

were obtained from similar research studies conducted at other universities offering a four-year degree program in Agricultural Mechanization (Bekkm, 1987; Gaultney, 1984). Much of the information obtained from these studies paralleled the findings of the study reported herein. Input from current and future employers of graduates was obtained through individual and group interviews. Employers emphasized the importance for future graduates to have above average skills in written and oral communications and management. Finally, input was obtained on an individual basis from peers at other state universities that offered a four-year degree program in Agricultural Mechanization. Some of the most valuable information obtained from these peers was contained in the curriculum guides for their respective curriculums.

After obtaining input about the curriculum, a departmental curriculum committee, consisting of faculty and students, synthesized the information collected. Based on the information, the committee developed a revised curriculum which incorporated many of the recommendations from the input sources. The revised curriculum underwent multiple revisions as it was being validated by faculty, students, and standards established by the American Society of Agricultural Engineers (ASAE) A-206 Committee — Agricultural Mechanization Curriculum Recognition Committee. The completed revised curriculum for Agricultural Mechanization at KSU became effective with the fall semester 1988.

Summary

The procedures reported herein were used effectively to obtain input about the Agricultural Mechanization curriculum at KSU from graduates, employers, peers at other state universities, previous research, and students. The information obtained was synthesized to comply with program standards established by the ASAE. The outcome of this process was a revised curriculum which incorporated the necessary ingredients to more closely align it with current agricultural and industrial technology.

While the information reported herein is discipline specific, the process is quite adaptable to other agricultural disciplines. The curriculum evaluation process should be conducted with methodical procedures which will yield reliable and consistent data. Research by Wentling (1980), Bekkm (1987), Gaultney et al. (1984), and Baugher et al. (1986) indicates these types of studies should be conducted every five years in order to maintain a curriculum which is relevant to the needs of graduates.

References

- Baugher, E.E., and J.W. Slocombe. 1986. "The Employment Status and Satisfaction of Agricultural Mechanization Graduates." *The Journal of Agricultural Mechanization* 2(1):3-10.
- Bekkm, V.A. 1987. "Five Year Follow-up Study of Agricultural Mechanization Graduates." ASAE Paper No. MCR87-102. ASAE, St. Joseph, MI 49085.
- Gaultney, L.D., P.T. Phegley, and R.E. Hammitt. 1984. "Curriculum Formulation Based on Industry Needs and Graduate

Perceptions." ASAE Paper No. 84-5544. ASAE, St. Joseph, MI 49085.

Wentling, T.L. 1980. *Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs*. 2nd ed. Allyn & Bacon, Inc., Boston, MA.

Wentling, T.L. and W.E. Piland. 1982. *Student/Employer Follow-up*. Local leader guide II. Locally-directed evaluation handbook. 2nd ed. Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 225 018).

New Approaches

Degree Programs In Agriculture

Herbert Hansen

Several things impressed me during the Curriculum 2005 Conference in St. Louis last October. Two events in particular made strong impressions. The first of these was the response from those attending to the question, "Do you feel our curricula in the colleges of agriculture should be more general in scope?" About 95 percent of the hands went up affirming this versus the approximately 5% supporting the specific nature of our current curricula. This show of hands by the curriculum leaders present in St. Louis, was a shock to me as I had no idea they would agree so much on this one point. This reinforces the call made by some of the panel members who spoke to us yesterday, for us to be less "vocational" and more "general" in our curriculum development.

The second most impressive event to me was the report by the University of Guelph regarding their proposed curricula changes, including the combination of some of their majors and the renaming of most of their major offerings. Their proposals were sweeping and even included the renaming of their bachelor degrees to include a Bachelor of Science (Agriculture), Bachelor of Management Studies, Bachelor of Environmental Management, Bachelor of Food Science and a Bachelor of Rural Studies. I thought they were sweeping and innovative changes.

This last spring, I received Guelph's new brochure. Even though they did not complete all the changes, they made some definite progress. The following are the categories of their majors as listed in their brochure:

- Environmental Management
- Resource Use
- Animal Production Systems
- Plant Production Systems
- Food Product Development
- Business Management

According to the brochure, they have not renamed their majors but are grouping them under these

Invited paper presented by Hansen, Assistant Dean and Associate Director of Academic Programs, College of Agricultural Sciences, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR at the 34th Annual NACTA Conference, June 26-29 at Oregon State University.

six categories. They have not yet breached the departmental barriers but they are discussing it and seem to be making progress.

The final remarks at the St. Louis conference made by Dr. Sledge of Wisconsin and the challenge by Dr. Hartung of Nebraska, for us to turn in our pledge cards, go back to our institutions and work for change, motivated me. I came back wondering how we could begin such a discussion.

We are currently going through conversion to the semester system and had convened a Curriculum Conversion Council with a representative from each department in our College of Agricultural Sciences and it seemed as if this is the best place to start. We reviewed Guelph's brochure and discussed it at length. We saw the advantages of going to our clientele and showing them how we are keeping up with the changing times, and how it could improve recruiting by being able to say, "Look what we are doing to meet the challenges of a dynamically changing field." and "Come and be a part of the new approaches to finding solutions for agriculture in our State and the World." These are positive but the question remains: "How do we breach the barriers of discipline orientations, administrative structures, and the reliance on specific discipline research and publications for success on the promotion and tenure tracks?"

Where are we now? We are still in session on the topic. It has been discussed by the college and departmental administrators, and I believe they see the merits, but they are faced with the same dilemmas. These are not easy changes for they interrupt long and successful traditions. Changes like these must have the support of the faculty. Our task now is to have them "buy into" the concept after they wrestle with the same questions, evaluate the same rewards and calculate the same risks. I feel we have begun. Some have asked me, "When are we going to bring this up again?" We are just finishing up the semester conversion paperwork and I feel we are about ready to devise a way for the faculty to get involved in this discussion in a formal way and bring forth proposals. These discussions will be on a college-wide basis and not department by department because this is a college-wide issue, not a departmental issue. I would appreciate some of the more experienced administrators among you giving me some ideas on how to get the faculty to buy into this type of major change.

The following is a model we have come up with. We are beginning to recruit with this model by showing, on a broader scale, how our majors interface under these categories.

- Environmental and Resource Management
- Agricultural and Resource Economics
- Horticulture Landscape Construction and Maintenance
- Fisheries and Wildlife Science
- Rangeland Resources
- Soil Science

- Animal Systems
 - Animal Science
 - Poultry Science
 - Preveterinary Medicine
- Plant Systems
 - Crop Science
 - Horticulture Crop Production
 - Rangeland Resources
 - Soil Science
- Food Systems
 - Food Science and Technology
 - Animal Science (Dairy and Meats)
 - Poultry Science
 - Agricultural Engineering
- Business Management
 - Agricultural Business Management
 - Animal Science
 - Crop Science
 - Horticulture
 - Poultry Science
- International Agriculture and Education
 - Agricultural and Resource Economics
 - Agricultural Education
 - General Agriculture

This model still needs improvement but it is one from which we can build. It is close to the Guelph model but with some wording changes which we think might be more compatible for us. I hope that it may be of some value to you as you look for new approaches to meeting needs and expectations through your degree programs in agriculture.

Make Plans Now



35th Annual Conference
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN
June 11-14, 1989