vocational agriculture program in the state?

c. To involve those affected by supervision in the evaluation process?

*Editorial Change:* Changed "To involve" to "To utilize"

d. To utilize available criteria and techniques for state staff use in formal and informal evaluation of supervisory effort as a basis for program development?

*Editorial Change:* Changed "basis for program development" to "basis for the development of the supervisory program"

e. To develop continuous evaluation procedures which provide for subjective judgment as well as objective evidence?
To encourage state staff members to engage in critical self-evaluation on a planned, periodic basis?

Editorial Change: Reworded as follows, to be more specific:
To provide an instrument or set standards upon which the state staff members can engage in critical self-evaluation on a planned, periodic basis?

PRINCIPLE XVI: SUPERVISION IN VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE SHOULD MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EDUCATION PROFESSION

INDICATORS

1. What is the state supervisory staff doing:

a. To assist teachers and state staff members develop individual professional improvement programs?

b. To identify and develop prospective state and local vocational education leaders?

c. To develop policies and procedures for a comprehensive in-service education program for state staff members?

d. To encourage state staff members and teachers to belong and participate in local, state, and national professional organizations?

e. To encourage teachers and state staff members to contribute to the literature of agricultural education and other fields of education?

f. To make it possible for state staff members to participate in educational activities other than vocational agriculture?

Editorial Change: Reworded as follows, to sharpen wording:
(no change in meaning) To involve themselves in educational activities other than those of vocational agriculture?

Additions

g. To encourage well-qualified men and women to enter and remain in the teaching profession?

h. To influence the improvement of teacher education programs?
Summary of Responses from the Jury

In general, the responses of the jury assisted the writer in avoiding duplication, clarifying the meaning of the indicators, and completing the list of major indicators. An analysis of the jury's responses showed that the sub-groups within the combined jury had a slightly different concept of the role of the state supervisor.

The state directors of vocational education, for example, were more critical than the other sub-groups of the wording in the indicators which tended to infer that supervisors should have the responsibility for influencing state board policy.

The value of having different educational interests represented on the jury was also apparent. Each sub-group appeared to be the most critical of indicators which had definite implications for their particular field of educational interest.

The teacher educators, for instance, were careful to point out any wording which tended to infer control of supervision over teacher education programs. They preferred wording which reflected a more cooperative approach.

The general educators on the jury seemed to emphasize the broad, general education of supervisors. The following comment from one of the jurors illustrates the point: "Individuals in the field of vocational agriculture need study in the philosophy of education; curriculum construction; statistics; the social, political, and economic forces shaping educational policy and development; human growth and development; etc. These are areas not limited to vocational agriculture but necessary for a professional person in education."
There was evidence that individual jury members were influenced by the situations which existed in the areas of the country with which they were most familiar. One excellent example of this influence was the suggestion of a juror from a state which has a limited supervisory staff that standards for work loads of supervisors should be established.

One of the most notable features of the jury's responses was the agreement expressed on a number of occasions. Most of the changes which were made in the wording of indicators were brought about because a number of the jurors felt a change needed to be made. Although they didn't always agree on the exact wording to be used, their common concern about the wording caused the writer to reword the indicator in terms of what appeared to be a consensus of the jurors' dissatisfaction. The fact that no critical comments were made about a majority of the indicators might have been reason for concern to the writer had there not been some common critical comments on a number of other indicators.

The addition of indicators to the list was generally brought about by some degree of agreement on the part of jury members. In most instances jurors' comments, rather than, specific wording revealed the need for an additional indicator.

In conclusion, it appeared that the jury tended to agree upon what should be added to the list of indicators, which indicators should be changed, and which indicators were satisfactory. In making changes or additions to the list of indicators, the writer's interpretation of the individual comments of jurors was an important factor, since the comments varied from exclamation points and question marks to detailed explanations of why changes should be made.
To further refine the instrument, the research design called for sending the revised instrument to a second jury. This jury, like the first one, was composed of persons representative of the leadership in (a) general education, (b) state supervision in other vocational education fields, (c) U. S. Office of Education, Agricultural Education Branch, (d) teacher education in vocational education in agriculture, (e) teachers of vocational agriculture, (f) state supervision in agricultural education, and (g) state directors of vocational education.

Their selection, as was that of the first jury, was based on the following considerations:

1. A known interest in evaluation and state supervision.
2. Recognized leadership in the field of education which they represented
3. Geographic location and, in the case of state level vocational staffs, the size of the state staff

The following persons were selected to serve on the second jury.

**General educators**

Dr. Ralph Bohrson........Director of the Western States Small School Project (Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah), State Department of Education, Denver, Colorado

Dr. Henry M. Brickell.....Assistant Superintendent, Manhasset Public Schools, Manhasset, New York. Formerly, Consultant on Educational Experimentation to the Commissioner of Education, New York. Author of Organizing New York State for Educational Change
Dr. Allen Lee..........Assistant Superintendent in charge of
Division of Education Development,
Oregon State Department of Education.
Formerly, State Supervisor of Vocational
Education in Agriculture in Oregon

Mr. Bob Turner..........Principal, Greeley High School, Greeley,
Colorado. Formerly, Assistant Super­
intendent in charge of Curriculum and
Instruction, Logan County, Colorado.
President of the Colorado Association
of Secondary School Principals. Member,
Executive Committee of the National
Association of Secondary School Prin­
cipals. Member, Colorado State Committee
North Central Association

U. S. Office of Education,
Agricultural Education Branch

Mr. Harold F. Duis.......Program Specialist, Agricultural Education,
Office of Education. Formerly, State
Supervisor Agricultural Education, Nebraska

Dr. A. W. Tenney........Director, Agricultural Education Branch,
Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Teacher educators

Dr. G. F. Ekstrom.......Professor, Agricultural Education Depart­
ment, University of Missouri

Dr. Leo L. Knutl..........Head, Department of Agricultural Education,
Montana State College

Dr. Milo J. Peterson.....Chairman, Department of Agricultural Edu­
cation, University of Minnesota, Past Pres­
ident, American Vocational Association

Vocational agriculture teachers

Mr. Robert Howey........Teacher of Vocational Agriculture, Illi­
nois. Treasurer, National Association
Vocational Agriculture Teachers
Mr. Sam Stenzel...Teacher of Vocational Agriculture, Russell, Kansas. Vice President, Region II, National Association Vocational Agriculture Teachers

Head state supervisors in agricultural education

Mr. Neal D. Andrew......State Director, Agricultural Education, New Hampshire

Mr. M. M. Botto.........State Director, Agricultural Education, Kentucky

Mr. J. W. Carney.........State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Tennessee

Mr. George R. Cochran....State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Minnesota

Mr. L. C. Dalton..........State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, New Mexico

Mr. Elvin Downs..........State Supervisor, Agricultural Education, Utah

Mr. George Hurt..........State Director, Agricultural Education, Texas

Mr. R. C. S. Sutliff.....Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Education, New York

Head state supervisors in other vocational education

Mrs. Lucile Fee..........State Director, Home Economics Education, Colorado. Vice President, American Vocational Association

Mr. K. Otto Logan......Chief Supervisor, Distributive Education, Washington. Vice President, American Vocational Association
State directors vocational education

Mr. R. D. Anderson........State Director, Vocational Education, South Carolina

Mr. J. E. Hill............State Director, Vocational Education, Illinois

Mr. Earl H. Little........State Director, Vocational Education, New Hampshire

Mr. Mark Nichols.........State Director, Vocational Education, Utah

Instructions to the Second Jury and Their Responses

The second jury was asked to rate on a five-point scale the indicators under each guiding principle according to its value as an effective indicator of implementation of the guiding principle. Each member of the jury was sent the revised instrument which was constructed to include the rating form.

The following rating scale was included in the instrument to assist the jury in evaluating each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the juror, in his judgment, considered an indicator to be extremely important to the implementation of that principle, it was assigned five points; if very important, it was assigned four points; if important, it was assigned three points; if seldom important, it was assigned two points; and if not important, one point.
Those indicators which received a combined mean rating of less than 3.0 (important) were deleted from the instrument.

Summary of responses from the second jury

An analysis of the returns from the jury revealed several interesting facts. Perhaps, the most significant was that only one indicator had a combined mean rating of less than 3.0.

When the mean ratings were analyzed by sub-groups—according to the jurors' field of educational interest—it was found that of the 122 indicators in the tentative self-evaluation instrument only eighteen received a rating of less than 3.0 by any group. Only three of these eighteen indicators had less than 3.0 mean ratings by two or more sub-groups.

Indicator "q" of Principle VIII, To encourage local schools to incorporate sabbatical leave provisions in their school policies, was rated below 3.0 by five of the seven sub-groups. Only the teacher educators in agricultural education and the vocational agriculture teachers gave this indicator a mean rating above the 3.0 cut-off point.

Indicator "b" of Principle VII, To acquaint themselves with the research in communication, was rated below 3.0 by two groups—the U. S. Office of Education and the general educators.

Indicator "f" of Principle IX, To encourage the development and utilization of educational leave policies for state staff members, was rated below 3.0 by the state directors of vocational education and general educators.
The general educators were the most critical of the sub-groups. They rated twelve indicators less than 3.0 and rated seventy-nine of the indicators lower than the combined mean rating of the jury. The least critical sub-group—the agricultural teacher educators—did not assign a mean rating below the 3.0 cut-off point to a single indicator.

The directors of vocational education assigned a mean rating of less than 3.0 to two indicators. Members of the U. S. Office of Education staff in Agricultural Education rated seven indicators below 3.0, but even though they were nearly as critical as the general educators, they only would have eliminated two of the same indicators which the general educators rated low. Their agreement was on Indicator "q" of Principle VIII, To encourage local schools to incorporate sabbatical leave provisions in their school policies, which was deleted from the instrument because it had a combined rating of less than 3.0, and Indicator "b" of Principle VII, To acquaint themselves with the research in communication, which the jury as a whole gave a mean rating of 3.2.

Because of the general acceptance of the indicators, and the apparent lack of a marked difference of opinion among the various sub-groups, it was decided to keep all of the indicators which received a combined mean rating of 3.0 or higher in the instrument.

Tables 1 through 16 report the combined mean rating of each indicator, the range of each indicator, and the mean rating for each indicator by the following sub-groups: general educators, vocational agriculture educators, directors of vocational education, and other vocational educators. The indicators are listed in the tables in a descending order of importance as determined by the combined mean rating of the jury.
In the instrument which was sent to the jury and in the final instrument, the indicators were listed in what appeared to be a more logical order.

The range, although not consistent in all cases, was generally greater for those indicators which had a lower mean rating. Every indicator received a rating of five by at least one juror, and only thirteen indicators received a rating of one by one or more jurors.

Tables 1 through 16 also reveal that very few of the mean ratings fell near the mid-point of the five-point rating scale. The fact that the ratings clustered near the upper end of the scale appears to confirm the belief of the writer and that of the first jury that the indicators were important to the effective implementation of the guiding principles.

Tables 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 15, and 16 reveal that none of the subgroups rated an indicator below 3.0 (important). These tables contain the indicators found under:

Guiding Principle I
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture
Should Provide Leadership in Appraising the Needs for Vocational Agriculture.

Guiding Principle III
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture
Should Aid in Coordinating the Efforts of Agencies, Groups, and Organizations Interested in Improving Vocational Education in Agriculture.

Guiding Principle IV
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture
Should Stimulate Local Initiative and Responsibility and Coordinate the Various Elements into a Unified State Program.

Guiding Principle VI
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture
Should Recognize the Dynamics of Human Relationships by Determining Supervisory Procedures and Techniques Based on the Needs of Each Situation.

Guiding Principle X
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture
Should Operate Within A Framework of Functional Written Policies and Procedures Which Have Been Developed Cooperatively.
TABLE 1.--Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in providing leadership in appraising needs for vocational agriculture (Principle I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine the state-wide need for vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assist the general public, including school personnel at the local and state level, understand the role of vocational agriculture in public education?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assist local school personnel in determining needed adjustments in local vocational agriculture programs?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the socio-economic trends affecting vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assist local school personnel determine the need for vocational agriculture in local communities?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the present agricultural situation?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1.—(Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. To cooperate with other state vocational education services in determining the total vocational education needs of the state?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To identify and interpret to educators and the general public the agricultural situation of the foreseeable future?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To provide consultative services to other groups who are studying the local needs for vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principle XII
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture Should Cooperatively Develop A Program of Public Relations Which Adequately Interprets To the Public the Purposes, Procedures, and Accomplishments of the Complete Vocational Agriculture Program.

Guiding Principle XV
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture Should Provide for Evaluation of the Supervisory Program.

Guiding Principle XVI
Supervision in Vocational Agriculture Should Make a Contribution To the Improvement of the Education Profession.

Since the importance of all of these indicators was generally accepted by each sub-group, as well as, the complete jury, the balance of this discussion will center on the remaining tables which did reveal some difference of opinion among groups of jurors.

Table 2, which shows the indicators under Guiding Principle II, "Supervision in Vocational Agriculture Should Provide Leadership in Educational Planning and Involve In the Planning Process Representatives of Groups Interested in the Vocational Agriculture Program," reveals that the general educators in the jury objected to Indicator 8, To encourage and assist the teacher education staff in developing an annual written program of their activities, although none rated it as low as 1.0 (not important). The other three groups rated the indicator quite high. Perhaps, common practice was an influencing factor. It is generally accepted that the working relationships between state supervisors and teacher educators in vocational education in agriculture are more intimate than they are in general education.

Table 5, which shows the indicators under Guiding Principle V, "Supervisory Procedures and Techniques in Vocational Agriculture Should Exemplify Democratic Processes," reveals that the general educator group
## TABLE 2.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in providing leadership in educational planning

**(Principle II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To cooperate with teacher educators in developing annual and long-range goals and objectives for the state supervisory and teacher education programs in agricultural education?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To make use of professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the state program of vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assist local school personnel in establishing realistic, immediate, and long-time goals, objectives, and ways and means for implementing all phases of the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To develop a written program of supervisory activities for the state supervisory staff?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To utilize local vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in the development of the state-wide program of vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>3.3 4.1   3.8 3.5 3.9</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To assist other vocational education services in helping local vocational education personnel develop comprehensive vocational programs?</td>
<td>4.0 3.4 3.5 4.5 3.6</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To assist local school personnel establish and utilize professional and lay citizen advisory committees in planning the local vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To encourage and assist the teacher education staff in developing an annual written program of their activities?</td>
<td>2.3 3.5 4.0 4.0 3.4</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in aiding in coordinating the efforts of agencies, groups, and organizations (Principle III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To assure that the activities of the teacher education staff and the state supervisory staff are complementary?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assist teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents in developing a proper perspective of the vocational agriculture program and its relationship to the school and community?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assure that the activities of the state vocational agriculture teachers' association contribute to improved vocational agriculture programs?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To influence the administrative policies and decisions of groups, organizations, and agencies interested in agriculture education so that their efforts will contribute to improved vocational agriculture education programs without needless duplication of effort?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assure that the educational efforts of the vocational agriculture program of the state harmonize with the acceptable educational efforts of other educational and agricultural organizations, groups, and agencies?</td>
<td>4.5 3.4 3.8 3.0 3.6</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To assure that &quot;vested&quot; interests of various groups, organizations, and agencies do not unduly influence the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.3 3.7 3.8 3.0 3.6</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To identify agencies, groups, and organizations that are interested in and concerned with the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.3 3.7 3.3 3.0 3.5</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To acquaint themselves with the functions, responsibilities, and programs of other educational agencies?</td>
<td>4.0 3.4 3.0 4.0 3.5</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To utilize an inter-organization structure among the state's agricultural groups to coordinate common educational efforts?</td>
<td>3.3 3.5 3.0 3.5 3.4</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.--Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in stimulating local initiative and responsibility (Principle IV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To assure that state regulations allow maximum freedom and responsibility to local schools consistent with the state's obligation for effective education?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To cooperate with local school personnel in determining and maintaining the basic common elements of a quality vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assure that state and local supervisory policies are developed and administered with sufficient flexibility to encourage local initiative in program development?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To encourage and assist local school personnel design experimental and demonstration programs in agricultural education?</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To develop state reimbursement plans and policies which promote local</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school initiative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To encourage local educational innovations and utilize them in the</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state-wide program of vocational agriculture?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To encourage creative thinking on the part of the local school</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in exemplifying democratic processes (Principle V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To become sensitive to the attitudes, beliefs, and opinions of vocational agriculture teachers and local school administrators?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To develop a common understanding of the role of the state supervisory staff among local school board members, administrators, and teachers?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members to participate in the solving of problems related to the educational profession?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assist state supervisory staff members develop the ability to utilize group processes effectively?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assist themselves and local school personnel to understand and utilize the techniques of democratic leadership?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the state supervisory staff doing:

1. To become sensitive to the attitudes, beliefs, and opinions of vocational agriculture teachers and local school administrators?
2. To develop a common understanding of the role of the state supervisory staff among local school board members, administrators, and teachers?
3. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members to participate in the solving of problems related to the educational profession?
4. To assist state supervisory staff members develop the ability to utilize group processes effectively?
5. To assist themselves and local school personnel to understand and utilize the techniques of democratic leadership?
TABLE 5.—(Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. To assist local school personnel in understanding and assuming their responsibilities in the democratic processes of educational leadership?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in recognizing the dynamics of human relationships (Principle VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To assure that state supervision is a cooperative effort between the supervisor and the supervised?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To diversify the techniques of supervision to meet the needs of the different persons and groups to be served?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assure that human concerns and needs take precedence over material needs and other external factors during the supervisory process?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To determine the kinds of consultative services that local school personnel need and desire?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assure that the activities of state staff members reflect an understanding of the differences in individuals and situations?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gave a mean rating of 2.8 to Indicator 2. To develop a common understanding of the role of the state supervisory staff among local school board members, administrators, and teachers. The other three groups rated the indicator quite high, and the combined rating by all groups gave this indicator a mean rating of 3.9, which was just under the very important step on the scale.

Table 7, Indicator 8, To acquaint themselves with the research in communication, was also rated lower by the general educators than by the other three groups. In this instance, however, each group considered this indicator the least important of those listed under Principle VII. The range varied considerably, however, reaching from both ends of the rating scale.

Table 8 reveals the greatest diversity of opinion among the four groups on several indicators. There is also noted a great deal of unity on the other indicators. This is illustrated by the fact that nine of the eighteen indicators in this table were considered very important by all members of the jury. All groups also agreed that Indicator 19, To encourage local schools to incorporate sabbatical leave provisions in their school policies, was something less than important. Because of this complete agreement and because this indicator received a mean rating from all groups of less than 3.0, it was deleted from the final instrument.

The difference of opinion centered around the indicators which follow:

Indicator...............To obtain and prepare appropriate instructional materials for distribution to vocational agriculture teachers
TABLE 7.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in facilitating communication (Principle VII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Voc.</th>
<th>Dir.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the state supervisory staff doing:

1. To assure that important policies and procedures of the state staff are clearly written and made available to all affected?
   
   4.3  4.4  3.8  4.0  4.2  (5-3)

2. To establish a state staff organizational structure and staff operational procedures which facilitate effective communications?

   3.8  4.1  4.3  4.5  4.1  (5-3)

3. To assure that all parties participating in the vocational agriculture program are provided significant information influencing administrative decisions and program development?

   3.8  4.3  4.3  3.5  4.1  (5-3)

4. To assure that all communications to and from the supervisory office are promptly handled and correctly interpreted by the intended recipients?

   3.3  4.3  3.5  3.5  3.9  (5-3)
### TABLE 7.—(Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To aid vocational agriculture teachers in establishing effective</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications with all individuals, groups, and agencies concerned with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the local vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To maintain effective two-way communications with all individuals,</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups, and agencies involved in the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To assist vocational agriculture teachers and state staff members in</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowing and using official channels of communications among their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and cooperating groups, organisations, and agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To acquaint themselves with the research in communication?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8.--Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in contributing to the improvement of instruction
(Principle VIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the state supervisory staff doing:

1. To provide technical and professional in-service educational programs for teachers and administrators of vocational agriculture programs?
   - 4.5 4.3 4.0 4.5 (5-3)
2. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers to participate in technical and professional in-service training programs?
   - 4.5 4.5 4.0 4.4 (5-3)
3. To assist vocational agriculture teachers in improving their instructional program?
   - 4.3 4.4 4.0 4.4 (5-3)
4. To determine professional and technical educational needs of vocational agriculture teachers?
   - 4.0 4.4 4.8 3.0 4.3 (5-3)
5. To assist vocational agriculture teachers in procuring and using appropriate methods, media, facilities, and equipment in teaching?
   - 4.0 4.4 4.5 3.5 4.3 (5-3)
TABLE 8.—(Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. To assist beginning teachers make a satisfactory entry into the business of teaching?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To assist vocational agriculture teachers with vocational agriculture curriculum development which is in harmony with the total curricular program of the school?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To design state FFA activities so they will contribute to the teaching-learning process and the educational objectives of the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To utilize local vocational agriculture teachers and administrators in designing state-wide programs to improve instruction?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To encourage and assist in securing higher professional standards in teacher education programs preparing vocational agriculture teachers?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To effectively and economically distribute their time between group and individual supervisory techniques?</td>
<td>4.0 3.6 3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To encourage more effective use of teaching resources found in the local community?</td>
<td>3.5 3.9 4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To obtain and prepare appropriate instructional materials for distribution to vocational agriculture teachers?</td>
<td>2.5 3.9 4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To encourage local school administrators to provide adequate supervision of the local vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>2.8 4.1 3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To assist in recruiting prospective vocational agriculture teachers of promise?</td>
<td>2.8 4.1 4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To develop certification and personnel policies which encourage individual professional growth on the part of the local teacher?</td>
<td>3.5 3.6 3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8.—(Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To secure maximum benefits from required reports for program development and improvement?</td>
<td>2.8 3.6 3.8 3.5 3.5</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To involve other divisions of the state educational agency and agricultural agencies in the improvement of instruction in vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.0 3.1 3.0 4.0 3.3</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To encourage local schools to incorporate sabbatical leave provisions in their school policies?</td>
<td>2.5 2.6 2.8 2.5 2.6</td>
<td>(5-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator.............To encourage local school administrators to provide adequate supervision of the local vocational agriculture programs

Indicator.............To assist in recruiting prospective vocational agriculture teachers of promise

Indicator.............To secure maximum benefits from required reports for program development and improvement

In each instance the group of general educators disagreed with the other three groups.

Table 9 reveals a marked difference of opinion among the four groups regarding Indicator 7. To encourage the development and utilization of educational leave policies for state staff members. This indicator suggests that the state supervisory staff should be encouraging the development and utilization of educational leave policies for the staff members as a means of harmonizing supervision in vocational agriculture with modern educational theory and practice. The state directors of vocational education and the general educators would not have included this indicator in the instrument and the vocational educators, other than those in vocational agriculture gave it a bare 3.0 rating. Contemporary practice does not support this indicator and may have been a contributing factor to the low rating. It could also be reasoned that the relatively high rating (3.8) given by the vocational agriculture educators might have been influenced by the personal gain which would accrue if leave policies were more common. The writer is inclined to believe, however, that the variance in rating was based on whether this indicator was important to the implementation of the guiding principle.

Table 13, Indicator 9, To assist in coordinating the research efforts of graduate students in approved teacher education institutions, which
TABLE 9.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in harmonizing supervision with modern educational theory and practice (Principle IX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To keep up-to-date with new developments in educational theory and practice?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To encourage the adoption and use of modern theory and practice in education which is applicable to the teaching of vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To organize and conduct the state supervisory program in vocational agriculture to harmonize with the total educational program in the state?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assist teachers to keep up-to-date with new developments in educational theory and practice?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assure that the vocational agriculture program complements and enhances other vocational education services and programs?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To engage in educational activities apart from vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To encourage the development and utilization of educational leave policies for state staff members?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in operating within a framework of functional written policies and procedures (Principle X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. Voc. Dir. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing?</td>
<td>Gen. Voc. Dir. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To involve those who are affected by state vocational agriculture policies in the development of these policies?</td>
<td>4.3 4.4 3.5 4.5 4.2</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To involve school personnel and representatives of agriculture in the development of a state plan for vocational education in agriculture which stimulates desirable educational outcomes?</td>
<td>3.8 4.3 3.5 3.5 4.0</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To develop policies and procedures which effectively utilise the special abilities of state staff personnel?</td>
<td>3.5 3.9 4.0 4.0 3.9</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assure that written policies are comprehensive, current, and available to those affected by them?</td>
<td>3.5 4.2 3.5 3.5 3.9</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To provide written policies and procedures which give general direction and guidance to state staff activities?</td>
<td>3.5 4.2 3.5 3.5 3.9</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11.--Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in assuring that programs are consistent with the legal provisions of the state plan (Principle XI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To assure that local school personnel understand the minimum standards</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and flexibilities inherent in the state plan?</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assure that the state office maintains a system of records which</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides evidence of the state's compliance with the legal provisions</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of state and federal regulations?</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assure that sufficient and valid data are available on each local</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program to determine its compliance with the legal provisions of the</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state plan?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assure that the reporting system is functioning effectively?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assist local school personnel develop a written plan for the</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operation of their vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in developing a program of public relations
(Principle XIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To assure that the state's public relations program is honest?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To assure that the state's public relations program takes the initiative with a positive approach?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To ascertain and improve the public image of vocational agriculture education?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To assure that the state's public relations program is planned and purposeful?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assure that the state's public relations program is continuous?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To provide leadership which stimulates and mobilizes the talents and</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts of state staff members, local school personnel, and citizens in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a coordinated public relations effort?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To make effective use of all news media in reporting comprehensively</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the vocational agriculture program in the state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To assure that the state's public relations program is designed to</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reach many publics?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To assist local schools in conducting effective programs of public</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To make use of the talents and abilities of the various social and</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic groups in interpreting the vocational agriculture program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in promoting, conducting, and utilizing educational research (Principle XIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Voc. Education</th>
<th>Agric. Education</th>
<th>Voc. Dir.</th>
<th>Other Voc.</th>
<th>All Groups</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To make effective use of research data in their supervisory activities?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(5-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To refine research findings through pilot or experimental programs in local schools?</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assist local school personnel in implementing research findings in action programs at the local school level?</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To cooperate with local school personnel and teacher educators in identifying needed research studies in agricultural education?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To make known to researchers present and prospective needed research studies in agricultural education?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Agri.</td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To encourage vocational agriculture teachers to conduct and utilize</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational research in their instructional programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To assist in analyzing and interpreting research data to local school</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To secure adequate time and finances necessary to develop and conduct</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an effective research program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To assist in coordinating the research efforts of graduate students in</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved teacher education institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggests that supervisors should assist in coordinating the research
efforts of graduate students was given a mean rating of 2.8 by one group
of jurors. Again the dissenting group was the general educators. It
appears possible that tradition may have been an influencing factor. The
writer's experience leads him to believe that such an activity is rarely
engaged in by state department of education personnel who are concerned
only with general education, while the practice is quite common in voca-
tional education.

Table 14. The general educators disagreed sharply with the other
three groups about the importance of Indicator 4. To stimulate teachers
to make use of self-evaluation instruments as a basis for program im-
provement. This indicator suggests that state supervisors should stimu-
late teachers to make use of self-evaluation instruments as a basis for
program improvement. Perhaps, the wording suggests direct contact between
the state supervisors and teachers. Modern practice varies considerably
between general and vocational educators on this point. It is much more
common to find state supervisors of vocational subjects working directly
with teachers than it is for other state department personnel.

Final Form of the Instrument

Following the deletion of Indicator 19, To encourage local schools
to incorporate sabbatical leave provisions in their school policies, in
Table 8, the remaining indicators in each section were arranged in what
appeared to be a logical sequence.

The last indicator in each section was one which was an addition
to those previously mentioned. This final indicator was worded to give
TABLE 14.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in encouraging and assisting in the evaluation of local programs (Principle XIV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>Dir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the state supervisory staff doing:

1. To assist local schools in interpreting and utilizing evaluation results in projecting and improving their vocational agriculture program?
   - 4.0 4.4 4.0 4.3 (5-3)

2. To assure that local evaluations are concerned primarily with the improvement of local programs and not with the comparative ratings of individual teachers?
   - 3.5 4.3 4.5 3.5 4.1 (5-3)

3. To assist local schools in selecting and developing instruments for evaluating the important outcomes of their efforts?
   - 3.5 4.2 3.8 4.0 4.0 (5-3)

4. To stimulate teachers to make use of self-evaluation instruments as a basis for program improvement?
   - 2.8 4.2 4.3 5.0 4.0 (5-2)

5. To encourage the group problem solving approach in evaluating local vocational agriculture programs by including those involved?
   - 3.0 3.9 3.5 3.5 3.7 (5-2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine the influence that state supervision has on the effectiveness of the vocational agriculture program in the state?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To utilize in the evaluation process those affected by supervision?</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To develop a climate of financial and professional security among state staff members to encourage greater interest and participation in evaluation procedures?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To collect and summarize annually evidence that supervisory goals and objectives are being met?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To develop continuous evaluation procedures which provide for subjective judgment as well as objective evidence?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To provide an instrument or set standards upon which the state staff members can engage in critical self-evaluation on a planned, periodic basis?</td>
<td>3.3 4.1</td>
<td>3.8 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To utilize available criteria and techniques for state staff use in formal and informal evaluation of supervisory effort as a basis for the development of the supervisory program?</td>
<td>3.8 4.0</td>
<td>3.5 3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16.—Importance of indicators by groups of jurors in contributing to the improvement of the profession (Principle XVI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the state supervisory staff doing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To influence the improvement of teacher education programs?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To develop policies and procedures for a comprehensive in-service</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education program for state staff members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To encourage state staff members and teachers to belong to and</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in local, state, and national professional organizations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To encourage well-qualified men and women to enter and remain in the</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching profession?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To assist teachers and state staff members in developing individual</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional improvement programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To identify and develop prospective state and local vocational education leaders?</td>
<td>3.3 3.9 3.8 3.5 3.8</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To involve themselves in educational activities other than those of vocational agriculture?</td>
<td>4.3 3.8 3.3 3.5 3.8</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To encourage teachers and staff members to contribute to the literature of agriculture education and other fields of education?</td>
<td>3.3 3.7 3.8 3.0 3.6</td>
<td>(5-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
evaluators a space to list supervisory activities which did not appear to fit under any of the other indicators. The added indicator was worded in the following manner: What other activities indicate that the supervisory staff is implementing this guiding principle?

Rating scale and summary

A rating scale designed not for the purpose of exact or scientific measurement, but for the purpose of identifying strengths and weaknesses was added to the instrument. It was the belief of the writer that little could be gained by arriving at a combined score on all of the indicators. The value of this instrument is no greater than the integrity and professional attitude of its users. Its design was to encourage thinking and planning and not to achieve ratings. To further emphasize the importance of planning as the end product of this instrument, a summary page was provided opposite each page of indicators in order that the evaluators could list important activities for inclusion in their annual and projected programs of work.

Summary of Chapter

This chapter has described the development of an instrument for use in the self-evaluation of state staff supervisory programs in agricultural education.

The foundation of the instrument was the sixteen guiding principles of state supervision of vocational education in agriculture which were developed and validated by a recent doctoral study.
The practices and activities which were pertinent to the responsibilities of supervisors were identified through a search of the literature and the assistance of two national juries of experts. The responses of both juries were shown to illustrate the extent of their participation and acceptance of the final instrument.

Since the practices and activities of supervisory responsibility were identified and classified according to their importance to the implementation of the guiding principles, they were referred to as indicators rather than standards or criteria.

No attempt was made in this chapter to describe how the instrument should be used since the following chapter describes the procedures for using evaluation instruments in some detail and suggests the procedures for using this instrument.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR USING THE SELF-EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

This chapter was designed to report the development of suggested procedures which would be appropriate for the use of the self-evaluation instrument described in the preceding chapter. A section will also be devoted to a discussion of a trial of the completed instrument in four different states.

The specific instructions for the use of the instrument were developed by the writer and were based on desirable procedures for self-evaluation as set forth in the literature.

Logan's study suggested the following six steps for evaluating a state-wide program of distributive education:

1. Arrange date for evaluation conference
2. Appoint the evaluation committee
3. Prepare information for evaluation committee
4. Send information to evaluation committee
5. Hold evaluation conference
6. Follow up the evaluation

These are logical steps and appear with some modification in terminology,

---

if not intent, in a majority of the evaluation instruments reviewed by
the writer.

Dull, in developing criteria for evaluating the supervision pro-
gram in school systems, suggested that the criteria might be used in
several ways, but the alternatives he proposed fall generally in one or
more of the steps mentioned in Logan's study.

Many evaluation instruments included only those instructions which
pertained to the mechanics of using the instrument. Elsbree and McNally,
in their discussion of self-evaluation for teachers, suggest that "it is
unrealistic to propose any one method of self-evaluation for teachers.
The chief objective is to help teachers to develop an attitude of self-
evaluation, for without the teacher's own disposition to evaluate him-
self, no self-evaluation is possible."  

Although their discussion is not directly related to evaluation,
Morphet, Johns, and Reller present a conflicting view in this statement:

An organizational structure is necessary when any group has
a common task. An unorganized group is a mob. It can neither
determine nor accomplish its goals. Therefore, in order to sur-
vive, the group must organize. The organization, no matter
how simple, must provide for at least the following procedures
for making decisions and taking action:

1) A procedure for selecting a leader or leaders.

2) A procedure for determining the roles to be played
by each member of the group.

2Lloyd W. Dull, "Criteria for Evaluating the Supervision Program
in School Systems" (Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School, The Ohio State
University, 1960), pp. 312-316.

3Allard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School
Administration and Supervision (2d ed.; New York: American Book
(3) A procedure for determining the goals or purposes of the group.

(4) A procedure for achieving the goals of the group. 4

It appears logical that a structure similar to the one described in the preceding quotation would have value as a guide in the evaluation process. It also appears logical that the procedure would be influenced by the nature of the program which is being evaluated and the purpose of the evaluation. Henry, in referring to the evaluation of in-service programs in education, defends a similar philosophy in these words: "The nature of the evaluation process is determined in part by the nature of the problems attacked in programs of in-service education and in part by the nature of changes desired. It is helpful, however, to examine briefly the necessary aspects of the evaluation process to see how they apply to the problems of evaluation of changes in programs." 5

In deciding on the procedure to use for this instrument, the writer found that the information needed by the evaluators fell into the following simple groupings: Who, what, why, when, where, and how. These are not uncommon groupings to anyone who reads a newspaper. Further analysis of the procedures recommended for the evaluation instruments reviewed by the writer reveals that the instructions given could be


included appropriately under one of these headings. Further discussion of the procedures for using the self-evaluation instrument is continued under the following sub-headings: Who should evaluate; when to evaluate; what should be evaluated; why evaluate; where should the evaluation be conducted; and how to evaluate.

Who Should Evaluate

In determining who should evaluate, it is necessary to keep in mind that this instrument was designed for the self-evaluation of a supervisory program which is the responsibility of several persons. The meaning of self-evaluation in this case then is group self-evaluation.

To secure differing viewpoints and perspectives for effective evaluation, it was suggested that in addition to the state supervisory staff the following groups and individuals should be represented as resource persons:

1. The state director of vocational education who is responsible for all aspects of vocational education in the state.

2. The vocational agriculture teachers who must carry out the state program at the local level.

3. The teacher educators in vocational education in agriculture who are responsible for the pre-service and in-service training of vocational agriculture teachers.

4. The state advisory committee for vocational education in agriculture who represent in most cases the lay public, as well as, school administrators who must administer the program at the local level.

Gwynn subscribes to this concept of who should evaluate in this
The role of resource persons should be one of raising questions and stimulating thinking. Because of their lack of direct involvement in the supervisory program, they are apt to be more objective and less emotional in their judgment.

When to Evaluate

The literature repeatedly refers to evaluation as a continuous process. The statements which follow are typical examples:

If a supervisor is actually to improve instruction to a significant degree and if this improvement is to be of lasting value, then continuous studies should be made of the needs of a good program of supervision and the extent to which these needs are being met. Provisions must also be made for meeting these needs.

A cooperative and continuous plan of evaluation will promote the growth and development of supervisors and those who work with them, and will contribute to the improvement of the whole program of instruction.7

"Only as evaluation is constantly applied can the superintendent have


assurance that developing programs are moving in proper directions.\footnote{Emery Stoops and H. L. Rafferty, Jr., Practices and Trends in School Administration (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1961), p. 478.}

In interpreting these statements they should not be construed to mean that the complete process of evaluation is carried on each day. Evaluation should be conceived as a continuing cycle of related activities some of which may appropriately be carried out periodically on an annual formal basis. Others may be carried out less formally and at intermittent times.

The self-evaluation of the state supervisory program logically would take place soon after the end of the fiscal year, for this is the time when annual reports of the past year's activities are summarized and submitted to appropriate state and federal agencies. Since the fiscal year ends June 30, this would allow new programs to be developed as a result of evaluation prior to the start of the new school year in September.

\textbf{What Is to Be Evaluated}

The intent of this self-evaluation instrument was the evaluation of the supervisory program. Although it was recognized that benefits would accrue to individuals engaged in the process, it was not intended that the indicators be used in any way to measure the individual effectiveness of any staff member. Gwynn describes the principle in these words: "Evaluation takes place in terms of purposes, not people. When one
studies how to evaluate supervision fairly and effectively, he should keep constantly in mind that it is the program that is being evaluated, not the supervisor."

It is not being suggested here that evaluation procedures cannot and should not be devised which provide assessment of individual growth. The point is that this instrument was not designed for that purpose.

**Why Evaluate**

Although this subject has been covered quite extensively in Chapter I, its relationship to the development of procedures needs to be briefly reviewed. The purpose of this instrument like most other evaluation instruments was designed to aid supervisors of vocational agriculture improve their supervisory programs. Wiles obviously concurs with the writer's purpose in this statement: "Evaluation is the process of making judgments that are to be used as a basis for planning. It consists of establishing goals, collecting evidence concerning growth or lack of growth toward goals, making judgments about the evidence, and revising procedures and goals in light of the judgments. It is a procedure for improving the product, the process, and even the goals themselves." If changes in programs are not to take place as a result of the evaluation process then there would appear to be little benefit from the effort. Adams and Dickey have said that "if supervision is actually

---

9 Gwynn, p. 385.

to improve instruction, it must result in the revision of existing educational points of view and practices. When objectives are determined and evidence of progress toward achieving them is collected, analyzed, and interpreted, then judgments may be formulated to use as bases for planning.¹¹ Their reasoning, as it is applied to supervision at the local level, is as applicable and as important when applied to a state supervisory program of evaluation. The reason for evaluation is to determine strengths and weaknesses as a basis for identifying priorities to be included in the supervisor’s program of work.

Where Should the Evaluation Be Conducted

The evaluation of a supervisory program is too serious an undertaking to be interrupted by the routine activities of a normal office day. The evaluation conference should be afforded the same dignity and surroundings which normally are provided any high level conference. The absence of telephone and other routine interruptions of the normal office will contribute to the setting and promote unity of thought essential for a conference of this kind.

The atmosphere should be conducive to free discussion. Normally, this cannot be achieved if the group is huddled around the status leader’s desk. Comfortable facilities with ample room for writing and displaying materials are other essential features of the conference room.

¹¹Adams and Dickey, pp. 248-249.
How to Evaluate

Procedure for using evaluative instruments, as described in the literature and evidenced in a review of a number of evaluation instruments, reveals the following common elements.

1. The proper climate, setting, and group interest is developed by the status leader.

2. The persons who are to use the instrument are asked to familiarize themselves thoroughly with the entire instrument even though they may only be concerned with or responsible for a section of it.

3. Assignments are made to various staff members for specific responsibilities in the evaluative process.

4. The mechanics of using the instrument itself, including the proper method of scoring, are described.

5. Certain facts or evidences which are pertinent to the study are compiled, gathered, or identified.

6. Judgments are made and recorded.

7. Summaries which reveal strengths and weaknesses are noted.

8. Plans are formulated for program improvement and continued evaluation.

The philosophy of the previous headings was the basis used by the writer in developing the instructions for the use of the self-evaluation instrument. The suggested procedures for using this instrument incorporate each of these features.
The Use of the Instrument in Trial States

The research design called for a "pre-trial" of the instrument and procedures in the home state of the writer before being tried in other states. The Colorado group involved in the pre-trial included the entire supervisory staff, the director of vocational education, the president of the Colorado Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, all members of the teacher education staff, and the director of vocational education at Colorado State University.

The trial of the instrument and the procedures in the evaluation of the state supervisory program of vocational agriculture in Colorado substantiated the writer's opinion that the suggested procedures were appropriate.

Only two minor changes were made in the instrument and procedures as a result of the Colorado trial. The writer had originally designed the following three-point scale to determine "how well" the staff was doing in implementing the guiding principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who were involved in the Colorado evaluation were unanimous in their opinion that the following four-point scale was more appropriate for the purpose of this instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The writer agreed with the reasoning of the Colorado group that a four-point scale tended to be more definitive since it caused a greater number of ratings to fall away from the mid-point in the scale. It was also agreed that the descriptive terms used in the latter scale were of greater assistance in identifying priority activities when the supervisory program was being revised.

The Colorado group also called the writer's attention to the fact that the date for holding the evaluation conference should be more specific than "during the summer months." It was suggested that a more appropriate time would be soon after the close of the fiscal year, since this is the time of the year when much data on the state program are collected by the state supervisory staff.

The two changes suggested by the pre-trial group in Colorado were incorporated into the revised procedures.

It was recognized, however, that the presence of the writer during this pre-trial may have caused the other persons involved in the evaluation to be less critical than had he not been present. It was also possible that the writer's opinion may have been prejudiced by his close association with the instrument and its development.

Selecting trial states

It was decided that the instrument and suggested procedures should be tested further and, if needed, additional refinement be made by its use in the evaluation of four other state supervisory programs where the writer would not be present to direct its use.

It was agreed, in cooperation with the writer's graduate committee,
that the states should be located in each of the four regions of the United States as designated by the U. S. Office of Education. It was also agreed that there should be some variance in the size of the staffs in the states selected.

The states selected were Alabama, Ohio, Washington, and West Virginia. Alabama represented the Southern Region and has ten members on its supervisory staff. Ohio represented the Central Region with a supervisory staff of seven persons. Washington was selected to represent the Pacific Region and has four members on its staff. West Virginia is in the North Atlantic Region and has a supervisory staff of four professional persons.

The head supervisors of each of the four states were personally contacted several months in advance, and each agreed to schedule time to use the instrument in evaluating their supervisory programs. A questionnaire was developed and sent to the head state supervisor in the trial states for their use in reporting suggestions for the improvement of the self-evaluation procedures. A copy of the questionnaire may be found in the Appendix. The responses to the questionnaire describing their experiences with the evaluation instrument and procedures are discussed in the following section.

Results of the Trial Evaluation

Each of the states mentioned previously used the self-evaluation instrument developed in this study to guide the self-evaluation of their state supervisory programs.

Several weeks in advance of the evaluation conference the writer
supplied each staff with sufficient copies of the instrument so that each staff member could become familiar with the instrument. Additional copies were also provided for each of the other persons present at the evaluation conference. Each of the four states conducted its evaluation during the last week in August or the first week in September.

Response from the trial states

Each of the head state supervisors of the trial states returned a questionnaire which had been designed to secure the combined judgment of those who participated in the trial evaluation. The responses were generally complimentary of the self-evaluation instrument and the suggested procedures. The remaining portion of this section will be devoted to the responses found in the questionnaire.

In reply to the question, "Did the self-evaluation instrument provide an effective guide to you and your staff in evaluating your supervisory efforts?" all four said, "Yes." When asked how it contributed, the answers ranged from a terse, "Caused us to consider areas of the program in a thorough manner," to this more elaborate reply:

The objective questions of the self-evaluation instrument, covering many important points of supervision, helped us to analyze our program, locate our strong and weak areas, and offered us a chance for constructive self-criticism. The instrument has great value when used as a guide for committee work in investigation, research, and discussion of the supervisory staff's duties and responsibilities, and the quality and quantity of its work.

In each state, the head state supervisor said that the instrument adequately covered the essential features of their supervisory program.

The amount of time necessary to complete the evaluation varied
according to the degree to which each state developed its revised supervisory program as a part of the evaluation procedure. The actual time spent in conference varied from one to two days. One small state staff and one large state staff spent two days, and the other two states spent one day. One of the states which spent only one day in conference estimated that an additional four days would be spent in revising their annual supervisory program.

In reply to a series of questions regarding "the number and titles of persons who participated in the evaluation conference," it was found that all of the supervisory staff members in each state participated in the conference. In each of the four states, the teacher educators were represented by all or a majority of the teacher education staff. The role played by the teacher educators in the evaluation varied slightly. In three states, they were involved as completely as the supervisory staff. In the fourth state, they assumed the role of consultants.

Although only one of the states involved the state director of vocational education in the evaluation process, they all agreed that it would be desirable for him to participate and would invite him to attend future evaluation sessions.

All of the states were in accord that teacher educators and the state director of vocational education should be involved in the evaluation process. It is interesting to note that none of the states involved vocational agriculture teachers, school administrators, or leaders in agriculture. Yet, three of the four states suggested that representatives of these three groups should be involved in future evaluations. Perhaps they were reluctant to invite others to participate until they
had a chance to satisfy themselves that the self-evaluation process had merit.

Each of the head state supervisors reported that the instructions for using the instrument were clear, but three states suggested or inferred that each member of the staff should be thoroughly familiar with the entire instrument prior to the evaluation conference. Since the suggested procedures were not explicit on this point, they were revised to include the suggestion.

In answer to the question, "What benefits do you believe accrued to your staff as a result of using this instrument?" the four states gave the following answers.

State Number 1—"Careful analysis of the progress the supervisory staff has made in all the areas for which they are responsible is always beneficial. This instrument gave the staff members a chance to analyze their progress, and it also helped them identify the strengths and weaknesses of their programs, and served as a guide for the future planning of their supervisory program of work."

State Number 2—"It pointed up some of our weak points as well as a number of strong points."

State Number 3—"Will cause us to continue our self-evaluative process. It will be continued."

State Number 4—"The instrument provided us the opportunity to look at our program of work in a different way. We reworded several individual items as a result."

When these remarks are analyzed and combined with the statements that each state supervisor made, saying that definite changes would be
or had been made in their supervisory programs, it appears obvious that the instrument served its intended purpose of contributing to the planning of supervisory programs in the trial states.

In commenting on the format of the instrument all of the states indicated that they had no suggestions for improvement.

Their reaction to the interpretation of indicators was more varied. Two of the states experienced no difficulty in interpreting any of the indicators. One state raised five questions about the meaning of different indicators, and the fourth state raised questions about ten entirely different indicators. In the latter case, however, most of the comments or suggestions centered on the choice of words and the possibility of duplication. It was also noted that some of the criticism was based on the opinion that some of the indicators did not apply in that state. It seems doubtful that any document of this length would find complete agreement among any group of professional educators in its terminology or acceptability. Since there was not common agreement among the trial states upon which indicators were difficult to interpret, the writer assumed that the suggestions made were not of sufficient seriousness to override the opinions of the other three states and the national jury of experts which had participated in their development. Furthermore, the writer can visualize no reason why a state could not make minor changes in the wording of any single indicator if by so doing they describe local conditions more adequately.

In summarizing the responses to the questionnaire, it is evident that

1. The instrument proved to be a useful guide for directing the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in the trial states.
2. Program planning was the end product and major value of the self-evaluation process in the trial states.

3. The instrument was comprehensive enough to be of value in all of the trial states.

4. In addition to members of the state supervisory staffs, the following persons or groups should be included in the evaluation conferences:
   a) The director of vocational education
   b) Local school administrators
   c) Leaders from other agricultural groups and organizations
   d) Teachers of vocational agriculture
   e) Teacher educators in agricultural education

5. All persons involved in the evaluation process should be familiar with the entire self-evaluation instrument and the procedures for its use.

6. A minimum of one to two days should be allowed for conducting the self-evaluation conference, depending upon the degree to which the supervisory program is to be revised as a part of the evaluation process and upon the preparation of the staff for the conference.

7. The same persons who were involved in evaluation were involved in planning future supervisory programs of the trial states.

8. The suggested procedures for using the self-evaluation instrument were clear and adequate to guide the evaluation process in the trial states.

After a careful analysis of the results of the pre-trial and trial evaluation, it was decided to further emphasize in the suggested
procedures for using the instrument the importance of each staff member's being familiar with the evaluation instrument. Final procedures, as they were revised following the trial evaluations, are presented in the following section of this chapter.

Revised Instructions for Use of the Self-Evaluation Instrument

The procedures described here for the use of this instrument are predicated on the belief that self-evaluation is a preliminary step to the development of annual and long-time programs of work.

It is intended that this instrument be used by state supervisory staffs in agricultural education as a means of identifying strengths and deficiencies in state supervisory programs. This instrument then becomes a tool to use in assessing staff activities for the purpose of developing an improved supervisory program.

If this instrument is to serve its purpose it will not be used to secure a comparative rating of individual supervisors or a comparative rating of the various state supervisory programs. The rating scale described later is designed solely to assist state staffs in identifying priorities.

Who should participate in the evaluation process?

It is recommended that representatives of the teacher education staff, the state director of vocational education, a representative of the vocational agriculture teachers' association, and a representative of the state vocational agriculture advisory committee meet with the state
supervisory staff annually for the purpose of consulting with the state staff as they evaluate their efforts of the past year.

When and where should the evaluation be conducted

It is recommended that two consecutive days be set aside annually, preferably soon after the close of the fiscal year, for the purpose of evaluating the total supervisory staff effort. A suitable atmosphere which is free from office formality, telephones, and other interruptions should be selected for the formal evaluation process. The room should be comfortable and arranged in a manner that is conducive to group discussion. The head state supervisor and the director of vocational education, if he is present, should make every effort to assure that a climate exists which encourages staff members to discuss freely their opinions concerning the supervisory activities.

An additional day, immediately following or as soon thereafter as possible, should be used by the staff to prepare an annual program of work and to revise long-time goals and objectives.

How should the evaluation be conducted

1. Several days in advance of the agreed upon date for the staff evaluation, the head state supervisor should assign each staff member the responsibility of gathering "evidence" of supervisory accomplishment as it applies to one or more sections (PRINCIPLES) of the evaluation instrument. Each staff member should become familiar with the entire evaluation instrument before attempting to gather evidence for any individual section.
2. The assigned staff member should describe, in the space provided after each question, the activities of the local staff during the year. He should then evaluate the effectiveness of the staff's efforts by circling the appropriate number in the recording column in the right hand margin using the following values:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. After each staff member has completed the evaluation of his assigned portion of the program, the total staff should meet as a group with the state director, members of the teacher education staff, and representatives of the state advisory committee, and the vocational agriculture teachers' association. At this time the total staff will review and revise, if necessary, the evaluation made by individual staff members.

4. During the time the group evaluation is in process, one staff member should be assigned the responsibility of recording the group's composite rating for the activities listed under each question. He should also record, on the blank pages provided, all suggestions for improving staff activities. Each staff member should make notes concerning activities for which he is primarily responsible.

5. As soon as possible after the evaluation conference, staff members should meet to develop their annual program of work. Plans should be made which will correct the deficiencies noted in the supervisory program during the evaluation process and attention should be given to priorities which were identified.
6. Following the development of a new program of work, the supervisory staff should set dates for at least a quarterly review of progress.

7. In order to assure that future evaluations are conducted in the most efficient and effective manner and to assure that self-evaluation becomes a continuous process, it is suggested that at the time a new program of activities is drawn up, each staff member be assigned the primary responsibility for seeing that certain activities are accomplished on or before an agreed upon time. Staff members should continuously gather evidence of program accomplishment in order that such evidence may be considered during future evaluations. Such evidence, if compiled continuously should also be valuable in presenting suggested program modifications to the state board, the state legislature, and the general public.

**Summary of the Chapter**

This chapter described the development of procedures for the use of the self-evaluation instrument which was developed in the preceding chapter.

Desirable practices in conducting evaluations were identified through a study of a variety of evaluation instruments and a review of the literature on the subject. The desired practices, which appeared to be applicable to the specific purpose of this evaluation instrument, were developed into suggested procedures for conducting self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

In an effort to further refine the procedures and instrument, a complete instrument and procedures were sent to four states for use in
evaluating their state supervisory programs. The responses of the head state supervisors in these four trial states revealed that with minor revisions the instrument and procedures were adequate to guide self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The central purpose of this study was to develop an instrument and procedures for self evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

Specific Objectives of the Study

The following specific objectives were identified to provide further direction to the study:

1. To design an instrument to assist state supervisors in self-evaluation of their supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

2. To develop a procedure for self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

Need for the Study

The need for this study was determined by an analysis of the following conditions:

1. Rapidly changing conditions in agriculture and vocational education have created a need for systematic methods of guiding change in supervisory programs.
2. The need for and value of evaluation as a means of improving educational programs is well documented in the literature.

3. Writers in the field of educational supervision have deplored the lack of evaluative criteria and instruments for evaluating supervisory programs.

4. State supervisors of vocational education have acknowledged a need for greater emphasis on evaluation of state supervisory programs.

5. No instruments could be found which were designed to be used in the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

6. The writer was encouraged in the development of the study by the expressions of need from members of the vocational agriculture staff in the U. S. Office of Education and a number of state supervisors of vocational education in agriculture.

Method of Investigation

Following the identification of the purpose and specific objectives of the study, an extensive review was made of the literature concerned with evaluation in education and supervision. Special emphasis was given to evaluation of state level supervisory programs.

From this review, the writer developed a set of statements which were designed to be indications of successful implementation of the guiding principles for state supervision of vocational education in agriculture. The guiding principles were those which had been developed and validated by a recent doctoral study. The statements which were designed to be indications of the implementation of the guiding principles,
hereafter, referred to as "indicators," were submitted to a nationally recognized jury of twenty-four experts in educational supervision. The members of the jury were selected from the following areas of educational competence: State supervisors of vocational education in agriculture, state supervisors of other vocational services, state directors of vocational education, teachers of vocational agriculture, teacher educators of vocational education in agriculture, and general educators.

These experts were asked to respond to the suggested indicators in terms of their importance in implementing each guiding principle. They were also asked to suggest changes and additions which they believed should be made. As a result of the jury's suggestions, twenty-two additional indicators were added to the list, and a number of editorial changes were made in the wording of several other indicators.

The revised list of 122 indicators was submitted to a second nationally recognized jury of twenty-four experts who were asked to assist in the further refinement of the list of indicators. This jury was asked to rate, on a five-point scale, the indicators under each guiding principle according to their value as effective indicators of the implementation of the guiding principle. The following rating scale was included to assist the jury in evaluating each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>Seldom Important</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those indicators which received a combined mean rating of less than 3.0 (important) were deleted from the list of indicators. Only one
indicator received a combined mean rating of less than 3.0. The remaining indicators were included in the final self-evaluation instrument.

Following the development of the instrument, a set of procedures was developed to guide the use of the instrument in the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

The procedures included instructions on who should be involved in the evaluation, what should be evaluated, when and where evaluations should be conducted, and how evaluations should be conducted. Instructions were also included for the use of the findings of the evaluation conference.

These suggested procedures were synthesized by the writer from the desirable procedures for self-evaluation as set forth in the literature.

The research design called for a "pre-trial" of the instrument and procedures in the self-evaluation of the state supervisory program of vocational education in agriculture in the writer's home state of Colorado.

The pre-trial evaluation in Colorado was conducted by the state supervisory staff, the state director of vocational education, the director of vocational education at the teacher training institution, the president of the Colorado Vocational Agriculture Teachers' Association, and members of the teacher education staff.

The use of the instrument and procedures in the evaluation of the Colorado State Supervisory Program revealed the need for two minor changes which were made before the instrument and procedures were submitted to the four states in four different regions of the United States for further trial. The states which had agreed to conduct trial
evaluations included Alabama, from the Southern Region; Ohio, from the Central Region; Washington, from the Pacific Region; and West Virginia, representing the North Atlantic Region. Forty-one state staff members were involved in the trial evaluations conducted in the four states.

The response of the combined supervisory staffs who tried the instrument and procedures in an evaluation of their state supervisory programs revealed acceptance of the instrument and suggested procedures.

**Summary of Findings**

Following is a summary of the findings derived from the study.

1. The 121 indicators developed by the writer in cooperation with two nationally recognized juries of experts identify activities which are important to the effective implementation of the guiding principles of state supervision of vocational education in agriculture.

2. The self-evaluation instrument developed by this study, utilizing the sixteen guiding principles of state supervision in vocational education in agriculture and the indicators validated by the two national juries of experts, provided an effective guide for evaluating the state supervisory programs in the trial states.

3. The trial states reported the self-evaluation instrument adequately covered the essential features of their state supervisory program.

4. The supervisory staffs in the trial states agreed that the suggested format for the self-evaluation instrument was satisfactory.

5. Definite plans were made for changing the supervisory programs of each of the trial states as a result of the self-evaluation.
6. The suggested procedures for conducting the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs, which contained the following major characteristics, were used and reported acceptable by the supervisory staffs in the trial states.

   a) The self-evaluation conference should be scheduled shortly after the end of the fiscal year. (June 30)
   b) A minimum of one to two days should be scheduled for the evaluation conference followed by one or more days to revise the supervisory program.
   c) The self-evaluation conference should be held in a setting and location free from outside interruptions and distractions.
   d) Staff members should become familiar with the entire instrument prior to its use in the evaluation conference.
   e) Individual staff members should be assigned to gather evidence of staff accomplishment prior to the evaluation conference.
   f) In addition to the members of the state supervisory staffs, the following persons or groups should be represented in the evaluation conference:
      (1) The state director of vocational education
      (2) Local school administrators
      (3) Leaders from other agricultural groups and organizations
      (4) Teachers of vocational agriculture
      (5) Teacher educators in agricultural education
g) Persons involved in the evaluation conference should also be involved in the program planning.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were arrived at by the writer as a result of conducting this study.

1. The self-evaluation instrument and procedures developed by this study may appropriately be used by other state supervisory staffs of vocational education in agriculture as a device for assessing their supervisory programs.

2. The use of the instrument and procedures for the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs is an effective means of bringing about change in state supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture.

3. The indicators listed in the self-evaluation instrument identify the major activities of an effective state supervisory program of vocational education in agriculture.

Recommendations

In preparing the following recommendations, the writer was aware that they are judgments not restricted to the data and facts developed in conducting this study.

1. Teacher educators of vocational education in agriculture should make use of the indicators for class discussions in administration and supervision classes.
2. The instrument and procedures developed by this study should be used as an in-service training guide for state staff personnel in vocational education in agriculture.

3. The instrument, *A Guide for Self-Evaluation of State Supervisory Programs in Vocational Education in Agriculture*, should be distributed to state supervisors and teacher educators of vocational education in agriculture and to other state leaders in vocational education.

4. The development or revision of state supervisory programs should be conducted as a part of the self-evaluation process developed by this study.

5. Persons who are involved in the evaluation process should also be involved in the development or revisions which follow.

6. A national seminar on the evaluation of state supervisory programs should be called by the U. S. Office of Education, The National Center for Advanced Study and Research in Agricultural Education, or some other appropriate institution or agency to give further consideration to the ideas expressed in this study.

7. Consideration should be given to the utilization of this instrument and procedures in the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of other vocational services.

*Recommendations for Further Study*

In conducting this study, the writer became conscious of the need for further study in the areas related to this study. The following are some areas of needed research identified by the writer:

1. To develop procedures and instruments for evaluating state
supervisory programs of vocational education in agriculture by means other than self-evaluation.

2. To develop a procedure and instrument for self-evaluation of state supervisory programs of other areas of vocational education.

3. To repeat this study in five years to determine changes needed in the instrument and procedures.

4. To determine the effect of self-evaluation on the improvement of state supervisory programs in vocational education in agriculture.

5. To develop a method of appraising individual effectiveness of state supervisory staff members.

6. To further perfect the instrument and procedures developed in this study by their use in other states.

7. To develop guides for state supervisory staffs to use in program planning.
APPENDIX
January 5, 1964

(A copy of the letter transmitting the first phase of the instrument to the first jury of experts. Letters were individually addressed.)

Because of your experience, insight, and perspective of the job of the supervisor, you have been suggested as one who could make a valuable contribution to a study concerned with the development of an instrument to be used in the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in agricultural education.

As a member of a select national jury of experts, you are respectfully requested to review critically the enclosed material for the purpose of evaluating its contents in light of the instructions which appear on Page A.

The material in the enclosed instrument was developed through the utilization of ideas found in educational literature and the suggestions of many who are engaged in supervisory work. I am sure, however, that the instrument will be more valuable to supervisors after it has been evaluated by a group of leading educators representing a variety of educational interests.

You will note that the enclosed instrument is coded. This is for follow-up purposes and to allow the researcher to stratify replies by area of educational interest. All individual replies will be hidden in the summary of the data.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to cooperate in this study. I sincerely appreciate your professional support.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Linson, Director
Agricultural Education

MGL/dl
encl
January 27, 1964

(A copy of the first follow-up letter written to the first jury of experts who had not responded. Letters were individually addressed.)

Recently, a survey instrument concerned with the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in agricultural education was sent to you as a member of a jury composed of twenty-four national leaders in education. Because of your position and experience with supervisory work, your comments and reactions are especially important to this national study.

My follow-up records indicate that your survey form has not been returned. In the event it has been lost in the mail, I am enclosing another copy with the original cover letter and a self-addressed envelope.

I will be extremely grateful if you will complete this survey instrument soon and return it to me. If you have already forwarded your response, please disregard this letter and accept my most sincere thanks for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Linson, Director
Agricultural Education

MGL/dl
encl
May 22, 1964

(A copy of the letter transmitting second phase of instrument to second jury of experts. Letters were individually addressed.)

Because of your experience, insight, and perspective of the job of the supervisor, you have been suggested as one who could make a valuable contribution to a study concerned with the development of an instrument to be used in self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in agricultural education.

As a member of a select national jury of experts, you are respectfully requested to review critically the enclosed material for the purpose of evaluating its contents in accordance with the instructions which appear on Page A.

The material in the enclosed instrument was developed through the utilization of ideas found in educational literature and the suggestions of a jury of leading educators selected from a variety of educational interests over the nation. Your reactions and those of other jury members will contribute to making this instrument more functional.

You will note that the enclosed instrument is coded. This is for follow-up purposes and to allow the researcher to stratify replies by areas of educational interest. All individual replies will be submerged in the summary of the data.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to cooperate in this study. I sincerely appreciate your professional support.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Linson, Director
Agricultural Education

encl
June 18, 1964

(A copy of the first follow-up letter written to the second jury of experts who had not responded. Letters were individually addressed.)

Recently a survey instrument concerned with the self-evaluation of state supervisory programs in agricultural education was sent to you as a member of a jury composed of twenty-four national leaders in education. Because of your position and experience with supervisory work, your response is especially important to this national study.

My follow-up records indicate that your survey form has not been returned. In the event it has been lost in the mail, I am enclosing another copy with the original cover letter and a self-addressed envelope.

I will be extremely grateful if you will complete this survey instrument soon and return it to me. If you have already forwarded your response, please disregard this letter and accept my most sincere thanks for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Linson, Director
Agricultural Education

MGL/d1
encl
July 17, 1964

(A copy of the letter of transmittal sent to the four trial states. Letters were individually addressed.)

Under separate cover, I am sending to you several copies of a self-evaluation instrument for state supervisory programs in agricultural education. This is the instrument that I discussed with you recently over the phone.

I hope you will be able to use this instrument with your total staff in the near future and report your opinion of its value to me prior to September 1.

I have suggested procedures for using the instrument on Pages 1 and 11. I am especially interested in knowing how you and your staff reacted to the instrument, and your opinions of the procedures which I have suggested. Therefore, I have enclosed a brief questionnaire for you to fill out after you have used the instrument. I am NOT interested in knowing the rating you gave to your program. I am only interested in an evaluation of the instrument, and the procedure used, and in general was this a valuable guide; also, how it could be improved.

You might be interested in knowing that the self-evaluation instrument was developed with the assistance of two national juries made up of vocational agricultural supervisors, directors of vocational education, supervisors of other vocational divisions, teacher educators in agricultural education, teachers of vocational agriculture, and general educators.

We used the instrument in Colorado, following the suggested procedures, and found that it took about a day and a half to go through the evaluation process. We then spent the major part of two additional days developing a staff program of work for the coming year.

I certainly appreciate your willingness to cooperate in the further development and refinement of the self-evaluation instrument. I hope you find it of value in your work.

Sincerely,

Marvin G. Linson, Director
Agricultural Education

MCL/d1
encl
1. (a) Did the self-evaluation instrument provide an effective guide to you and your staff in evaluating your supervisory efforts?
   Yes____No____
   If yes, how?
   If no, why not?
   
   (b) Did it adequately cover the essential features of your state supervisory program?
   Yes____No____
   If no, what seemed to be lacking?

2. How long did it take your staff to complete the evaluation process?  
   ________________
   Do you believe this was adequate time? Yes____No____

3. Did your entire staff participate in the evaluation?
   Yes____No____
   If no, please explain.

4. (a) What were the titles of individuals other than supervisors who participated in the evaluation?

   (b) What role did these people play in the evaluation process?
(c) Do you believe it is advisable to include the persons you named in (4-a) above in the evaluation process?

Yes______ No______

Explain why.

(d) What contributions do you feel the individuals named in (4-a) made to the evaluation process?

(e) In future evaluations would you involve someone other than those you involved this year?

Yes______ No______

If yes, who? (By title)

(f) What was the total number of individuals involved in the evaluation? ___________________

How many of these were members of the supervisory staff?______

5. Were the instructions for the use of the instrument clear?

Yes______ No______

If no, please suggest changes or additions.

6. What benefits do you believe accrued to your staff as a result of using this instrument in the evaluation process?

7. Please list any suggestions you might have for improving the format of the self-evaluation instrument.

8. Did you have any difficulty in interpreting any of the indicator questions in the self-evaluation instrument?

Yes______ No______

If yes, please indicate which ones and suggest changes.
9. What suggestions do you have for the use of this instrument not previously mentioned?

10. Did you involve anyone other than members of the supervisory staff in developing your revised supervisory program of work?
   Yes____ No____
   If yes, who? (By title)

What contributions did they make?

11. Do you plan to make changes in your supervisory program as a result of this evaluation?
   Yes____ No____
   If yes, please list major changes.

PLEASE RETURN TO: M. G. Linson, Director
(Prior to Sept. 1, Agricultural Education
if possible) State Department of Education
510 State Office Building
Denver, Colorado 80203
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