

The Legacy Project

This article is the first in a series of articles entitled “The Legacy Project.” The Legacy Project will focus on the lives and actions of leaders who have forged our profession into what it is today. Members of the profession owe a debt of gratitude to these leaders. One simple way to demonstrate that gratitude is to recognize them and some of their accomplishments.

The focus in this issue will be on Mr. James (Jim) Edward Good, DTE, who graciously responded to a series of questions about himself and the influence that he had on the vocational/technology engineering education profession.

By Johnny J Moye

1. What were the most significant events during your tenure that impacted the profession in terms of curriculum development and teacher training?

There were a number of significant curriculum development and teacher training programs that took place in the 60s, 70s, and 80s. Independently, each had an impact on a

particular segment of the field. The two that stand out in my mind were the federally funded National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Institutes and the Industrial Arts Curriculum Project (IACP). The NDEA Institutes began in the summer of 1966 with five pilot workshops that focused on innovative ways to develop and implement content more reflective of contemporary industry and technology than the traditional wood, metal, and drafting programs. I was a member of the American Industry Institute held at the State University of New York at Oswego. We spent a lot of time visiting industries around the country, listening to speakers from all corporate segments, and then developing curriculum that

James Edward Good, DTE

AIAA/ITEA/ITEEA President 1979-1980

Place of Birth:

Denver, Colorado, April 1, 1939

Degrees:

Bachelor of Science, Western State College, Gunnison, CO, 1961

Masters of Science, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO, 1965

Occupational History:

- Taught high school industrial arts for four years in Montpelier, VT and two years in Barre, VT.
- District Director of Vocational and Technical Education in the Greece, NY Central School system for 20 years.
- Retired in 1987 and lives in Salt Lake City, Utah and Carolina Beach, NC.

Married for 50 years to his lovely wife Mary.



would provide students with a better understanding of how industry actually works. It was a great experience. It should be noted that these institutes were the result of the efforts of our first paid AIAA Executive Director, Kenneth Dawson, who developed an excellent working relationship with congressional leaders as well as with NEA in gaining recognition and support for our cause. Programs like the Stout American Industry plan and the Maryland Plan also made a significant contribution to both curriculum development and teacher training. However, the Ohio State-based IACP project had the greatest impact. It was a well-funded federal project focused on the development and implementation of two one-year courses in manufacturing and construction, primarily for middle school students.

Under the leadership of Willis Ray and Don Lux, the project had strong support from business and industry and produced a well-developed curriculum with a nationwide teacher training program. It was not the complete solution to our curriculum aspirations, but it was an excellent start.

2. You were a member of the original U.S. Office of Education (USOE) Career Education task force, the Standards Project, Jackson's Mill, and the Chicago 10 Project. What impact did each of these groups have on the profession?

The USOE Career Education task force was an outgrowth of the appointment of Sidney Marland as the U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1970. Dr. Marland took a strong stand that education at that time was not meeting the needs of our youth in terms of preparing them for a productive and rewarding life. He appointed Robert Worthington, a long-time supporter and leader in industrial arts, as the Associate Commissioner of the Bureau for Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education to take an active role in the development of an educational system that focused on career education. Worthington met with his close friend, Dr. Rudy Lockette, who was then President of the Industrial Arts Division of the American Vocational Association as well as with then AIAA President, Dr. Fred Kagy, to establish a Career Education Task Force for the purpose of developing guidelines for Industrial Arts in Career Education. The task force was equally represented by members from the Industrial Arts Division of AVA and AIAA. They were given clear instructions from Dr. Worthington to work together, as he was well aware of the dissension between the two camps. Many AIAA leaders felt that industrial arts should be a part of general education rather than vocational education. Many members in both associations felt the best chance to obtain funding needed to support industrial arts programs was to cooper-

ate with both general education and vocational leaders and clearly identify this role as not limited to the career education movement, but open to all segments of education. The document published was the result of the combined efforts of the task force and participants in two national reviews and two national open hearings. They provided a clear and distinct role for industrial arts in career development.

The original Standards Project (1979) was a result of the inclusion of industrial arts by name in the amended Vocational Act of 1976. With the support of USOE, The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI/Virginia Tech) with Dr. William Dugger as Director, was awarded a federal grant to develop basic standards for industrial arts programs. This effort included numerous hearings and resulted in a clear set of standards and guidelines for the profession. It has gone through several revisions over the past 30 years and provides a clear and concise direction for the role for industrial arts/technology education/technology and engineering education in public schools.

The Jackson's Mill Industrial Arts Curriculum Theory Project directed by Jim Snyder, West Virginia State Department of Education, and Jim Hales, Director of Technology at Fairmont State College, was primarily funded by the American Technical Society. There were 21 members who met a number of times at a retreat in Jackson's Mill, West Virginia to deliberate the literature in our field and determine the relationship of industrial arts to comprehensive education. Most of these leaders were the best we had in the field including: Myron Bender, Jim Bensen, Paul DeVore, Bill Dugger, Frank Field, Jim Good, Norma Heasley, Dan Householder, Everett Israel, Don Lauda, Gary Lintereur, Eugene Martin, Charles Pinder, Willis Ray, John Ritz, Al Rudisill, Earl Smith, Kendall Starkweather, and Tom Wright, among others. As a result of these discussions, I concluded that this project could easily make a case for a sharper focus on technology as opposed to the career education movement clusters such as manufacturing, construction, transportation, and communications. Confirmation of this idea came when New York State was redesigning its curriculum in the mid-80s and used the Jackson's Mill guide to establish a technology-based rather than the cluster-based concept for its basic curriculum structure. The report did not rule out clusters, as later confirmed by the "Chicago 10" project, but it made a strong case for identifying the body of knowledge within the realm of technology that was unique to industrial arts as we know it. One could easily conclude that the outcome of our vigorous debates straddled the fence regarding our role in technology as well

as industry. Thirty years later the focus on technology has become the primary focus for our profession.

The “Chicago 10” project, which officially went by the name, “The Industry and Technology Education” project, was basically a guide for curriculum designers, implementers, and teachers that attempted to adhere to the guidelines resulting from the “Jackson’s Mill” project. It was funded by The Technical Foundation of America. Tom Wright of Ball State and Len Sterry of the University of Wisconsin-Stout codirected the project, which included 10 participants and consultants. The end result was an excellent planning guide with emphasis on industry and technology that included curriculum design for small, medium, and large schools. The content focus included a series of 18-week courses offered at four to five levels from middle school through senior high. The focus was on exploring industry and technology at the beginning level and moving to courses with emphasis on communication, construction, manufacturing, and transportation systems. It was an excellent document for state- and local-level curriculum planners. Again, the focus was industry and technology as opposed to the present focus on technology and engineering education.

3. You were Chair of the AIAA Legislative Committee when industrial arts was included by name in the amended Vocational Act of 1963. How did you pull this off when the vocational community was strenuously opposed to such action? How did this inclusion impact the profession?

The Smith Hughes Act of 1917 was the first recognition of national approval of vocational education in public schools. Its purpose was job training, which was never an objective of industrial arts. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 attempted to broaden the role of vocational education to include those programs that pertained to the body of related subject matter or courses organized for the development of understanding of all aspects of industry and technology as well as programs that assisted individuals in making informed and meaningful occupational choices. Clearly, industrial arts had a role in the expanded definition of vocational education and deserved to be so recognized and supported.

The 1972 amended Vocational Act of 1963 recognized the importance of industrial arts in vocational education, and 1973 federal regulations made it possible for industrial arts programs to be funded through vocational legislation. The career education task force was given the responsibility of developing these regulations in cooperation with USOE officials. Many states took advantage of this provision by includ-

ing industrial arts programs in their state plans. However, the funding was limited, and industrial arts was perceived in many states as a prevocational program that brought into serious question the compromise of the general education role upon which industrial arts was based.

The real breakthrough came with the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976. Among other things, this new legislation included industrial arts by name in the definition of vocational education. IA was the only subject area mentioned by name and was included in the block grant section of the Act, which included 80% of the funding appropriations. It allowed states to increase staff, expand training programs, build and expand facilities, and to provide essential resources for many learning experiences common to industrial arts, including: experimenting, designing, constructing, evaluating, and using tools, machines, materials, and processes. It also provided the opportunity to incorporate experiences for students that would assist them in making informed and meaningful occupational choices, whether it be job entry, vocational programs, or courses at the college and university level. It did not limit the role of industrial arts programs or compromise its role in meeting the needs of all students regardless of career aspirations.

4. You knew and worked closely with every AIAA/ITEA/ITEEA executive director, including Dr. Kenneth Brown, during your career. What were your impressions of their mode of operation and contributions to the profession?

I met Dr. Kenneth Brown for the first time at the State University of New York at Buffalo in the spring of 1968. Among other things he talked about his experiences as the first and only nonpaid Executive Secretary of the AIAA. He talked about carrying all of the affairs of the Association in a briefcase. He would bring the briefcase to meetings where he and other leaders in the field would meet to deliberate key issues. I gathered that his role was primarily record keeping and recording of minutes.

Dr. Kenneth Dawson was the first paid Executive Secretary and came aboard in the early 60s. The AIAA office was in the NEA building in downtown Washington, DC. Dr. Dawson was a most effective manager and had an excellent relationship with many political and education leaders. His problem with the profession was that during his tenure and for many years prior, all AIAA presidents were teacher educators and there were a lot of egos involved. This, coupled with the fact that many of these leaders were anti-vocational education, made it most difficult for Dr. Dawson to foster a working

relationship with members of the vocational community. Personally, I give Dr. Dawson credit for the inclusion of industrial arts in the legislation that made possible the industrial arts institutes, which were held for the first time in the summer of 1966.

Dr. Howard Decker, who followed Dr. Dawson, was from my perspective a good office manager and kept things running smoothly. I don't remember any negative comments or criticisms. Conferences ran smoothly, and board members were happy. Basically, Howard was a great guy who did a good job of managing the Association.

Dr. Decker was succeeded by Ed Kabajkian who proved to be a real lightning rod. Shortly after Ed was appointed (I think it was in 1968), I attended a supervisors' conference at Lake Mohunk in New York where he was a keynote speaker. I was most unimpressed, as his attitude and demeanor left a great deal to be desired. I still remember his criticism of the IACP project, which I thought was out of line. Throughout his tenure he was very controversial. His relationship with officials in the USOE and the Industrial Arts Division of the American Vocational Association (AVA, now the Association for Career and Technical Education) was less than it could have been. He left on a sour note, and the next AIAA President, Dr. Donald Hackett, had to spend considerable time reorganizing the office.

Ed Kabajkian was replaced by Don Rathburn, an associate in the AVA office. His appointment was timely, as his relationships and insights with AVA, USOE, and congressional leaders, coupled with a pleasant personality, proved to be invaluable at a most critical time in our profession. Don was not the most efficient office manager, and I am sure he was upset at times with my efforts to micromanage. However, he played an instrumental role in our successful legislative efforts in both vocational and career education. During Don's tenure, the association faced some real financial problems because we had deficit spending for several years, which prevented us from providing essential staff and support needed for an efficient office operation. I am sure this was most frustrating for Don.

A "new look" is the way President Les Litherland introduced Dr. Kendall Starkweather as Don Rathburn's replacement in the fall of 1980. Kendall was my replacement as head of the AIAA legislative efforts and had a good working understanding of the Association. Kendall has been in this position for over 30 years and has done an outstanding job. He resolved our budget crisis by obtaining a number of grants

over the years that were managed by the Association. He established a great relationship with NASA and the National Science Foundation and worked closely with Bill Dugger and others in keeping the Standards current and allowing the Association to truly reflect a focus on technology. Along the way, he obtained advanced certification in Association Management and has gained the highest respect from his colleagues.

5. From your perspective, how would you compare what is happening in the profession today with what was happening when you were President of AIAA?

I have been retired for 25 years and certainly am not qualified to provide an accurate assessment of what is taking place in our field today. However, from my perspective, we have a sound philosophical base and a responsive set of standards and guidelines for the development, implementation, and evaluation of quality technology and engineering programs in the public schools. There are many exciting projects underway under the guidance of excellent leadership. I have a concern that many of our teacher training programs are being phased out, and we are not going to be able to provide enough trained teachers to meet the demand. Since we are usually an elective curriculum area, many programs could be cut or eliminated. I am also concerned that the quality of our programs is suffering despite the wealth of resources available to teachers. While our leaders are focusing on technology, programs like "STEM" are proving to be most valuable, and I suspect it is business as usual in many school systems. It would not surprise me to find a lot of traditional programs still being taught with total disregard for the standards. Thanks to 30 years of refinement of the standards, we know our role in education and the content we expect to cover, as well as how to achieve and evaluate it. What we are missing are the resources and respect in the education community to reach our full potential. Hopefully this will be overcome over the next several decades. 🍷

The next article in The Legacy Project will appear in this journal in a few months. If you have a suggestion of a leader for whom recognition is appropriate, contact the author with that person's name and contact information.



Johnny J Moyer is a Supervisor of Career and Technical Education at Chesapeake Public Schools, Chesapeake, VA. He can be reached via email at johnnymoye@gmail.com.