

Oral History Interview with Paul Belomy

This is a 92-page PDF document using the Adobe Acrobat Reader plug-in. You may click on section names below to view individual parts. Use the Adobe tool bar (inside the OTAN frame) to navigate through the document and or to print a document.

To save this PDF document to your hard drive, go to the File menu, choose "Save As," and enter a suitable name, including the ".pdf" extension. (For example, if the PDF file is called "History," then you will need to save it as "History.pdf").

[Cover](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

*(the page numbers on the table of contents
may be different from those at the bottom of the screen)*

[Restrictions, Literary Rights, Quotations](#)

[Preface](#)

[Interview History](#)

[Interviews](#)

[Index](#)

[Biographical Information](#)

Downloaded from the Outreach and Technical Assistance Network Web Site,
<http://www.otan.dni.us>. This is California Adult Education Archives Document number

003314

OTAN activities are funded by contract #9000 of the Federal P.L. 105-220, Section 223, from the Adult Education Office, California Department of Education. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position of that department or of the U.S. Department of Education.

PAUL BELOMY

Interviewed by Cuba Z. Miller

California Department of Education
Adult Education Oral History Project

California Department of Education
Adult Education Oral History Project

Oral History Interview

with

PAUL BELOMY

Consultant in Adult Education
1995 - Present

Santa Clara Unified School District
Director of Educational Options
1981 - 1995

Fremont Union High School District
Principal of Adult Education
1976 - 1981

June 12, 2001
Milpitas, California

July 11, 2001
Berkeley, California

By Cuba Z. Miller



TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESTRICTIONS, LITERARY RIGHTS, QUOTATIONS. v

PREFACE. vi

INTERVIEW HISTORY. vii

INTERVIEWS June 12 and July 11, 2001

[Tape 1, Side A]. 1

Background – Transition to adult education – Fremont Adult School,
Sunnyvale – Mentors - Expansion of program – School profile –
Proposition 13 – Federal grants – Move to Santa Clara – Separation from
MAEP - Starting a new adult school – Early school profile – Independent
study – Federal grants at Santa Clara – School age mothers' program –
Consolidation of five alternative programs into Educational Options –
Student activities – Graduation –Impact of amnesty – Competency based
adult education

[Tape 1, Side B]. 21

Concurrent enrollment – Reform legislation – New adult schools
authorized – Small schools – Relationships between adult schools and
district offices – Lottery money – Discrepancy in revenue limits – Fiscal
problems – Direct and indirect costs – Educational philosophy –
Cooperation among adult schools – Professional organizations – Public
relations and the California State Consortium for Adult Education.

[Tape 2, Side A].36

California State Consortium for Adult Education (continued) – Advisory
roles and committee work – Relationships between the field and the
California Department of Education – Five percent funds and distance
learning – Learning Networks – Local leadership training - Leadership
Institute and Academy – Other administrative training

[Tape 2, Side B]	56
<p>The Nordstrom of adult education: customer service – Executive Development Program - Professional Resources Outreach System/PROS – Continuing work since formal retirement – Wishes and recommendations for California adult education – Influential individuals during career – Frustrations of career</p>	
[Tape 3, Side A]	76
<p>Major accomplishments and most satisfying aspects of career</p>	
INDEX	80
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	83

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATIONS

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the California State Archivist or of the California Department of Education.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to:

California State Archives
1020 "O" Street
Sacramento, California 95814

or

California Department of Education, Adult Education Unit
P.O. Box 944272
Sacramento, California 94244-2720

The request should include identification of the specific passages and identification of the user.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Paul Belomy, Oral History Interview, Conducted 2001 by Cuba Z. Miller
in Milpitas and Berkeley, California, for the California Adult Education Oral
History Project

PREFACE

Adult education in California has a proud history of helping its citizens to meet the challenges of life in a huge, complex, multicultural state. Through the years, California adult educators have provided leadership to the nation in the development of innovative instructional practices and creative educational solutions.

The California Adult Education Oral History Project began in 1992 as a companion to a print history of adult education commissioned by the California Department of Education. The oral history project started with a small group of leaders whose careers began in the 1950's and 1960's and who witnessed and influenced important events in the development of the nation's largest adult education program.

To date, twenty-seven educators whose careers span seventy years have participated. They represent the varying professional roles, organizations, and geography that comprise our state's diverse adult education programs. Their stories tell how California adult education met the needs of citizens in the wartime 1940's, and those of veterans and an exploding population in the 1950's. The growth and energy of California adult education in the nineteen-sixties, the institutionalization of competency based education in response to the influx of refugees and immigrants in the seventies and eighties, the innovative uses of technology of the nineties, and visions for the new century have been recorded.

Significant assistance to the project was provided by the staffs both of the California State Archives and of the Oral History Program, History Department, California State University, Fullerton. This project could not have begun without the vision of Raymond G. Eberhard, Administrator, Adult Education Policy and Planning Unit, California Department of Education, and the support of the late Lynda T. Smith, Consultant, Adult Education Policy and Planning Unit.

Linda L. West
April 2002

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer

Cuba Z. Miller

Interview Time and Place

Two interviews were conducted in Milpitas, California, on June 12, 2001 and in Berkeley, California on July 11, 2001.

Editing

The interviewee reviewed and edited the transcript. When the tape was inaudible or when necessary for clarification, some information was added and is indicated by brackets [].

Tapes

The original cassette tapes were transferred to reel to reel format at California State University, Fullerton and deposited with the California State Archives.

PROJECT: California Adult Education Oral History Project

INTERVIEWEE: Paul Belomy

INTERVIEWER: Cuba Miller

DATE: June 12 and July 11, 2001

July 11, 2001

CM: This is Cuba Miller interviewing Paul Belomy for the California Adult Education Oral History Project. Paul is a retired adult school administrator who has remained active in the field since his formal retirement from the Santa Clara Unified School District. The purpose of the interview is to record his recollections of his career and the events and trends in California adult education during that time. The interview was recorded in two sessions. The first was in Milipitas, California, on June twelfth 2001. A significant part of the recording of that interview was lost. A second session was held in Berkeley, California, on July eleventh 2001 to re-record the lost portion and to conclude the interview.

Paul, as is common among adult educators, you came to the field in the second phase of your career in public education. Briefly give us your background and early experience in education prior to your work in adult education.

PB: Okay. I graduated from Teachers College of Connecticut in the area of mathematics and started teaching in a junior high school. Then went into the service, and when I came back out, I transferred to another school, in the high school, teaching mathematics. During that period of time, I also started working on my master's degree and got a master's degree in statistics. The school was the same school, but

they changed names from Teachers College of Connecticut to Central Connecticut State College. Taught for about seven years in Connecticut and decided that I needed to make a move with the family. We moved out here to California in 1963. I was fortunate enough to have had a scholarship to Boston College, Massachusetts, in the 1962 summer and had another scholarship to University of Santa Clara in 1963 for summer work.

When I came to California, I was hired by the Fremont Union High School District in Cupertino and Sunnyvale as a math instructor at Cupertino High School. There I worked through the chairs of teacher, [mathematics] department head, counseling dean, dean of discipline. Changed schools, transferred to Homestead High School, where I was the vice principal for student services, and then changed [positions] there to be the vice principal of curriculum and instruction. At that point in time, I was asked by the superintendent to consider taking over the adult education principalship in 1976.

CM: What made you decide to do that?

PB: Well, it was a Sleepy Hollow program, if I could describe it as such. Had about five hundred units of a.d.a. (average daily attendance).^{*} The person that had the position prior to me had it for one year only, and he was promoted to a high school principalship. His predecessor had the program for many years – more than ten – and really, it was just a small program, not very creative or innovative. They only had a minimal amount of a.d.a., so I felt this was an excellent opportunity for me to be in charge of and responsible for a program, which was what I was looking for.

^{*} 525 aggregated hours of student attendance is one unit of a.d.a.

CM: And actually, that had not had *anything* done to it for at least a year.

PB: Yes, that's right. So it was a good opportunity. Some of the people I talked to indicated that adult education was a good place to try to make some headway.

CM: Paul, you had two years at Fremont before the earthquake of Proposition 13 hit California adult education. What stands out about these first two years, about getting started?

PB: The first two years, there were all kinds of opportunities. If you wanted to be creative, you wanted to do marketing and advertising – where we went from a fold-out newsprint kind of thing to an actual catalog of several pages to mail to our clients. There just was a lot of need in the community that wasn't being met. And as soon as we would put out some kind of information about classes, we were stormed at our office doors and at the classroom doors.

CM: So you were able to get some growth in before the cutback of Prop 13.

PB: More than doubled our program in just those two years with respect to a.d.a.

CM: Where did you learn how to work in adult education? Where did you get your training? Did you have a mentor, or what?

PB: Well, there actually were no individuals that were just assigned to work with me. I was kind of given my wherewithal to go find out about the legislation, et cetera. However, locally, Lee Clark, from the Metropolitan Adult Education Program (MAEP), was a real leader in the state, had a very large program. He provided a lot of mentorship. I could always count on him for ideas and suggestions and the legalistics. Also, from the State Department, two individuals, Joe Simms and Carl Larsen (both consultants, Adult Education Unit) – in particular, Carl – came to visit a

number of times. They were very, very helpful in terms of what adult education was all about and what we could do, if we wanted to try and do it, which we did. So I would say those three individuals – Lee, Joe, and Carl Larsen – were the three people that probably gave me the most guidance at that time.

CM: You mentioned you doubled your program in the first two years. About how big was it? And if you could, along with that, give us a school profile, what the student body was composed of, and so on.

PB: I would say that we jumped from somewhere just over six hundred to almost fourteen hundred a.d.a. in those two years. The school profile was across the board, and this was something that I felt that our board wanted me to do. They wanted to have programs in all of the authorized areas, so we attempted to do that. We went out and found programs in the various areas of the curriculum. There was a large proportion of ESL (English as a second language) students, of course, but we had a large senior citizen population that would come to our sites. We didn't do convalescent hospitals. That was not something that we chose to do at the time. Parenting education grew astronomically because there just wasn't that entity in the community, so as soon as we came on board, we just opened the floodgates for parenting students.

CM: Were those primarily the parent cooperative preschools?

PB: Yes. We actually started two preschool cooperatives, and then on our own site we did all of the various preschool programs, other than the [parent] participation that we had off-site.

CM: So this expansion then certainly was a major change. Were there any other major changes other than the expansion that took place?

PB: They did give us a site. The elementary school district was downsizing. They had closed a facility, and we were able to take it over, which gave me office space and about sixteen classrooms. Which was a real boon because they had worked the other program out of a portable building, and take what you can get in terms of church space, et cetera. Which we still used. But having a facility, I think, was probably one of the motivators to really allow us to grow the program the way we did.

CM: Prior to Prop 13 – I know you'd just been here a couple of years – but statewide, what would you say were the major trends and issues of adult education in the seventies prior to Prop 13?

PB: I'm probably not that familiar with what happened prior to Prop 13, other than those two years I was in it, because if you had asked me about adult education prior to 1976 when I became a principal, I knew nothing about adult education. It was, as they always said, the "best kept secret in California."

CM: So the adult education statewide revenue limit⁷ had already been established when you came in?

PB: Yes.

CM: And 5 percent growth cap, was that in effect? I think that it was. I think it came in in '75.

PB: I can't remember that one.

CM: Okay. Before we go into detail on Prop 13, I'd like to know if your program was impacted by the Southeast Asian refugees – well, the refugees came in two parts, in

⁷ Revenue limit is the amount of money the state allocates for each unit of a.d.a. Adult education revenue limit is approximately one-third of the amount allocated to unified and high school districts, per unit of a.d.a.

two groups. The first one started arriving in '75, and the second wave came in the eighties. Had a lot of the refugees impacted the Fremont program prior to Prop 13?

PB: The Fremont program was primarily impacted by the Iranian immigration. There were large numbers of Iranians that came to our program. Some of them were very wealthy and had come from high level positions in Iran and still had leadership amongst the Iranian community members, and they encouraged them to come to our school. So we had a significant number of Iranians. They were good students. They worked very, very hard. Didn't feel the impact probably of the Southeast Asians until much later for us.

CM: Did the Iranians – were they seeking student visas, or were they people who had gotten here by other means and were just availing themselves of the education?

PB: I would say for the most part, they got here on their own somehow or other. A few of them were still looking for visas. But many of them came with their records, their high school records, and we were able to help a number of them go through the ESL (English as a second language) program into our high school diploma program, which many of them wanted to achieve. Which was kind of nice for all of us.

CM: Let's go on to Prop 13 then and the impact that it had on your program. Different districts treated their adult schools different ways after the passage of Prop 13. Did you get to keep all of your funds in that first year block grant that came?

PB: Yes. Our district wanted adult education to succeed – the board and the superintendent – so they gave us the funds to operate. Our program was halved because of the cuts that the legislature made, so we were reduced significantly. The number of areas that we were in was also reduced because we had, as I said earlier,

across-the-board programming, and then we were reduced to probably half the number of authorized areas that we once had.*

CM: Any other changes from Prop 13 or adjustments that you had to make?

PB: Oh, I can remember two or three incidents that still stick in my mind. One was that we had mailed our summer schedule. We were forced to mail it prior to the vote. And as soon as the vote hit, we had to come out with another mailer right away, significantly decreasing our catalog, going back to the old fold-out newspaper print thing, which was pretty traumatic. But I do recall not having any clerical staff and no custodial staff, because no one knew what the funding was going to be like right at the very beginning. So I was closing doors and opening doors in the morning and emptying wastebaskets, and all those good things that administrators are flexible enough to do.

CM: And that the teachers had to help with too. (chuckles)

PB: Yes. What teachers were left, that is. In the authorized areas, yes. It did force me to come up with a [new] philosophy, because it was traumatic to be on this roller coaster going up – not uphill, but going fast – and then all of a sudden being almost stopped. I realized at that time that everything we were doing was driven by adult education apportionment,[†] so I made an internal decision that never again would I be caught with all my eggs in the same basket. As soon as Prop 13 was over, I said to myself, as soon as it's finished or gets leveled out, I'm going to make sure we diversify. So we made a conscious decision to do things such as go after grants and go after fee-

* After Proposition 13 there were ten authorized program areas financed with state funds.

[†] Apportionment is the total amount of funds allocated by the state, based on an agency's a.d.a. and revenue limits: a.d.a. x revenue limit = apportionment.

based community education kind of programs, in addition to apportionment [programs], to spread out the income that we were taking in so it all wasn't in one place.

CM: What were some of the early grants that you had? I recall that Fremont did have a couple of the – what were they, 309 grants at that time?*

PB: Yes. I tried to remember them, and the best I can recall is that we had a grant called TRIP, which is a Teacher Reading Improvement Program. And then we had a diagnostic reading grant. We had an ESL outreach grant. Those are the three [I remember].

CM: Was it Fremont – didn't you have something dealing with VESL (vocational English as a second language) also?

PB: That came in the next district.

CM: That came in the next district. Okay. What was the funding on these grants?

PB: It came from the federal monies through the state, whatever those numbers were then. I can't recall them all – 306 at one time, and then 309. So they were a portion of the monies that were required to be spent by the state for staff development kinds of activities. [306 was the basic grant used to supplement instructional activities.]

CM: Okay. Now, you moved to Santa Clara in 1981 as director of – what were you when you first went?

PB: I was the principal.

CM: You were the principal when you first went.

PB: There was a [new] director, right.

CM: Tell us about the setup that you had at Santa Clara. And again the size and the profile

*Section 309, later 310 and 353, of the Adult Education Act funded special projects.

of the school.

PB: Sure. Santa Clara was a large district, and they were dealing with significant [day school] enrollment decreases. They had, at the time, four high schools [and] five [junior] high schools, I should say – and they decided to close two of those high schools, close three of the [junior high] schools, and consolidate all of their secondary students in those remaining schools. They also had about sixteen elementary schools. So the board decided to give us a closed middle school, which was a very nice facility. It had over thirty-six classrooms. It had a huge gymnasium that sat twelve hundred people in the bleachers. It had a lap pool out in the back with boys' and girls' locker rooms. It had a huge music facility. And some interesting things beside the fields. It had a large [science facility and] 4H Club that had animals and gardens, and things like that, which was very, very unique.

CM: Yes. I remember all of us on the peninsula being very jealous of your facility at Santa Clara, and you graciously shared it with everyone who needed meeting space for various things. Again, let's go into the size and the profile. Now, the size has a particular story to it, doesn't it?

PB: Yes. The size was legislated in terms of what could happen there, because Santa Clara was one of five school districts that was part of the Metropolitan Adult Education Program. There were five school districts that were providing adult education but through the direction of San Jose Metropolitan Adult Education. They were Milpitas, Santa Clara, Campbell, San Jose, and Eastside. The Santa Clara board decided to break with the coalition and start their own programming. They had their own reasons, and most of it had to do with servicing the students in the community as they

thought they should be serviced. So in that legal transfer, we received about six hundred and eighty units of a.d.a. through that transfer. That was the way the law was structured, and that's the way San Jose Metro gave us that amount of a.d.a. that we then started as our base program.

CM: So in reality, although there had been some adult education programs in the community, when you went there, it was starting a new school without any previous structure.

PB: Right. Metropolitan had rented or leased a couple of the [Santa Clara] elementary schools, and they [also] had a large program at the Agnew State Hospital. We agreed to continue the program at Agnew State Hospital since that was within our boundaries, but the other two schools [that MAEP was using], the board didn't feel they wanted to give those to adult education. So they decided to really give us a good start by giving us a middle school, which allowed us to really expand rapidly, or as rapidly as we could under the constraints, I should say.

CM: That first year, was it still just adult education programs? Because I know eventually you started bringing other programs in. Would you tell us about what all eventually got located there?

PB: We, in essence, started from zero. We didn't have anything. We didn't have any students, we didn't have any advertising, we didn't have any curriculum. We didn't even have forms or pencils or any staff whatsoever. I was the first employee hired, and then the director and I sought out some teachers, and teachers sought us out from other districts. We eventually put a program together, and the very first year – during that summer – we did do an advertising catalog, and it was like sending invitations to

a party not knowing who was going to show up. We were just really fortunate that people came out of the woodwork. So there was an absolute need in the community, far beyond what was being served before. We just tried to meet that need. The board gave us the direction that they wanted us to [provide all programs but especially to] concentrate on senior adults.

That was important to them. So we definitely hired a specialist, one of our staff members, to go out and try to put some curriculum together and programs and get teachers for the senior adult population in the community.

CM: So you started then with this advertising campaign. You had the program at Agnew, which was a . . .

PB: Continuation.

CM: . . . a program for the disabled.

PB: That's correct.

CM: I'm not coming up with the correct words here. Obviously, you would have had an ESL population. What else was early in your program there? You said you went out for seniors.

PB: Seniors. The developmentally disabled at Agnew. We had a lot of ESL students that were in the area that we felt weren't being served, mostly Hispanics and Asian at the time. We had a unique facility with that 4H Club so that we went into parenting [education] quite heavily right away. We were able to turn the science facility into four preschool rooms with the little bathrooms that we had to construct. [It] was always fun doing those things. They had their own petting zoo. There were sheep, pigs, ducks, pheasants, chickens, pigeons, rabbits, [and a large fish pond]. This was

just so excellent because it was all in the same fenced enclosures – the preschools and the 4H Club. So that was very exciting and was very well received by the community. They took right off on that.

CM: And the animals would wander around campus sometimes.

PB: Yes, they would, especially the peacocks. And they would scare the life out of you when they screamed (chuckles) or cackled, or whatever it's called. We decided that vocational training would be important to us because we were right in the middle of Silicon Valley. We did everything we could to set up electronics labs, and finding a way [to establish wafer] fabrication labs, and eventually computer labs of all types. So vocational [education] became a big area for us. We also branched out by bringing in the independent study program for the K-12 part of the district under our umbrella.

CM: So this was your first reach then outside straight adult education.

PB: Right. And that was K-12 apportionment, and it was for youth, out-of-school youth. That program grew very rapidly to the point where we probably had four hundred students. It's surprising that there were that many, but many came from out-of-district with the interdistrict transfers too. It turned out to be a very successful program.

About that time – just about 1981 or so – I thought we should still be working on grants, and I knew some people in the state that were interested in doing some projects. I approached ACSA (Association of California School Administrators) and asked them if they would consider being the fiscal agent for statewide grants, where we would, through Santa Clara, run the grant, but they would be the fiscal agent, which would give us some credibility plus it would give us a statewide presence.

Those grants came through very nicely. One of the first ones was the ESL staff development grant with Lynn Savage. The VESL grant with Nick Kremer out of Hacienda La Puente. [Those] were two of the first ones that we had that ACSA was the fiscal agent.

Just about that time too we wrote the – three of us, Jane Zinner and Tim Cuneo and myself – wrote the DNAE grant, the Dissemination Network for Adult Education. I was going to be the director of that, but with the duties at Santa Clara, the new duties at Santa Clara, it just was too big a job, so I decided to be the administrative liaison for that project as I was with staff development and the VESL projects. Jane Zinner became the director of the program and Tim Cuneo a consultant. They were housed on our campus in a room for the first couple of years of their operation before they moved to the ACSA headquarters in Burlingame.

We had a subsequent grant with ESL (Teacher) Institute, and Lynn was again the person that ran that. And those were the ones that we – I think were the big ones that we got. There were some small ones too because we were dealing with what everybody else was dealing with, with IRCA (Immigration Reform and Control Act) and SLIAG (State Legalization Immigrant Assistance Grants) and some of those kinds of things. We had a number of vocational grants too that the state provided us.

CM: Paul, did you remain the administrative liaison for the ESL Teacher Institute throughout the length of it after Mary McMullen took it over?

PB: No. When Mary was there, I was not there.

CM: Okay. So it was basically with Lynn.

PB: That's right.

CM: And then when they reapplied for that grant

PB: I was not involved in that.

CM: Okay. You also had a school age mothers' program on your campus?

PB: Yes. We brought in school age mothers for the district and built three rooms for child care: one for babies or infants - the nursery, one for toddlers, and one for preschoolers. That took some construction in the buildings to make everything appropriate with the legal agencies and social service agencies, because you had to have X-number of rest rooms, and they had to be so small or so tall so the kids could use them. But that program grew tremendously and it was very successful. Probably that's one of the prouder things I feel I've done in my adult education career was to have that program. That was a great program.*

CM: Somewhere in bringing in these other programs – the independent study and the school age mothers and so on and so forth – your title changed to reflect what was going on on campus.

PB: Right. Well, the director retired, and they asked me how to reconfigure the organization. We reconfigured it. And the superintendent at the time was very much interested in consolidating programs, so essentially, we created a program known as Educational Options. Educational Options was – the easiest way to describe it is that it's all the programs that weren't regular K-12 except for special education. So we took over all the state preschools, latchkey, child care centers, [and created before and after school care] on every elementary school campus, using portable buildings. So

* Teenage mothers would come to school with their children. We usually had thirty to forty mothers all working toward a high school diploma. We would graduate ten to twenty a year.

the administration of that program [family child care education] came to our Education Options operation. We enlarged significantly the Independent Study program with more teachers and recruitment for more students. At that time, we were allowed to [have] adults [in independent study], so that program even grew more because of the adults that didn't have their diplomas.

We still did the regular adult education [programs] for apportionment, but we made a major move in the fee based area, so for us, we had a significantly large fee based program that probably reached half a million dollars in the first couple of years of income from students paying fees for their classes.

CM: There were financial advantages to having these alternative programs on one campus. Can you address that a little bit?

PB: Well, just take my own position for an example. Rather than just being the director of adult education, I was able to split up my responsibilities where I was 40 percent adult education, 20 percent independent study, 20 percent family child care, [10 percent continuation high school], and 10 percent for the fee based [programs]. So I was able to maximize the use of the money that was being spent for me because it was coming from five different areas. And that happened with the co-administrators also. They had multiple responsibilities that were similar, even though the programs were different. We had one bookkeeper. We had to have several attendance people because those regulations were so stringent. But we were able to consolidate [positions wherever we could].

CM: When you're dealing with the alternative programs, the attendance becomes key.

PB: Oh, yes. But we were able to consolidate certain kinds of activities into one person

who had their finger in several different program areas, which I think fiscally was a sound thing to do.

CM: There always seemed to be a lot going on at school. Did you have a student government? It seems like the students were very active in a number of different things.

PB: No, we didn't have a student government as such. But because of the independent study high school, we did have a lot of activity there. The activity really was generated by the students themselves, along with the teaching specialists that we had, who were just creative and wanted to do things. They wanted to participate in Adult Education Week, and they wanted to have shows of what they could do in their classrooms using our multipurpose room and the stage. There was a lot of self-generated activity on the campus.

CM: And there was a student lounge too.

PB: Yes, we dedicated a student lounge, which very few districts had done at the time.* They had [comfortable] furniture, soft drink machines, and a snack bar, that kind of thing. There was also a microwave and a refrigerator so they could even cook their own meals if they wanted to.

CM: I know you did have very elaborate graduations. Do you want to talk about your graduations?

PB: Yes. I always wanted to have graduations with cap and gown for adults. I know a lot of districts didn't do that, and it probably had to do with the numbers, that they didn't have sufficiently large numbers. But from the very beginning when we thought we

* A new staff lounge was located in one of the cafeteria rooms.

were going to have maybe sixty graduates, we decided to do cap and gowns with the dark blue cap and gowns with a white tassel or a blue tassel, depending on female or male. And we did it in the gym. The gym would be filled. We'd have probably eighteen hundred people in the gym. [We] sat twelve hundred in the bleachers. And then we put up chairs on the floor for [the public]. One of the closed schools had a portable stage that was about twenty-by-twenty, and it was on wheels, folded up like an accordion. We talked somebody out of that and put that in the gym, and that became our stage for graduation. It was great. And for many years – I can't tell you exactly how many, but for many years – every single board member came to the graduation and was on the stage and stood in the receiving line.

CM: That's great.

PB: Yes, that was good.

CM: And that shows real support for your program.

PB: They were very, very supportive. And that tradition has continued. I talked to the director recently, and the same thing, all the board members showed up again. And they love it. They love it. Because it's a very personalized graduation, because even though we have a hundred and fifty or a hundred and sixty graduates, we still try to say something personal about each one of them so that when they hand us their three-by-five card with their name on it, there is a personalized statement from them and from us to them. Usually they thank a teacher or the school or their parents, and we thank them for whatever they did in terms of being one of our students.

CM: Did you have speakers at graduation?

PB: Oh, yes. We've had the mayor, and we've had – you name it, we've had (chuckles) as

many people as we could get in to be speakers.

CM: And student speeches as well?

PB: Yes. Two or three student speeches.

CM: The whole thing.

PB: And it was interesting because there was usually an ESL contingent that had finished ESL, gone through the diploma program, and they would be one of the speakers. Then there was the young parents' center, the pregnant minors, who had gone through the diploma program, and they would be one of the speakers. And then we would have one of the students from just the regular high school program for adults. We had a lot of unique things happen. Once we had the grandmother, the mother, and the son all graduating on the same stage at the same time.

CM: Oh, my goodness!

PB: Which is kind of unique.

CM: You must have gotten lots of publicity out of that.

PB: Susan Caruthers was our public relations person, and she would call Rico Chacon and all these people that she knew, and they would swarm us at night on graduation night. The channels were vying with each other to see who could get the most footage.

CM: What a nice position to be in.

PB: Yes, it was nice. It was just so positive for the school district. They loved us.

CM: Paul, you made a very fleeting reference a few minutes ago to IRCA and SLIAG. That certainly was a part of what I refer to as trends and issues of the eighties. Let's talk about the amnesty program and SLIAG and how that impacted your school.

PB: We could not sustain the impact of that program on our campus. I really had to arm

wrestle with the deputy superintendent in charge of business and finance to let us get some extra classrooms. They allowed us to take over two wings of a closed middle school that was about a mile and a half away, and we opened fourteen classrooms to provide for this particular program. It was run by Tom Reid, one of our specialists on our staff. It was a large program and was very successful. I think we did very well in it.

CM: And that was the result of legislation granting amnesty, but it carried with it an educational component.

PB: Yes. And vocationally too. We tried to do some things in the vocational education area for some of our students.

CM: You said that you took over fourteen classrooms. In my school, it literally doubled our ESL population. Is that about the proportion in your district as well?

PB: At least. These classrooms had been closed. They'd been boarded up. But the district came through again as they did with our original site, and they helped us clean up the place and painted it up a little bit so it looked appropriate, and cleaned up the inside of the classrooms. So we had good facilities. They weren't trashy facilities. They were really good facilities. The students liked to come there. It was right on a major bus route, so that always was good.

CM: You made reference earlier also to having a lot of Asians, and this of course was the second wave of the Southeast Asian refugees that came starting in 1980. Did they present any special circumstances that you needed to address?

PB: Well, I think because of the variation of their backgrounds in terms of the amount of education they had – some absolutely illiterate even in their own language, all the

way up to those that were advanced. It forced us to really start to subdivide our program. Where we may have had beginning, intermediate, and advanced classes, we ended up probably having eight different categories to try to address all of them. And of course, that meant the initial screening and the testing that we had to do with our counselors. The students became more and more important, so we ended up having a full-time counselor just to deal with that.

CM: Certainly one of the major trends in the state during the eighties was the competency based adult education (CBAE) movement, and that tied in very well with the refugees coming because of its emphasis on adapting your instruction to meet the needs of the students. Do you want to say anything else about that CBAE mandate?

PB: Well, I always felt that that's the way our education should be structured on the whole, not just adult basic education or competencies for adult, but competencies throughout the whole system, so it made a lot of sense to us philosophically as a school organization. And we just adhered to it and did the best we could with it.

CM: And GAIN (Greater Avenues to Independence, a welfare reform program)?

PB: We were involved in GAIN but not as significantly as I felt we could have been. The demographics in our county were such that most of the GAIN students were on the east side, in the Eastside School District, so we did not see a large number of them. But we had enough where we did have a half-time specialist to oversee the program, to make sure of attendance records, and things like that, and that GAIN requirements were being met. [She was] an outreach and follow-up person for those students. We never really achieved large numbers, [possibly sixty at maximum].

CM: I think also, for a short while anyway – I don't know how many years – but you

housed the CASAS (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System) north office.

Ardis Breslauer.

PB: Yes, I think we had Ardis in room sixteen on our campus, which was also originally where DNAE was when they first came to our campus. Ardis was an employee there. [She operated] independently [of us]. We didn't have much to do with her other than try to provide in-kind support. They were fledgling themselves at the time. They were trying to make do with what they had.

CM: But didn't Ardis also work with your refugee program?

PB: Yes, she did.

CM: As an employee of yours.

PB: Yes, she did both.

CM: Okay.

[end tape one, side A; begin side B)

June 12, 2001

CM: This is tape one, side B, of the Paul Belomy interview. Since adult education never stays static, there were some other things that came up, particularly in the late eighties and early nineties, that impacted the entire state, and that was concurrent enrollment* and independent study. Do you want to elaborate on those and how that evolved, what it led to?

PB: Well, in the state, from what I know - and I was not one of those individuals or districts that would be one of the "bad guys" - there was an increase in concurrent enrollment which was astronomical. And the reason adult education administrators

* Refers to students attending high school and adult school at the same time.

were doing that, I think, was to obtain the K-12 revenue limit, which was nearly twice to three times as much as the adult education revenue limit for those concurrent students. Santa Clara had a reasonable number of concurrent students. We stayed within the guidelines of the majority being adults and less than 51 percent being youth from the high schools.

We did, though, find that the law at that time, from our interpretation and what we had from the state, was that independent study was allowed for adults because the basic statement was that if an adult did not have a diploma, that he was eligible for high school and he could go to any high school in the state and actually enroll. Most principals of a high school did not see that as a viable option. What they'd usually do, if confronted with that problem, they'd send that person to adult education because they were an adult. Well, a number of districts in the state saw that as an opportunity to create a new program, because apportionment was locked in. We couldn't go beyond our caps.* And that allowed us to expand in the area of independent study for adults under the K-12 regulations. Santa Clara did get involved in that significantly because we felt that there should be nothing constraining adults from getting a diploma.

Two factors there. One was that the funding was going to again be K-12 type funding because these were [high school diploma] students – even though they were older – that were eligible for high school subjects. They didn't have the time to spend twenty hours a week or ten hours a week or four nights a week in school; whereas,

* A school's cap refers to the maximum number of a.d.a. that will be funded by the state. Its purpose is to control growth and thus control the total amount of money spent on adult education.

they could do school work on weekends or some days when they wanted to. So it seemed like an appropriate way to deal with independent study for these students.

Well, that issue, the issue of ESL supplemental funding, concurrent enrollment, and adult education in general became the basis for the joint funding proposals that came out of the early nineties. The prime mover on that was Ray (Dr. Raymond) Eberhard, the state administrator, director for adult education. [What was created] was a combined [legislative] bill that took adult education apportionment, took ESL supplemental dollars, took independent study adult a.d.a. dollars, and also – I'm forgetting the fourth one.

CM: Concurrent.

PB: Concurrent enrollment. See, I wasn't involved in that, that much. And what the state did was come up with a formula where they put all their dollars together, all of the money together, and created what they called a hold harmless package, where each district would still get essentially the same amount of money that they got before, and the a.d.a. would be calculated by lumping those four programs' a.d.a together. That then created a new revenue limit for each individual district, plus a new cap for each individual district within the state.

Along with that legislation, there was other legislation to clean up the problems with concurrent enrollment and how it was being dealt with in the state by administrators. Cleaned up, saying that adults in independent study really were adults, and they should only retain the adult education revenue limit. So that really cleaned up a lot of the problems we were facing. It became horrendous for some districts in the state because of the financial losses that they were going to look at

because of the significant numbers of concurrent that they had, and then they were going to have to reduce that. We were not involved in any of those lawsuits, and I'm not that familiar with all of the details.

CM: Okay. It was around that, though, that the lawsuits were filed?

PB: Right. The early nineties. I would say probably '93 would be my guess.

CM: And it was over what? Pay-backs, or how much money they had coming from these?

PB: Yes. The design of the legislation was what we would call – those of us in the field that dealt with this – we called it squeeze and freeze legislation. In other words, we knew some districts, because they had such large numbers of concurrent, had significantly more funding available than other districts. So the squeeze and freeze was designed to set up a statewide number for the revenue limit. Initially, it started with a low value for those districts that didn't do concurrent and didn't do adult education independent study, and then it had a higher revenue limit for those that did. The idea was to bring those two revenue limits together. They said it would take five to six years, and essentially, it's taken almost ten years, but they are together, or within about a hundred and fifty dollars of each other now. Whereas, before, [there was as much] as fourteen hundred dollars difference in the revenues.

CM: I know that reform legislation was a *major* accomplishment.

PB: It sure was.

CM: Even though some districts, as you say, lost money from it.

PB: Right.

CM: There was one other aspect of that reform legislation, Paul, and that was the new schools.

PB: Yes, that to me was – it goes back to something we talked about earlier, and that is that when Prop 13 hit, a real disparity [was created] in the state with respect to a.d.a. But there was another major problem. That was, no new schools could come on board and offer adult education. Yet there were many school districts that wanted to offer adult education, but the law had stopped that from occurring. This new legislation opened the door by allowing a school district to apply for fifteen units of a.d.a. to start an adult education program. About a hundred and fifty-five school districts took advantage of that, did apply, and they were supported by the Department of Education and field colleagues that went out to different districts in the state to help put programs together. The intent was that every year the number of a.d.a. would increase by at least fifteen units, and that did happen for – at least one year it did go to thirty, and then they did get growth. It ended up, I think we're at about thirty-three units right now for those programs. But it did bring on a hundred and fifty-five new school districts, which added to the two hundred and seventy or so that were in existence at Prop 13 time.

CM: So half again as many.

PB: Right.

CM: We might just mention that part of the need for new school districts was not just the desire of a school district to enter adult education, but in point of fact there again, population shifts in the state. So that rural districts that used to not have a need suddenly found themselves

PB: Starting up the new school districts, that was great, but I think there was a void in the legislation, and it was definitely because of funding. That void was, there were many

small school districts that didn't get any assistance. I remember very clearly here in Milpitas where I live now, Rich Barbier was the director of adult education. And he had a hundred and twenty units of a.d.a. and the community that he first took over probably was fifteen thousand people. Now it was forty thousand people and he still had a hundred and twenty or so units of a.d.a., so he constantly was on the bandwagon to try to improve that status of that size school district. And that has not changed or improved at all. They get some growth, but there's been no real improvement of that disparity in the state.

CM: Paul, you've had experiences as the top adult administrator in two different districts. I know that you're generally knowledgeable about what went on in a lot of the other districts. I'd like for us to talk just a minute about the relationship of adult schools to their parent districts and some of the issues that that brings out.

PB: I think I'll talk beyond the two school districts.

CM: Yes. That's what I want you to do.

PB: The thing I've seen statewide is that many adult education programs have to fight for recognition within their own school district. And when I say recognition, that's everything from yes we are part of the district, yes we do hire certificated teachers, yes they do have to go to college and get master's degrees, yes we do have a smaller revenue limit, et cetera. So there are many issues that I think create the impression that we're almost like a stepchild in the system. That's very bothersome to adult administrators. I'd say that that's pronounced. It's not just in a few districts, it's probably most districts.

There was a time when adult education probably was a cash cow in some

ways that they had low overhead, because the teachers were hourly, no unions, et cetera, and the districts were taking the excess funding and using it to support the regular general programs. Legislation was passed there, also, to stop that, where the legislation said monies collected in adult education needed to be spent in adult education and not on the general fund. And vice versa - the general fund is not supposed to support adult education.

That's been a difficult row to hoe. A typical example of the disparity there is that when lottery monies were given to the districts, adult education lottery money was based on apportionment that the district submitted, and the adult education a.d.a. was part of that calculation. So the district received dollars for adult education enrollment; yet many school districts – probably most – did not transfer any lottery funds to adult education, which again said, okay, we're a stepchild and you're taking money that we should normally have to run the general programs.

CM: I think very few adult programs got their lottery money. Did you in Santa Clara?

PB: No, we didn't. But they are now.

CM: Are they now?

PB: They finally turned it around with a new superintendent and a new attitude.

CM: I know Los Angeles, which is the largest one, did not get lottery money. So it's really the exception for that lottery money to go. Okay. You've touched on this, but let's concentrate just a little bit on the fiscal issues between adult education and district offices.

PB: Okay. The fiscal issues – the first part would be that you need to understand the difference in the revenue limit in either a high school district or unified district and

the adult programs. Typically, the adult program, say right now in this year, is making around twenty-one hundred dollars per a.d.a., which has its own formula for its basis. A unified district and a union high school district, their a.d.a. revenue limit is probably in the neighborhood of fifty-five to sixty-five hundred dollars. So you can see that there's a definite discrepancy between the amount of money that the K-12 system gets for its programs versus what the adult education program gets.

What's happening is that, over the years, many adult school programs' personnel have unionized, or come under the umbrella of the district union. What's occurred now is that raises are being given to the regular K-12 system, and these raises are being given also at a similar level to the adult schools. Well, it's one thing to have a revenue limit of fifty-five hundred dollars and give a raise of 2 percent. It's a lot different to give a raise at 2 percent when you're only drawing down twenty-one hundred dollars. So that's forcing a real financial crunch for many of the school districts.

Plus, you have to look at medical benefits, which most adult education didn't have to offer to their part-time employees because of the nature of the employment. So right now, I think, districts are in a major fiscal crisis in the state. You hear rumors, or you hear statements about an adult education program going bankrupt. Or you hear the statement, "They're going to have to close down because they don't have the money," or "They're cutting programs," which is self-defeating, because once you cut programs, you get less a.d.a., less revenue, so it becomes a total disaster, I guess, for school districts.

The fiscal problems are getting worse. When I first came on board, the one

thing I saw when I started to do budget and fiscal presentations for staff development was that many adult education administrators had no idea of how their budget was put together. They would say somebody downtown put the budget together. Or they wouldn't even be given dollar figures, they would be given FTE (full time equivalent) numbers, and that's what they were told: "You have so many hours of instruction, so hire the people to do that."

CM: And that's disastrous for an adult education program.

PB: Oh, sure, sure. Most people didn't know what is an S form, which is the form that identifies the adult education revenue limits, the caps, et cetera, and what we're going to get for apportionment. Most [adult schools] didn't even know that the district office got that kind of information. So what I think I found in my initial working in staff development with administrators is that they really didn't have any idea how the budgets were put together, how much money they were going to have, so it was kind of a crap shoot in a way of, we'll do what we can and see what happens.

CM: Just as an aside, you might say that the courses that are given for the administrative credential don't deal with adult education.

PB: Exactly. Right. That, I think, caused a fiscal crisis too because nobody was really monitoring those budgets. Then when the law changed, it said adult education monies have to be spent in adult education and not commingled with general fund, et cetera. Then everybody started to get more aware of what needed to happen, and that's, I think, when we see administrators trying to work their own budgets, find out about their own budgets, and then monitoring them. The only problem is, there's not enough money right now to really maintain a stable program.

- CM: Another fiscal aspect, Paul, is – and then you can elaborate on this – the fact that adult education is legislatively considered a categorical program
- PB: That's been in and out. We've been categorical, we've been non-categorical. We had the sunset law that we dealt with. Every five years, we would have to go through a whole sunset report (to justify continued existence of the program), or we were going to be sunsetted again. Finally, they got rid of that, fortunately. But, yes, the whole issue of categorical just lumps us in with special education, migrant education, et cetera.*
- CM: And it's particularly important when you talk about the COLA (cost of living adjustment), because sometimes the district will get a COLA, but the categorical programs won't.
- PB: And that's happening – that's very definite right now, where there were a couple of years when the district would get close to 5 percent and the adult education would get 2-1/2 percent. And all that did was exacerbate the problem of the revenue limit getting further and further apart between the two systems.
- CM: Okay. In connection with these fiscal issues, Paul, can you tell us a little bit about use of facilities and whether they are or are not paid for within a district.
- PB: All right. That was a major, major issue in the early nineties. I'm glad you brought it up because we have districts that were using the adult education system as a cash cow, as I mentioned, until the legislation was passed. But it took some districts a number of years to effect that legislation, that the monies should not be commingled.

* Categorical funds are "add-ons" to base funding. Some special programs receive money above the district's standard revenue limit. Adult education has its own revenue limit and is not part of K-12's base funding.

In turn, the districts tried to figure out, what should we be charging adult education in order to have them pay for their responsible costs? And what occurred was that they came up with a couple of ideas. One was that there would be an 8 percent rule, which would cover all the indirect cost, or there was the state average indirect value that was identified by the state. Under that was a subcategory that a district would use the lower of the state's average or their own average indirect cost rate that they reported to the federal government for their indirect rates. So that, then, gave us several options as to how districts could collect indirect dollars from the individual adult education programs.

One of the issues right away came out that, what can you charge under indirect costs, and what's allowable? And what we were finding is that many districts were [charging] rent for the use of district facilities by adult education programs, and that's specifically prohibited by the law, that rental is not an indirect cost to charge to an adult school as you would an outside agency. You can charge them for direct support costs, and those direct support costs would be for water, electricity, hand towels, custodial cleaning up the room, et cetera. But not saying that a district room can be rented to another program within the district. That was illegal. That still goes on in the state, unfortunately, and that will, I think, come back and bite certain districts.

CM: It does still go on, for sure. So that's another problem that we have. Paul, you were always considered on the cutting edge of adult education. And we certainly have talked about that some in terms of the changes that you've made in programs as you've gone into these school districts, and then completely setting up the program in

Santa Clara. Tell us just a little bit about what your philosophy of adult education is.

How are you looked at as on the cutting edge? (chuckles)

PB: That I can't tell you. (both laugh) I really don't know about that.

CM: Well, you can tell us about your philosophy.

PB: I can tell you what my philosophy is, and my philosophy is that everyone is welcome to the education table, that we should not leave anyone away from the table. So if somebody wants some type of educational item, they have the right to come to an adult school or community college, and partake of education, to have them get [what] they're seeking, whatever that is. And that makes you an open system, a very open system, that you're not going to be turning people away. It forces you to be reactive to your clients in terms of setting up the kinds of classes that they're looking for, or you think that they would look for.

And that's why we expanded beyond the apportionment driven programs into what we call community based or fee based or entrepreneurial type programs, because there we could offer, with qualified teachers, programs for the community that they paid for totally. That was one of, I think, the creative, innovative things that I was involved with early on. In fact, going back into the seventies when I was in Fremont, and I can recall heated arguments with my mentor, Lee Clark, who was driving an apportionment driven program and didn't believe in entrepreneurial fee based classes. We would discuss it ad nauseum. He finally came back to me in about the early eighties and said, "You were right. This was a savings for us."

And that all basically came about because he felt the same impact that we all felt when Prop 13 hit, was that if you have all your eggs in one basket in terms of the

way you're operating, just with apportionment, and they do something like they did with Prop 13 and cut you back by a half, then your programs are decimated. And that's when I made the decision that I would not have all my financial eggs in one basket, so I went to more grants, I went to entrepreneurial fee based classes and apportionment and tried to blend those so that if one got hurt, the rest were still alive. That might have been considered cutting edge, but at least it was something that almost all the districts are doing now because it's part of the survival.

One thing I'm kind of happy about that occurred, and I'm not sure why this is so. It probably was because of some training I received when I went to Berkeley working on my doctorate. For a whole year, I had a sabbatical from the Fremont district. The idea of involvement and the way you make decisions and how you delegate. I spent a lot of time studying that and trying to see what the research said, and it became very obvious that you give people a job, you give them the resources to do the job, and you let them go with it and just try to monitor them as best you can. And that's helped me a lot in terms of the training of the people in my own system. Because a number of them have gone on to other areas. In some ways, that may be considered cutting edge because three or four people from my system now are [directors of] schools of their own.

CM: Talk a little bit about . . .

PB: And I never got caught. (both laugh) Sorry.

CM: Talk a little bit about – not just the formal but also the informal ways that adult schools worked together and why that was necessary.

PB: I think probably the best way to put that in perspective is, if you come from a K-12

school into the adult education program as an administrator, your eyes pop wide open, because adult education people throughout the state are very giving kinds of administrators. They're working with the disadvantaged students in many cases, and that's just where their heart is, to help these different kinds of students. So what we do, typically, is we share. You talk to a high school principal that comes to adult education as a new administrator, they don't have that ability. They don't have other people they can share with. Their conferences that they had statewide are different than what adult education does. So there's a real give-and-take. We share curriculum, we share forms, we proselytize from each other's ideas. It's just a very open system where we're all interested in everybody succeeding, not just a competition kind of a thing. I think that's the critical part.

CM: And part of that is almost necessary because you're one of a kind in your district.

PB: Right.

CM: So if you're going to talk to anyone with the same interests that you have, it's going to be

PB: So all of the stepchildren, or all the lepers are put in the same place, and we deal with our leper colony.

CM: There certainly are some more formal ways as well. You may want to make some comments on the professional organizations, and then we'll go on to the state consortium. But what about ACSA and CCAE (California Council for Adult Education)?

PB: We're very fortunate, I think, to have several organizations that are very active in the state that do support adult education. ACSA, of course, is just for administrators, and

they probably have approximately five hundred adult school administrators that have joined their ranks out of the fifteen or sixteen thousand in ACSA. So that's been a good thing for us. We've been able to have a state level committee made up of eighteen regions, where an adult education rep from each region goes and meets at those state meetings. So that has given us a real strong voice in ACSA. We've been fortunate that Bob Wells, who is currently the executive director, has been very pro-adult education in terms of the legislation that they sponsor and the way he feels about our programs. He comes and talks to our conferences almost every year because he has a good feeling about what we do. ACSA is a strong organization, and for many years, they were the fiscal agent for many of our grants, especially the ones that Santa Clara and I promoted in terms of having them be the fiscal agent.

CCAIE, a strong organization too, maybe three thousand members. They allow everybody to be members – [administrators], teachers, counselors, classified, students even are members of CCAIE. They are strong on supporting and recognizing teachers and the good work that teachers do, and I think we need an organization that does that because it complements what ACSA does because it supports and does things for administration.

The third organization, CAEAA (California Adult Education Administrators Association), was an organization that was around for a while in the seventies. They disbanded and started up again in the mid-eighties. They represent administrators and the rights of administrators and really promote legislation from an administrator's viewpoint in the state for adult education. So you've got three organizations that give you a good blend.

There's a fourth organization that we don't hear too much about, which we'll talk a little more about later.

CM: Yes, I'll ask you in a minute. I did just want to comment – because you mentioned Bob Wells. I recall his saying that the legislative efforts of the adult education committee were exemplary as far as – the rest of ACSA should look at them for guidance.

PB: The ACSA Committee for Adult Education and the CCAE Leg(islation) Day – I think we represent a strong force that go to the legislature. That's part of what we do locally too is we all try to find out who's representing me up there in Sacramento. Of course, that's become a major issue now because [term limits force them to] change seats every two, four, six, eight years.

CM: Yes, too often.

PB: So keeping them informed or knowledgeable has become a major issue for us.

CM: Paul, you and, I believe, Lee Clark were instrumental in the organization of the California State Consortium for Adult Education (CSCAE). Tell us what that is, what need it fulfilled, and your role in that.

PB: Thank you for asking that question. (chuckles) This is one of those volunteer things you do in your life.

[end tape one, side B; begin tape two]

CM: This is tape two, side A, of the Paul Belomy interview.

PB: The California State Consortium for Adult Education was an idea that germinated in the early eighties. It came about because every time we would go to the legislators to talk about our program, they would say, "Who are you? Are you the community

college system? You mean you're part of the school district?" So the word came out that we were the best kept secret in the state of California. And that was said many, many times to us. So a few of us talked about it, and finally, Lee Clark, under his impetus really and my help, we sat down one day, got a group of people together and came up with [the idea to] do something to promote adult education on a larger basis than us doing it individually in our own school districts. And we organized a group of school districts, adult education systems, and we called ourselves the Bay Area Consortium for Adult Education (BACAE), and that was 1985. The intent would be that we would do things to help with public relations using the newspaper and print media, using radio, television, and whatever other way we could to get the word out about what adult education was. We charged a dollar per unit of a.d.a. to be a member of the organization and have this service provided to you.

The initial intent was that we would have five major promotional activities during the year. One would start with the opening of school. We would have one that was in January, which was for the comeback student, or we called it "Drop in Day for Dropouts," which some people thought was negative, but it was very similar to the smoke-enders day. We had, of course, graduation at the end of May or middle of June, and then we would have a couple of others that changed periodically. One was the citizen of the year, somebody that went through our citizenship program, or the ESL student of the year, or the parenting student of the year, the vocational education student of the year, or the senior adult of the year. So we had five major promotional activities and also Adult Education Week, which was something that we did in conjunction with the NAPCAE way back when, the National Association for

Public Continuing and Adult Education, which Tom Damon (Palo Alto Adult School), who was also one of my mentors, was a member and a leader. And then AAACE (American Association of Adult and Continuing Education). So we did promote Adult Education Week in conjunction with whatever week they chose.

We would do things such as put public service announcements together and would mail them to the districts so that they could use them on [local] radio, on TV, and in print. Announcements would have different lengths of time. Some were fifteen seconds long, some were thirty seconds long, et cetera. And that's how we promoted it. We did all this free stuff for the [districts] in terms of helping them promote adult education.

Within one year, we had probably about sixty school districts take advantage of the service and pay the one dollar per a.d.a. We started to get inquiries from southern California – even though we had a number of people that did join – [asking] how come it's the Bay Area Consortium? So within one year, we grew so rapidly and there was so much interest that we expanded to the California State Consortium for Adult Education.

We created bylaws. We organized as a non-profit organization. We had a board that worked voluntarily, no remuneration whatsoever, and we continued to hire the consultant that we had the first year, who was Robert Bestor and Associates. He was a public relations man that worked in Oakland for the Oakland Warriors basketball team as one of their promo people. And his wife, Liz Bestor, was an adult education teacher in Fremont Unified School District, so he had an insight into what adult education was all about.

The organization was successful. We did a lot of promos. We got some money from the state to put together a couple of videos that were shown on TV as public service announcements. One was called "Doors" and the other one was called "Diplomas." And it dealt with adult education people, the diversity of the students, the diversity of the programs in terms of what we were trying to do. We felt it was pretty successful. A lot of the school districts used it locally or within their own PR, within their own system.

CM: We still have copies of those in the adult education archives in Sacramento.

PB: They should be. They may be used again because they were quality work that was done by

CM: I mean, there are multiple copies there. They can be handed out.

PB: Good. It's good to know that. I don't think Bob has any more. But we would do things, like we would print up balloons that said, "Adult education. We're here for you." We'd print up badges and banners, and things like that, anything that we could to promote.

Then we came up with the idea that we need to have a better communication system amongst ourselves as adult educators. So we put together a directory. Started on a low basis and then we expanded it. The directory was initially just all of the lead administrators from every school district. And that has subsequently exploded into – not only do we have the administrator from every school district, we have all the coordinators of the special programs, such as ESL, vocational education, parenting, et cetera. We list all of the e-mails of all of the individuals that have e-mails. We list all of the key numbers of the state office consultants and programs that we deal with.

So it's become a very viable document that a lot of people use, and we get a lot of good feedback on it.

We went out and we solicited some of our vendors to contribute to help offset the cost of this. And we do have some vendors that are doing that right now, and it's been very valuable for us.

About five years ago – no, a little less than that – about four years ago, some of our board members said, "We've got to go another direction." They were tired of the five events, et cetera. So we had a brainstorming session, a work group kind of session, and we reorganized how we were going to deal with things. The group decided to create monthly newsletters called *The California Insider*, and those monthly newsletters are sent out to all adult education administrators. There's about seventeen hundred copies that go out to legislators, et cetera, to try to explain from a more human interest viewpoint, and information viewpoint, what's happening with adult education in the state. That's been very, very successful. Again we went out entrepreneurally, and we found someone to support that for us, from one of our vendors. So these are dollars that, for us, are very valuable.

CM: So it's still pretty active then.

PB: Right. We have over a hundred and twenty members right now. Many of the school districts that are large have difficulty with the payment formula, so they have not joined in this effort.* They use their own PR people locally to do their work for us. A number of the districts – as I said, over a hundred and twenty – are with us right now. It's still viable. It's still active. Robert Bestor and Associates is still the

* Some of the larger districts provide in-kind services in lieu of a fee.

consultant that we hire.

We've moved up to the point now where the directory now is online through the OTAN web page. We have our own web page there also. The directory is – we're able to access it and change data on it as administrators, addresses change, et cetera. We can do that online. We put the five initial functions for PR online so that there are PSA's (public service announcements) there, there are activities, et cetera, that we still use to demonstrate how we can promote public relations. So that's still going on.

CM: Very good. Now, Paul, you have served in several different kinds of advisory roles in the state. Let's start with the We've talked about the professional organizations, but what about the relationship of the professional organizations to the California Department of Education, to the Adult Education Unit?

PB: I always had the philosophy that the two major organizations – now there's three – should definitely work in conjunction with the department. That to me was always very important, and I still believe that. And I think that's happening. You have a group now called Policy and Issues Committee, and they're made up of the representatives from the three major organizations, with a few field reps that represent the department. The department has had to take a new kind of role in terms of legislation and advocacy where they aren't able to really promote legislation the way they used to, and they really are advocates but they can't be so out front advocates. They're relying on the associations to be the advocates for the things we need in adult education. But they are still a very important role. I think we're very fortunate to have a program where there are consultants at the state level who are

trying to be knowledgeable about adult education and can come to the districts and help us with compliance issues, help us with regional meetings, help us get together to understand where things are going, what the laws are, et cetera. I'm very pro the department. I'm not sure that it's as strong as it once was in terms of the leadership it provided, and I don't know if we'll ever see that again because of the nature of the political . . .

CM: Of the personnel.

PB: . . . of the personnel and the political system that we deal with.

CM: Again, and this may be part of the change that you're saying we may not see this kind of thing again, but it seems like, in addition to the formal organizations and working together, that the Adult Education Unit had, I guess, what I think of as kind of a kitchen cabinet of informal advisors. I'm wondering if you can

PB: I was never part of that.

CM: (laughs) Oh, yes. (chuckles) I wonder if you can talk about this loose network of . . .

PB: I don't know how much it's happening now with the new leadership. I think what happened in the past is, because we were so closely aligned at the hip, marching the same direction, that it was important for the field colleagues to let the department know what was going on and vice versa. So I think there was a lot of communication. Some of it was done informally with what you call the kitchen cabinet, and they had other names – the Monday night group, or whatever – where they would do conference calling, et cetera. I was never really part of that part of it, but I did know some of the administrators that were at the state level, and I did make my influence

known. Hopefully, it wasn't just my influence but an amalgamation of what I thought my colleagues were asking in the area.

CM: Now, see, I would contend the kitchen cabinet meets on the golf course.

PB: (laughs) I couldn't say that.

CM: (laughs) Of course you can. You're not at work anymore. (chuckles)

PB: The kitchen cabinet, and what was the other thing that you called it?

CM: Well, just sort of a Now, you were also on a very formal planning committee with the strategic plan, and this was a major, major effort of advising the state.

PB: I've been very fortunate in my adult education career to be asked to be on a number of advisory committees. I served with Juliet Crutchfield (Consultant, Adult Education Unit) when we were dealing with high school standards many years ago. I dealt with Lynn Savage when we were dealing with ESL standards. I've had a lot of chances to do that kind of thing. I was on the advisory committee for the A-22 course approval process. Then Dr. Eberhard created the Strategic Plan Advisory Committee in the late eighties, '88, '89, I guess, and I was fortunate enough to become part of that whole effort. When they started the implementation – the study phase – of the fourteen [original Strategic Plan] recommendations, I was asked to chair the [committee for] "Funding to Meet Today's Needs" and "Funding for Innovation and Performance," the EduCard, and "Facilities for the Future."

Well, we spent almost all of our time dealing with the "Funding to Meet Today's Needs," and that's where that legislation that we talked about came from in the early nineties. "Funding for Innovation and Performance" led to the California Distance Learning Project. What we did there was, we had the 5% projects that we

got authorized by legislation which allow districts to take 5 percent of their programs and do innovative kinds of things, and that also led to the California Distance Learning Project (CDLP). The "Facilities for the Future," we never even got to talk about it. It was one of the lower level recommendations. Even though, now especially, with class size reduction in the school districts, it's becoming more and more important because many adult programs are being bumped out of facilities that were district facilities, and they're going begging for either community centers, churches, or whatever, to have their programs.

And then I was lucky enough to deal very specifically with the EduCard concept, which – after we discussed these recommendations and did some planning, we went to an implementation phase. And that started to occur in the early nineties. I was asked to chair the concept known as Learning Networks. Learning Networks were an effort to go to regions and have adult schools, community colleges, business and industry, and you name it, all types of stakeholders, to come together and collaborate in terms of what adult education was trying to do within that local region.

One of the concepts that was very exciting at the time was known as EduCard. EduCard was an actual credit card looking [smart] card with your name on it, and the intent was – and did have – a smart chip on it so that when that card was put through a scanner, we would have a software program that would be able to identify the student, addresses, phone numbers, that kind of thing, and the kinds of courses they were taking with us so that it would have a major connection to workforce training and the needs of GAIN and WIA (Workforce Investment Act), so that each individual would be able to track their progress on this card.

CM: And JTPA (Job Training Partnership Act) was still active at that time.

PB: Yes, JTPA, right. The card was also designed so that if you transferred from one educational program to another, your record would be available on this smart card. So you could go from Santa Clara Adult School to Sequoia Adult School, and they could just swipe the card and see what classes you had taken, et cetera.

CM: Or to a class that had been established by JTPA, or whatever.

PB: Exactly. Especially with - the Department of Social Service was one of our clients that we were really trying to satisfy by saying, here's information about this student that's really good information.

We ran two pilot projects, one down in Merced and one in a small community up in the mountains, the Sierras. They were pretty successful, but it was an idea that was before its time. The collaboration, bringing those people together, what they wanted to have on [the card], the security issues, all those things were ironed out, and the stakeholders were really talking to each other. But I think we were ahead of our time with respect to the way that card was going to be used. I think if that's ever resurrected in the near future, with the new technology that they have today, it would be, I think, a much more viable concept. I think Superintendent (Bill) Honig has card number one, Dr. Eberhard has card number two, and I think I have card number three.
(chuckles)

CM: Do you still carry it? (chuckles)

PB: I don't carry it, but I do have it.

CM: It seems like cost of implementation was one of the factors that kind of brought it to a halt - in terms of equipping everyone with the scanners, and that kind of thing.

PB: Yes, there were some costs involved that were pretty large, and that's why we needed to have improved software, which I think we're getting now. The banks are doing it, these calling cards that the telephone companies are using, the credit cards, and that kind of thing. I think those things are all helping. And I think the thing that really was the toughest was that the mobility of the adult student population is awesome. I don't think we totally understand the way these students move around. They lose jobs, they come into training, they leave training, they move to another area. Their mobility is so high that I don't think we understood the complexity of the potential.

CM: They're in class, they leave to take a job, they lose their job, they come back to class.

PB: Or they'll go to another school.

CM: They change from day to night. Yes. Certainly characteristics of our students that make tracking very difficult.

PB: I'm sure we'll see that, because the seed has been planted. It'll germinate.

CM: It will come back again.

PB: Yes, it will.

CM: Okay. Paul, you are well known for the various types of leadership training that you've been involved in. We talked a little bit about the start of the Leadership Academy and Institute, and we may want to touch on that again. But I'd like to start at home, and that's your local mentoring. You've made reference to some of your coordinators that have gone on to head schools, but let's kind of nail that down. You have trained many adult education directors now, so I'd like to know how many, if you can remember, and how you organized your staff and trained them for leadership so that they were ready to go out and take on schools of their own.

PB: A lot of questions there that can't be answered very quickly, but I will try to do my best. In terms of the organization, the first thing I did was build a staff development room. It was Room 15 at adult education [site], and it had no classes in it. It was strictly for staff development and meeting kinds of activities. And I think by having that room available, it permitted me to schedule things on a very regular basis. We brought in outside people to help do our training. When it came to Schools Without Failure with William Glasser, we brought him in. When it came to some of his people that worked for him, we brought them in for reality therapy. We brought in people to help us with quality management training. We just continued those kinds of activities, involving as many of the staff as we could. Even the custodians and the classified were brought into these training sessions. We organized early on, because the district was [conducting] quality circle leadership training, and we just rode along on the district's coattails.

CM: Now, was this Santa Clara?

PB: This was Santa Clara, right. We rode on their coattails. Many of our individuals were trained, and we did set up quality circles at Santa Clara, which were invaluable. We probably had – at our high point, we probably had about nine different quality circles operating with anywhere from eight to twelve people on a circle, organized with a leader, a recorder, et cetera. [They centered on] topics that they would deal with and issues that they could take care of on their own, [as well as] issues that they would have to bring to management. It kind of created a full disclosure of everything that was happening in the system, so nothing was hidden or secret. They knew the budget. They saw copies of the budget. They knew what our shortfalls were. They

knew who was making how much money, et cetera. So the full disclosure was, to me, a way to build trust with the staff: You know what I do, you know what we're dealing with here. And I think that trust allowed us to take that step into the quality circle and really start to have very positive kinds of outcomes from that, where the facilities were improved, the staff reaction relationships were improved, the way the system functioned was improved. Because everybody was talking about the same thing. And in a circle, what you eventually did was, you tried to reach consensus without putting anybody down, so that everybody left the room being behind the decision that was made in that circle. That, to me, I think was very beneficial, and I'm happy that the district allowed us to be a part of that. We were not a stepchild in that one. We were really intimately involved with what they did.

CM: I'm impressed also that you brought in well-known experts to talk just to your staff.

PB: It was financially expensive, but it worked. It worked. I wish I could remember more of the names of some of them – Bill Green, I think, was one from Oxnard. There just were many, many people that came in to help us. And many of these people had worked in business and industry. Not that I want, necessarily, the philosophy of business and industry, but they do have some things that we can take on in the public sector that I think are very beneficial.

CM: You had – I believe they were still hourly, and you called them specialists, didn't you?

PB: Right.

CM: How many of those did you have, and what were their responsibilities?

PB: That was probably one of the unique things we did, so if you want to talk about

cutting edge stuff, that was probably one of them. The district – because we were new, there was some concern of the old regime of the district, not the superintendent. Mr. (Rudy) Gatti was very positive for us. But some concern that they didn't want to have too many administrators in adult education. They didn't understand our size, so they didn't want to put people on contract. So we came up with the idea, okay, then what we're going to do is, we'll have credentialed people taking on responsibilities beyond teaching. So they would share some of their teaching time with some specialist time.

And eventually, in some programs, it got to be so demanding that these specialists were 100 percent specialists in their particular program area. So they did everything just up to what the administrator had to do, such as evaluation, hiring, that kind of thing. But as far as operating the program, they really did 100 percent of the hands-on day-to-day of each of the programs. So there were specialists in all the program areas. Some had dual roles. Parenting education had one, senior adults, ESL, the independent study part of the program, handicapped, et cetera.

Eventually, the programs grew in size. When we had the combining legislation in the nineties, that's when the concept of Educational Options took hold, and because of that, we now are talking about a large amount of [combined revenue] compared to what we started with. So we were able to bring those people on board. Now there are five administrators, in addition to the director and the assistant director, right in the system. And they still have some specialists running the programs. Of course, those five administrators aren't just adult education. If you go back to the sharing of family education, vocational education, et cetera.

I'm proud of four of the people for sure that came up through that system. That's Ed Whitehead, who is now the director at Mountain View Adult School. Sharon Swindell, who is the director, principal at Sequoia Adult School. Sharon went to Morgan Hill first and then went to Sequoia. We have Sandy Steiger, who went to the Metropolitan program and then eventually is now the principal at Milpitas Adult School. And Danene Marciano, who took my job when I retired about five years ago. I'm proud of those individuals because they came up through the ranks of the system as specialists, then quasi-administrators, then they were given full administrative jobs. And now they've gone on to run their own programs.

CM: Didn't Larry North also get a school?

PB: No, he didn't get a school, but Larry and Pat Lawson got married. They were both [program managers], Larry with the independent study high school programs and Pat with the senior adults. And when they got married, they decided to move to San Luis Obispo, and they set up a private consulting firm. And also, they did some teaching in the area. Pat eventually went to work for the dean of fiscal programs – or fiscal something-or-other – at the college in San Luis, Cal Poly. Now, they're back in this area running programs for the private sector.

CM: Somehow I thought that Larry had a school. I want to mention something else about what I consider your local training, because I remember you taking – did you rent a bus or bring a van? – but it seems like all the state conferences, you brought all of your spccialists.

PB: (chuckles) Yes.

CM: And you always had one night out together for dinner and stuff. That's real team

building.

PB: Unfortunately, that's not possible any longer with the way the funding is. But we did that. People were willing to share rooms and drive if they had to, rather than fly, or whatever. That was very important to get the group together like that, because not only do you want to work hard but you want to have an opportunity to enjoy and relax together. Yes, that was always good. There were sometimes we brought a dozen people to a workshop. And they gained because they went to the sessions. We covered a lot of sessions so that when we'd go back and had our weekly or bi-weekly sessions, we'd be able to talk about what we picked up. We [took away] as much as we could from those workshops and tried to proselytize all the good ideas.

CM: Taking that many people to a state conference was really unusual. As I say, it seems like it paid off in so many ways for you.

PB: It was worth the expenditure.

CM: Then there have been various and sundry kinds of statewide training that you've done. You were designated CBAE administrator trainer (Competency Based Adult Education Staff Development project training). Do you want to say anything about that?

PB: In many cases, I was not a curriculum specialist as such, but I tried to assist those that were in charge whenever I could to be supportive as an administrator. Hopefully, I wasn't just a token administrator. Hopefully, I was there and was able to offer some advice. But I did work with the CBAE program. I did work with the ESL program, the standards and institute program. Didn't do a lot of the training. I was really there more as a support for the person that was directing the program since I was the fiscal

person responsible to ACSA, usually, or the school district.

Where I did start to do stuff on my own was when I finally got involved with the Institute-Academy, and there I did actually do workshops. They were mostly in the fiscal management area, customer service area, that kind of thing.

CM: I did just want to point out – when you said that you weren't much of a curriculum specialist on the CBAE training – the concept of CBAE was that it took a team. It took an administrator, your instructional people, and a counselor. And that it was only working together – I mean, the role of the administrator became quite strong, even if it was supporting your curriculum people.

PB: I shouldn't diminish it, but it was definitely a support element there too and showed that they had needs and I needed as an administrator to assist locally in those needs, yes.

CM: Before the Leadership Institute and Academy,^{*} it seems like you started your other statewide training with just new administrator workshops.

PB: Right.

CM: At the ACSA and CCAE conferences?

PB: Right. I did a lot of those individually, the one- and two-hour kinds of things. And then when the Institute-Academy was functioning, I did a lot of the fiscal management kinds of things, and the organizing of the conference with Lynda Smith (Consultant, Adult Education Unit) and a few of the others. Then finally Wally Copeland (Hayward Adult School) took over that responsibility, and he had it for a

^{*} This was a two-year training program for administrators. The Institute was year one, the Academy year two.

number of years, especially when it was under the Staff Development Institute. At the initial emphasis of the Staff Development Institute, he was the organizer and I was a presenter.

CM: You said the initial planning was you and Katy Leps (Morgan Hill Adult School) and Lynda Smith.

PB: Katy, Lynda Smith are the three I remember. I'm pretty sure Will Hopp (Simi Valley Adult School) was there. After that, I'm going to have to seek

CM: That's okay. When you went to Kellogg West, how many days did you spend there?

PB: Usually it was two and a half days, with accommodations and great food because of the nature of Cal Poly – Cal Poly Pomona. They fed us well and we had good workshop training, usually about thirty people in each group, the Institute and the Academy. A lot of networking. I think the success, not only of the basic training, but the success had to do with the networking of these individuals because they felt that they could pick up the phone and call somebody that they knew who knew about parenting education or knew about ESL, et cetera. And that I think was a real strong outcome of that effort.

CM: I just want to make a comment here, Paul. That Institute-Academy framework. You had two summers of two and a half days, and then you had two years of two days a piece. That's nine intensive days. That's much more than it does now.

PB: Right. I was directing the Learning Network project in the early nineties, so I had backed away from the Institute-Academy. And they changed the philosophy of the Institute-Academy when it became part of the Staff Development Institute (SDI) under the Sacramento County office. They went to a whole different approach, which

was more along the area of quality leadership training, that you would train the individuals and they would go back and become teacher trainers. So they walked away from the nitty-gritty, what I call "nuts and bolts," with quotes on it, kinds of activities. When I retired, I went to work for the Staff Development Institute as a consultant, administrator training consultant, and a presenter. I became a trainer in the quality leadership materials that Neil Malvetti (Sacramento County, Office of Education) put together and used within his own district in the county over there. Eventually, [SDI] only had one year of training. It was a totally different look. It was four days of training, one before ACSA, one before CCAE, and two days sometime during the year. I never felt it was enough.

What we found was, the group of participants didn't just want this leadership training where they were going to go back and become teacher trainers. They wanted to know about [basic things, such as] attendance. They wanted to know about fiscal, personnel, marketing, curriculum, et cetera. And the reason is – and it's become very obvious through [CSCAE]. We do a questionnaire now every year [to determine] how many new administrators are in the system. Well, you know, we have three hundred and seventy adult schools, and we're drawing down about eighty new administrators a year now that are brand new to the system and have no idea of adult education budgets or personnel or curriculum or standards, or whatever.

CM: That is such a need.

PB: So I think, from what I understand, the agency that got the new [staff development grant] – well, the last two years, we did start to go more toward nuts and bolts, and we've kind of melded some of the concepts of the leadership by using the things we

were learning there with the nitty-gritty kinds of presentations that we had. It worked out kind of well. I think what I'm hearing now is that the new grant that's out is going to go back to a two-year process where they will do a day before each conference, and they will do three days in the summer, and then they'll have a second year. So they'll be up to ten days, it looks like. The model is almost the model of the Institute-Academy where you'll have two classes going. So right now, they are rushing to finish the first session, which will be – they did one before CCAE. They'll be doing three days in July, and then they'll do one day in ACSA, and that class will move right into the second phase of being the Academy and a new class will come in being the Institute, and they will attend their first meeting in September.

CM: Are you continuing to work with that?

PB: Yes, I am.

CM: So hopefully, you can get back to the nuts and bolts of fiscal management.

PB: Right. (chuckles)

CM: Since our adult administrators are dead in the water if they don't know how to look after their own money.

PB: Yes. That and personnel, I think, are very high priorities. I found also that one of the things you need to teach is skills and techniques of running an organization or running a meeting or getting things done, so [you need to incorporate] the whole idea of brainstorming, consensus building, team building, doing things like continuous improvement and collaborative problem solving. All these things are, I think, very, very important, and they need to be blended into the training, along with fiscal, et cetera. And I think they could come up with a good, fine model.

I've probably done work in about twenty-five school districts since I semi-retired, and it's been a whole spectrum of things. I've done audits to help districts get ready for an independent study audit or an adult education audit. I've helped school districts by doing management reorganization, delving into that to see what their organizational structure would be like, especially when a key administrator left and they have an opportunity to reorganize.

One of the things I really have fun doing is quality customer care and service. That's become one that I've done maybe about five or six times in districts, and that one I really like.

CM: We wanted to talk about that because we kind of missed it a little earlier. Why don't you go ahead and talk about customer service.

[end tape two, side A; begin side B]

CM: This is tape two, side B, of the Paul Belomy interview.

PB: [One of the goals] that we came up with in our [Santa Clara] Adult Education program is that we wanted to be the best adult education program around. How do you demonstrate that? We came up with the model that we wanted to be the Nordstrom of adult education, because everybody knows about the customer service that you get at Nordstrom. Not that we're going to play pianos in the corridor or anything, but it just is awesome in terms of how they work with the customer and the way the store's organized, et cetera. So that was the model that we created. We were the Nordstrom of adult education. That started the whole concept of customer quality care and service.

That allowed us to do some internal training, where we learned the idea that

there are internal customers, such as your staff; there are external customers, such as your students; and there are end users. They all have a need and we'd better recognize what that need is and try to adjust to that need.

CM: The parent district is also one of those very important sets of customers.

PB: Right. And they could be internal, external, or an end user. Spent a lot of time with the group dealing with that and had to, of course, mix groups so that the classified staff knew what they were doing to the administrators, and the administrators knew what they were doing to the teachers, whatever. Got some good materials together that demonstrate fabulous service to customers and what it means and how it pays off for you. And some of the statistics, which are awesome, about what it takes to gain a customer, student, and what happens when you lose a customer. That was very significant when you can see that you lose a customer, and they'll probably never come back, and they'll spread the word to (chuckles) hundreds of others by the time they're finished. So it was very important to give everybody in the system the ability to handle problems as best they saw fit and do it in a very nice way.

So you really are giving personnel, staff of all levels, the ability to be accountable for who they're talking to and take care of somebody's problem, if it's a problem. The idea of a problem as a gift, in some ways, if we know about it, we can take care of it. If we don't know about it, we're in trouble.

CM: I suppose this became an important part of the administrative training that you were doing in the Institute and the Academy as well. Paul, I'm correct, and I think you mentioned this but just for clarification, that the first Institute-Academy that you put together was co-sponsored with ACSA, CCAE, and then the State Department funded

it.

PB: Right. That was one of the things that we felt was important to put those three organizations together at the time. And initially, the two organizations contributed money to support, with the CDE (California Department of Education) [providing the] major funding. Then that dropped away. I don't know what the reason was, but that dropped away. But that model of having those three organizations – or the two organizations and the state – working together led to the Executive Development Program (EDP). That came out of that model.

In the Institute-Academy, with the two organizations and the state, I think we can show that we have about four hundred and fifty people who were actually participants from the year 1985 to the year 2000. In EDP, the Executive Development Program, there were two or three years of that, and I would say that we had anywhere from twenty, thirty people a session, so we probably trained another sixty. So the actual staff development impact is well over five hundred people. Then if you take the people at the local districts that were supporting the effort – every participant had to have a sponsor, an administrator who was a sponsor – there were probably well over a thousand people that were somehow involved in the impact on the staff development, which is pretty significant.

CM: Yes, it is. You say the EDP grew out of the Institute and the Academy.

PB: Right.

CM: Tell us what it was

PB: The Institute-Academy, the very first few classes were designed for current administrators that were around for a while. And it worked pretty well. You've got a

lot of the power elite in the state. Those administrators attended. Then it became a program for new and aspiring administrators and stayed that way for a few years. Then we realized the old-timers were starting to get left behind with some of the new things that were happening, so we said, why don't we try to set up a program for the old-timers, or the well-established adult school administrator. And the Executive Development Program was an outgrowth of that, with the idea that we would have topics such as strategic planning, much more in-depth technology training, much more in-depth curriculum and instruction kinds of things. So beyond the nitty-gritty nuts and bolts into what they could do when they went back to their system to try to improve their overall system, such as through strategic planning.

From that group grew the concept of the PROS (Professional Resources Outreach System). I really think Ed Whitehead can be pinned as the person that came up with the name PROS at one of our EDP meetings. He had several others that we can't mention, but (chuckles) I'm sure he was the one. He could probably tell you more than I can. But the idea was to create a list of professional adult education administrators in the state and then identify their expertise areas and create a matrix of that fiscal, marketing, personnel, whatever, and then utilize these people to go out and be mentors, assistants, or advisors to other administrators, especially new adult education administrators, that were in their region.

CM: And this was formed immediately after the legislation for the new schools, wasn't it?

PB: Right. That was one of the things where they really first came into effect where we were put into teams of three, four, five people, and we went to the regional meetings throughout the state where the new small districts were showing up, and we

committed ourselves to help them with putting a package together. Because they were starting from scratch too. They didn't have adult education programs. So they faced the same kinds of things I did when I started Santa Clara's program.

That's where the PROS came from. It probably didn't get off the ground as well as it should. It's a lot of commitment from an individual who's trying to run their own program to take time and go to another program and spend a day or two or three a year. But I think the intent was there, and I think the PROS wanted to do it. They probably wanted to be more involved, and I think with a little more energy and a little more financing to support their travel, et cetera, which definitely shouldn't have come from the individual schools, that it could have gone quite far.

It resurrected itself about a year ago with a concept known as field colleagues. What happened there was the state actually trained six people, I think it was, to be field colleagues. A couple from the small districts, et cetera. And it was going to be a small pilot of the old PROS concept. I don't know where that is at this point in time.

CM: Paul, it sounds like, from what you've said, that when the Staff Development Institute was formed and took over the administrative training, it seemed to be the EDP portion that it took over and dropped the aspiring and new.

PB: No.

CM: No? That's not correct?

PB: The way the sequence worked, we had the Institute-Academy, which had turned out to be the new and aspiring administrators in a two year [program]. Then SDI, under Sacramento County Office, took over, and the whole vision changed that instead of

working this Institute-Academy [model], they wanted to have the administrators be teacher trainers or system trainers. Then what they were looking at was not management skills but leadership skills, which were not in the Institute and Academy. They wanted to look more at leadership skills only. So you didn't deal with finance, you didn't deal with personnel, hiring, that kind of thing. You dealt with, How do you run a meeting? Or, How do you get consensus? Those kinds of things. So that was the major change.

CM: The leadership has changed through the years, so I want to address that just a little bit later.

PB: EDP was not part of the Institute-Academy. It was part of Staff Development Institute. It was an outgrowth, which then led to the PROS.

CM: Okay.

July 11, 2001

CM: Paul, you've been retired a little over six years now, and yet you haven't been retired. You left your full-time employment with Santa Clara but have very definitely remained involved in adult education and various adult education projects since then. Tell us about these activities since you left Santa Clara.

PB: An outgrowth of the strategic planning that the state did in the early nineties and then the [implementation] legislation that followed it in '92 and '93 was a concept known as learning networks. The state decided to fund a three-year grant for learning networks to see if the concept of collaboration and student information systems would be workable. That was promoted, and probably the most famous part of that was the EduCard, as mentioned before. Santa Clara Adult Education, or actually the district,

was the fiscal agent for that grant during those three years, and they were very helpful in helping us promote the activities of that grant.

When that grant finished, I went on to work with the Staff Development Institute as a trainer, mostly in the area of administrative training, and grew into the responsibility of actually putting the training packages together. We had two kinds of training packages. One was a continuation of the Institute concept, and we advanced from the leadership-only kind of training to a combination of management and leadership, or nuts and bolts activities that administrators should know in adult education, because most of them were brand new.

Also, we put together a series of two-day workshops on particular topical areas, such as fiscal management, budgeting, attendance accounting, personnel, marketing, et cetera. And we did those throughout the state on a two-day basis, almost always using a hotel facility, where we would arrive and start our meetings at nine o'clock in the morning, have lunch, work until about five-thirty or six, then start the next morning again and go from about eight until three o'clock with a lunch included. So it gave us approximately ten to twelve hours of actual lecture-type time or interactive time with our adult students.

CM: You've also worked with the California Distance Learning Project, haven't you?

PB: Yes. I assisted Dennis Porter (Director, California Distance Learning Project) by doing some research for him in terms of distance learning and high school diplomas and found that there wasn't really a lot going on at the time. Dennis, through his project, the California Distance Learning Project, has put together several symposiums and a statewide conference. He asked me to be the one that organized it

and did all of the details. That was a very unique experience and a very worthwhile experience.

CM: That was just this past year?

PB: About a year ago, yes. Last February, a year ago February. I had done something like this in the early nineties when the National Dropout Prevention Network decided to have their conference in San Jose, and they chose me through Ray Eberhard's encouragement, to be the chair for the national conference that we did at the Fairmont Hotel in San Jose. So I did have some experience putting that conference together. That was a large conference. That had about eighteen hundred people from all over the United States and foreign countries.

CM: That was a major job.

PB: Right.

CM: Did they pay you for it?

PB: No. (both laugh) Definitely another freebie.

CM: We get lots of those. (chuckles) Are you still doing things for the California Distance Learning?

PB: Yes. I'm still helping Dennis. He is in the process of rewriting his grant, and hopefully, he will attempt another statewide conference for the project and has indicated he would like to use me in that effort.

CM: Is the state consortium, the PR group, still active?

PB: Yes, it is, and I still am the voluntary chair. We have approximately thirteen board members who also volunteer their time. We meet twice a year. We're continuing to try to promote adult education through the *California Insider*. We have some other

ideas that we're attempting to get off the ground, but I don't feel that I should discuss those at this point until they become more concrete, because we may not be able to follow through on some of them. (chuckles)

CM: You're not going to do your future forecasting at this point. (chuckles)

PB: Right.

CM: I assume that it's still maintaining enough districts in its membership to make it a viable

PB: Oh, sure. The [number of] districts have been growing every year. And with the addition of the small school districts to the state's base of adult schools, the numbers have increased. There's probably over a hundred and twenty school districts that have joined and are participating and I think they like the materials they get, especially the insider letter and the school directory.

CM: Okay. Paul, I think you mentioned one time earlier that you had done some sort of individual consulting with individual districts. Are you still doing that? Do you want to elaborate on that to some extent?

PB: Sure. That's been a very exciting part of being retired, especially since there are certain areas that are critical in the state with respect to compliance rules and regulations. I have had an opportunity to work with about twenty-five different school districts through the last few years dealing with those kinds of issues, especially in the area of independent study for adults and all of the requirements. There were some schools that had some difficulty in the central valley, and they asked me to come in and bring them up to snuff with the way the program should be operated because they were submitting legislation to try to avoid some penalties that

they had incurred because of not following regulations. And they all got up to running speed and passed the FCMAT (Fiscal Crisis Management and Emergency Team) inspection, and they all were given new levels of a.d.a. so that they could start running their programs again, which I'm very happy that happened for them.

School districts have called me to come in to do examination of their organizational structure. This happens especially when somebody will leave that's important in the program, like the director, and they're looking for somebody to come in and say, well, what should our organization structure look like? Should we have a director, a principal, or vice principals, or how should that be structured? That's been interesting.

CM: How have you made your contacts with these individual jobs? I assume they've come from referral maybe from the Adult Education Unit?

PB: I'm not sure. I think most of it's word of mouth, and a lot of people know me. They know I'm retired. I had a lot of visibility over the years, and that may have had something to do with it, because I've been called to do customer satisfaction and service in three or four different places, so people are starting to hear that I do that. I also have done that at some of the conferences, like ACSA and CCAE. I think when you do that, you're out front and then people remember your name and they say, oh, he can do budget or fiscal, et cetera. That's been an interesting thing to do, and it's one of those things that's kind of nice because you're picking your time and how much time, when, and how much spacing in between. That's one of the nice parts of being retired but still semi-working.

CM: We've mentioned the projects and the individual – anything else that you're still . . . ?

PB: I think that's enough. (chuckles)

CM: Obviously, you're still staying as busy as you want to be.

PB: Right.

CM: That's the important part of it. Paul, if you could wave a magic wand and have anything happen that you would like to see happen, where would you like to see adult education in the state go? And do any of your wishes in that line translate into specific recommendations for CDE?

PB: I have a number of concerns about adult education. I'm definitely worried about the manner in which we are funded. I don't believe that's as equitable as it could be with the other educational parts of the system in terms of our revenue limit, which is very unrealistic in terms of what we're expected to do.

CM: Funding just doesn't go away as a problem, does it?

PB: No. It's always been a problem. Right along with funding there's an equity issue in terms of the way the state has allocated a.d.a. amongst the districts, because that was the magic of Prop 13 essentially, and some school districts have been really shortchanged. Their populations have grown significantly, and there has not been sufficient growth.

CM: You mentioned Milpitas specifically earlier.

PB: Right. So I would like to see somebody address that issue, take a broader look at all of the counties in the state, see what their population size is, and see how much a.d.a. is authorized in those counties, and then somehow or other see if there could be some leveling effect, or equity effect, so that everybody gets the same share so that students that aren't being served could be served.

CM: When the reform legislation went through, they set out this period of years . . .

PB: Squeeze and freeze.

CM: . . . squeeze and freeze that you were talking about. In one sense, that seems fair. In another sense, some places have much higher expenses than others.

PB: Oh, sure, yes.

CM: I mean, if you want to compare teachers' salaries in Santa Clara with those in Lindsey and what the cost of living

PB: That's that equity issue. I don't feel our teachers are treated properly in adult education. The administrators typically are on the district's management schedule, salary schedule, with full benefits, et cetera. But in many cases, districts only have hourly schedules for their [adult education] teachers with no medical benefit provisions at all. But if you start to try to do that on a two thousand dollar revenue limit compared to six thousand for the district, there's no way that can be possible. I'm afraid districts will go into bankruptcy, especially if teachers groups try to organize and push for these kinds of things. Something will give in the system. I don't know what it would be, but something would give.

I think assisting the small school districts is a major recommendation that I would think about, because I was right there at the beginning when those hundred and fifty-four came on board. I've worked in different consortium areas in the state with the small districts, especially in Imperial County and San Bernardino County. And they need help. They cannot survive on thirty units of a.d.a. They need to get to a point where they can have a part-time administrator, or even more than a part-time administrator, somebody that's assigned to adult education, and that's a meaningful

position, not one day a week kind of a thing.

CM: Maybe we need to go to some kind of a two-tiered system, like a base, and then your a.d.a. on top of the base funding.

PB: Or bring everybody that's small up to a hundred units right away and somehow or other have the rest of the state realize that it's important to have all of those districts be at a hundred units. But some of the big districts may not like that because they may have to give up some a.d.a. or may not get the increases that they thought they were going to get.

I think the nature of the regulations that we deal with is becoming very, very cumbersome, and many of the things that we do are mandated but we don't receive any mandated costs, reimbursements. And somehow or other, a look has to be taken at that to ensure that if we're going to have the state mandate, that these things must be done, somehow or other they provide for it financially, whatever way they figure is the best way to do that.

CM: There are lots of cries about that now with the increased accountability.

PB: Yes, absolutely. I can't imagine what a small district does, or a medium-sized district does when they don't have the personnel to handle some of the amounts of records that need to be dealt with. So that would be one of the other things I think we should look at.

CM: A lot of those new requirements are in the federal legislation, and then the state has some on top of the federal.

PB: Yes, it gets complicated. I think adult education has a strong curriculum, but I truly believe it can be enhanced in many, many areas. You enhance that by providing staff

development time, but we don't have staff development time in the state for adult schools. Day schools can take [several] days to train their teachers. We need the same thing, and on an hourly basis, we can't afford to do that because if our teachers aren't in the classroom, they're not generating the revenues from their students. So we need to, I think, look at staff development days, even if it's only three or four a year, where we're not penalized through student attendance.

[In another area,] I think K-12 adult schools are just very, very strong in this state. We constantly hear about the takeovers that might be occurring. And I believe we have our niche, and we're close to the community, and that we should not go away. If the legislature attempts to do that, hopefully there will be enough of us that will speak out and say that's not the thing to do.

CM: Certainly, every few years it's suggested, and we fight the battle again, yes. Anything else in terms of maybe specific recommendations for CDE? The attendance accounting is picky.

PB: But I'm a statistics and math person, so I don't mind it. And it's important to do an accurate job, so I can't get picky about that.

CM: I think it's important to do an accurate job. I guess what I meant by picky is when they started saying that you can't give your teachers five minutes an hour or ten minutes an hour off. That's being picky. All federal labor laws say you have to allow so much time to

PB: Unfortunately, in the last few years, for whatever reason, somebody looking for scapegoats or something, they made some decisions that are cumbersome to deal with. You have a three-hour class that starts at seven o'clock and ends at ten, and you

have to take attendance every hour. That's [three times and is] not realistic when you think about it. Or as you say, you can't give the class a break and still count it as part of the class? It just makes things cumbersome, and it gets people in trouble, and then somebody's out of compliance because they didn't follow the regs or they didn't know the new regs, or whatever

CM: Do you think that the alternative delivery – what we were referring to as the 5 percent – do you think that will ever be increased, or should be increased?

PB: I would hope that that could be increased and allow districts to find a leveling point for their own particular system. But I know the legislature won't open the door totally on it. Probably the initial way to deal with it – as some of the districts are starting to do – is apply for a waiver to get beyond the 5 percent.

CM: Some districts are doing that.

PB: Los Angeles was approved, and I've heard of two other districts that are interested in writing a waiver for similar kinds of reasons. One of the things I would say is that – and I don't know how we do this other than the state continuing to work closely with the adult education organizations – and that is that, whenever a rule or a regulation is going to be promulgated into the system, that they really take a close look at it before they just say we are going to do this, or this is what we expect, because I don't think in all cases the ramifications of some simple decision are known when the decision is made. And the districts – the three hundred and seventy or more districts – are all individually very unique, have different kinds of support internally in their system, and one regulation or one request for one district might be easy to deal with and for another might be totally difficult to handle. So I would hope that that continues, that

the organizations do have field input into regulations.

CM: Again going back to the accountability requirements. Teachers can't be paid unless students are in classes, and yet, to meet these reporting requirements, the teachers have to do it, and it takes a lot of time.

PB: They [usually] don't get prep time in adult education, as you know, so that correcting papers or doing the registration of students or the attendance for students, that's all done typically on teachers' own time, not in the classroom.

CM: Okay. Paul, you had twenty-five years in adult education. I'd like for you to talk a little bit about the state leaders or people of influence during that time, both from the schools and from the state. People that stand out in your mind.

PB: Well, the first people that stand out in my mind are the seven board members from Santa Clara Unified that hired me to work there.

CM: Good for you!

PB: I'm very appreciative of that, and what they did, along with the director that I worked for for a number of years. Of course, I'd have to mention Superintendent Rudy Gatti, who was very well known in the state. Even after he retired, he did a number of things in his semi-retirement to help school districts. More specifically with adult education, I would think Lee Clark, who worked with MAEP, was highly influential and continues to be influential by working with the credentialing system for teachers and is an LEA (Local Education Agency) for Santa Clara Unified to help teachers get their adult education credentials. I think Ray Eberhard

CM: Before we go on to Ray, I just want to mention – Lee was also chair of the adult education ACSA committee during the time of Prop 13 when there were so many

problems that came down.

PB: Right. And he was a good spokesman for us. He was very knowledgeable, and he was very ethical and moral. He did everything he could to try to help the entire state at the time. I know that.

Getting back to Ray Eberhard, Ray I think is probably one of the most visionary leaders that we've had in adult education, saw what needed to be done and usually just gave people the empowerment to go and get the job done, be they his own staff or people out in the state or people working on grants. I think he's sorely missed from the adult education system, and the community college system is benefiting from his expertise.

There are several consultants in the department, namely Lynda Smith, who I miss dearly and feel that she was a very understanding and empathetic, sympathetic individual for adult students and did everything with that focus in mind, that our programs and what we did needed to help adult students. So I would say she provided a lot of leadership, especially with the Staff Development Institute-Academy and, initially, the EDP project.

Tom Damon – I'm sorry. I don't want to forget my close friend Bob Ehlers, before I get to Tom. Bob Ehlers, I think, should be noted as probably one of the best consultants that has worked in the Adult Education Unit for all these many years. He's retired, but he's back there as an annuitant working to assist them in their efforts. He's a fount of information, and he's a pack rat in some ways. He keeps all of the materials, like advisories and rule books and hand books, and he really has a lot of knowledge. He approaches being an adult education consultant in a way that I like.

It's the way that you go with the idea that you want to assist people. Can I help you fix the problem?

CM: How can we make this work?

PB: Yes, rather than somebody pointing a gun and a badge at you, saying too bad you made a mistake kind of a thing. Bob is a good mentor for other consultants when it comes to that. I started to mention Tom Damon. He was the principal/director at Palo Alto. Tom was very influential for me because he started small group meetings where about once or twice a year . . .

CM: I think that's where I met you. (chuckles)

PB: Right. . . . he would call together five or six people, and I was just enthralled to be part of this austere group that were known as adult educators. Tom was chair of NAPCAE during his career, which was the National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education. He was good. He was a real mentor and ran a good program and kind of kept all of us in line.

I would say that those would probably be some of the most influential for me. But of course, your staff that you work with, all the specialists, all the teachers, all the administrators. I wouldn't even begin to mention them because they all brought something to the table, and I just feel that there's a lot of dedicated people out there that work in adult education and probably do not necessarily gain the recognition that they should. Cuba Miller being one of them. (both laugh)

CM: Thank you. Do you think that the ACSA and CCAE conferences are enough in terms of bringing the southern California and the northern California groups together?

PB: I think they're okay, and I hope we never lose them or the way they're dealing with

the two-day [conference] sessions, but I don't think that's enough really. If we don't augment with separate staff development training days or work days or workshops, or whatever – which I'm getting the feeling we're not going to have that much in the future – that's not enough. We need to continue to be together, to meet – our strength is there by meeting, [being synergized], and proselytizing from each other.

CM: You know, as – I'll step on some toes here. As poor as they were for staff development, there was really some good in the – the state department used to, three times a year, pull together the directors of everyone who had the federal grants. That served as a good networking for people throughout the state. As I say, it wasn't true staff development. They were usually kind of business nuts and bolts meetings. But since adult school directors are so kind of isolated, that was a good thing, to bring them together, an opportunity to do that.

PB: I agree with that. And I agree with the regional meeting concept that the state does put together. And again, that's largely dependent on the consultant that runs the meeting. I don't know if the right word is "unfortunate," but there have been a lot of new consultants that have come to adult education that didn't have adult education background, and their learning curve was extremely steep. I think that seems to be stabilizing somewhat right now, that people are coming on board, staying a little longer, and hopefully that will improve. But I think regional meetings absolutely need to be held where people can come to them and not only be listeners but also be active participants and ask questions, and things like that.

CM: Nothing is always smooth. Jobs do have their frustrations. So I'd like to know what the major frustrations for you have been.

PB: (chuckles) Oh, my gosh. What I tell my students in my classes of budgeting and finance and all that, I always tell them, if there were two things we could get rid of, adult education would be a perfect job. And that is finance and personnel. (both laugh) I guess that's probably the big bugaboo that's always been difficult to handle, but you just have to keep working at it. But really, I've had the frustrations, but I think they're just normal in the way the jobs go. The financing always just seems to hold us back, and that's why you have to get creative and be entrepreneurial and try to find ways to be into something else that fits with what you're doing that doesn't necessarily depend on federal or state money. So I guess I can't mention just one thing in particular.

CM: Well, certainly you could – you're formally retired now, so you could talk about things (chuckles) without

PB: You just brought up an idea, and that's maybe why I've stayed with the consortium so long, and that is that somehow or other, we can't get the message out of who we really are in adult education. It was bad enough when we had legislators that were around for a while, but now we have term limits, and every two years or every six years, or whatever, we've got a whole new group of people. And they say, adult education, who are you? So hopefully, there can be some kind of a promotional public relations campaign that gets more and more people to – especially the state level decision makers – to know who we are and what niche we have in the educational system of adults. We're dealing with a million and a half to two million adults in our programs.

CM: It's a larger system, except for elementary school. Larger than secondary, larger than community college, larger than the state colleges and universities.

[end tape two, side B; begin tape three]

CM: This is tape three, side A, of the Paul Belomy interview. We're about to wind up here. Have we left out anything that you want to talk about?

PB: No. I think we've covered quite a bit. I can't think of anything that I would like to add.

CM: In conclusion then, we've talked about a lot of different things that you've done in your different positions, so in a way, this question may be repetitious, but I want you to narrow it down. I want you to focus. What do you consider your major accomplishments, or most satisfying aspects of your career?

PB: Well, I think the first one that comes to mind is the challenge of starting a program from absolutely zero at Santa Clara Unified and, I think, developing it over the years into an exemplary model program for the state of California. I know a lot of people come to visit us, did visit us, and still do because of the kind of things that we do, from the petting zoo to working with the disabled on campus. So I think that would probably be the highlight of my career, that I feel very good that we ran a [diverse,] positive, ethical, fiscally responsible kind of program all those years, even though there were difficulties in the operation.

I think having a number of people that worked with me advance to be responsible in their own program areas out of Santa Clara is a good feeling for me, and I'll take some of the credit for it.

CM: That's a real tribute to you, Paul.

PB: I know they're their own people and they were trained and went to school on their own, but I think that a lot of them got a good start at Santa Clara and walked away

and are building their own programs as they see fit, and they're good programs. So that's been good to see that kind of promotional advancement of these individuals.

I always will feel good about the Learning Networks. It's just that I think it was a concept whose time was before its time. The whole thing with the EduCard and student information. I think it is a real need that we still need to deal with because of things with [accountability,] the Department of Social Services, changing schools, and things like that.

CM: And you were working with that before the federal emphasis on one-stop centers.

PB: Yes. I always had that feeling that there should be a one-stop shop out there kind of a thing. In fact, one of the superintendents I [worked for] was going to give us a school in the system to convert into a one-stop shop school. It was a high school building with sixty or seventy classrooms, and it would have been a unique concept at the time. [It didn't happen, but] it's happening in places [now]. At least it's starting. We never were able to pull it together because of some other issues with that school. But I think that was a great idea.

The part that excited me the most – and I did this up and down the state – was that these networks developed these collaborations of many, many different agencies and organizations, and that, to me, was a real first, that they were really collaborative working groups that got together from other colleges, other schools, et cetera.

I think one of the people that we should acknowledge in all of that is Van Wooley, because Van was a [private] consultant that was hired by the state, worked on the strategic plan, and then continued to work on the Learning Network project as the person that would put those collaboratives together and help work them through

their meeting times, et cetera. He did just a super job on that and also the assessment of how well that they were doing.

I guess I need to include the nearly five hundred people that have gone through the staff development [administrative] institute or staff development activities over the last sixteen years. They were all very excited, all very dedicated, all very happy to be in adult education. I don't think I met a naysayer amongst them, even though many of them were brand new and didn't know what they were going to be dealing with.

CM: That's one thing about adult education, we have nice people that are willing to help each other in the system.

PB: And I think they learn so rapidly that we're all really together and we're just a different kind of group from some of the other parts of the system.

Working with the consortium was an idea that Lee Clark and I came up with in 1984, '85, and then being able to hire Bob Bestor to be our consultant. That has been, I think, very significant. It stayed alive. It's grown. And I think the potential is there, just that we need to find some funding to take that next very giant step in getting more people to know what adult education is.

Those are probably the highlights of what I feel my accomplishments were. Did a [number] of things along the way and created a lot of things. Fortunately, stayed on the right side of the law the whole time. Or the right side of the compliance regulations. And as I said, working with all those dedicated people will be something I'll remember. It's been a good career for me.

CM: Yes, it has. You've had a fulfilling career crammed with all kinds of achievements.

PB: And I'm not finished yet either. (chuckles)

CM: No, you're not finished. (both laugh) But your achievements have certainly left their mark on the state's adult education programs. Thank you, both for the interview and for the contributions you've made to California's adult education program.

PB: I really appreciate this effort that you've made to do this oral interview and including me as one of the people to be in the group. I feel very, very humbled by it.

CM: Thank you, Paul. This interview was completed as a part of the California Adult Education Oral History Project.

END OF INTERVIEW

INDEX

- 4H Club, 9 - 12
 5 percent funds, 70
 a.d.a., average daily attendance, 2, 4, 23, 25, 66
 AAACE, American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, 38
 Accountability, 68, 71
 ACSA, Association of California School Administrators, 12, 13, 34 - 36, 54, 57, 65, 71 - 74
 Adult Education Unit of the California Department of Education, 41, 42, 52
 Adult Education Week, 17
 Adult school directory, 39 - 41
 Agnew State Hospital, 10, 11
 Amnesty, 18, 19
 Apportionment, 29
 Asian students, 11, 19, 20
 Attendance accounting, 69, 70
 Barbier, Rich, 26
 Bestor, Bob, 78
 Bestor, Liz, 38
 Breslauer, Ardis, 21
 CAEAA, California Adult Education Administrators Association, 35
 California Department of Education, 41, 57, 58
 California Distance Learning Project, 43, 44
California Insider, 63
 Campbell, 9
 Cap (growth cap), 5, 23, 29
 Caruthers, Susan, 18
 CASAS, Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, 21
 Categorical program, 30
 CBAE, Competency Based Adult Education, 20, 51, 52
 CCAE, California Council for Adult Education, 34 - 36, 54, 57, 65, 73, 74
 CDLP, California Distance Learning Project, 62, 63
 Chacon, Rico, 18
 Child care, 14, 15
 Clark, Lee, 3, 4, 37, 71, 72, 78
 COLA, Cost of living adjustment, 30
 Computer labs, 12
 Concurrent enrollment, 21 - 24
 Consulting work, 64 - 67
 Continuation high school, 15
 Copeland, Wally, 52
 Crutchfield, Juliet, 43
 CSCAE, California State Consortium for Adult Education, 36 - 41, 54, 63, 64, 75, 78
 Cunco, Tim, 13
 Cupertino, 2
 Customer service, 56, 57, 65
 Damon, Tom, 72, 73
 Department of Social Services, 45
 Direct support costs, 31
 DNAE, Dissemination Network for Adult Education, 13, 21
Drop In Day for Dropouts, 37
 Eastside, 9, 20
 Eberhard, Dr. Raymond, 23, 43, 45, 63, 71, 72
 EDP, Executive Development Program, 58

EduCard, 43, 44, 61, 77
 Educational Options, 14, 15
 Ehlers, Bob, 72, 73
 Electronics labs, 12
 ESL supplemental funding, 23
 ESL Teacher Institute, 13
 ESI, English as a second language, 4, 6, 8, 11, 19, 49
 Facilities, 30
 FCMAT, Fiscal Crisis Management and Emergency Team, 65
 Fee based programs, 15, 32
 Fiscal issues, 27 – 31, 66, 75
 Fremont Adult Education, 2, 3, 8
 Fremont Unified School District, 38
 Fremont Union High School District, 2, 3
 GAIN, Greater Avenues to Independence, 20, 44
 Gatti, Rudy, 49, 71
 Glasser, William, 47
 Governance in adult education, 69
 Graduation, 16 - 18
 Grants (financial), 7, 8, 12
 Green, Dill, 48
 Hacienda La Puente, 13
 Hayward Adult School, 52
Hispanics, 11
 Honig, Bill, 45
 Hopp, Will, 53
 Imperial County, 67
 Independent study, 12, 15, 21 – 24, 49
 Indirect costs, 31
 Institute – Academy, see Leadership training in California
 Iranian students, 6
 IRCA, Immigration Reform and Control Act, 13
 JTPA, Job Training Partnership Act, 45
 Kremer, Nick, 13
 Larsen, Carl, 3, 4
 Latchkey, 14
 Lawson, Pat, 50
 Lawsuits, 24
 Leadership training at Santa Clara, 46 – 51
 Leadership training in California, 51 – 62, 72, 75, 78
 Learning Networks, 44, 53, 61, 77
 Legislation, 23, 24, 27, 67
 Leps, Katy, 53
 Los Angeles Adult Education, 27, 70
 Lottery money, 27
 MAEP, Metropolitan Adult Education Program, 3, 9, 10, 50, 71
 Malvetti, Neil, 54
 Marciano, Danene, 50
 McMullen, Mary, 13
 Merced, 45
 Miller, Cuba, 73
 Milpitas Adult School, 9, 26, 50, 66
 Morgan Hill Adult School, 53
 Mountain View Adult School, 50
 NAPCAE, National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education, 37, 38, 73
 National Dropout Prevention Network, 63

New adult schools, 24, 25, 59, 60
 Nordstrom of adult education, 56
 North, Larry, 50
 One stop centers, 77
 Parenting education, 4, 49
 Philosophy of adult education, 32, 33
 Policy and Issues Committee, 41
 Porter, Dennis, 62
 Preschools, 14
 Program specialists, 48 - 50
 Proposition 13, 3, 5 - 7, 25, 32, 33, 66, 71
 PROS, Professional Resources Outreach System, 59 - 61
 Public relations, see CSCAE
 Quality circles, 47
 Refugees, 5, 6
 Reid, Tom, 19
 Rent, 31
 Revenue limit, 5, 22 - 24, 27, 29
 Robert Bestor and Associates, 38
 Sacramento County Office of Education, 53, 54, 60
San Bernardino County, 67
 Santa Clara Adult Education, 8, 9, 12, 22, 45, 47, 56, 62, 76
 Santa Clara Unified School District, 8, 9, 47, 71
 Savage, Lynn, , 13, 43
 School age mothers' program, 14
 Section 306, 309 (of the Adult Education Act), 8
 Senior adults, 4, 11, 49
 Sequoia Adult School, 45, 50
 Silicon Valley, 12
 Simi Valley Adult School, 53
 Simms, Joe, 3, 4
 SLIAG, State Legalization Immigrant Assistance Grants, 13, 18
 Small schools, 26, 67, 68
 Smith, Lynda, 52, 53, 72
 Squeeze and freeze, 24, 67
 Staff Development Institute, 53, 54, 60, 62, 69
 Steiger, Sandy, 50
 Stepchild of education, 26, 34
 Strategic plan, 43
 Sunnyvale, 2
 Swindell, Sharon, 50
Teacher Reading Improvement Program, 8
The California Insider, 40
 VESL (vocational English as a second language), 8, 13
 Vocational training, 12
 Wells, Bob, 35, 36
 Whitehead, Ed, 50, 59
 WIA, Workforce Investment Act, 44
 Wooley, Van, 77
 Zinner, Jane, 13
 Zoo, 11

Paul Belomy

SUMMARY

Consultant in adult education specializing in all aspects of administration. As Director (now retired) of Educational Options, Santa Clara Unified School District, a new adult school was established which grew to become a model for California adult education.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

1995 – Present	Consultant in Adult Education
1995 – 1999	Content Specialist in Administration, Staff Development Institute, Sacramento County Office of Education, CA
1994 – 1995	Director, Learning Networks, California Department of Education
1981 – 1995	Director, Educational Options, Santa Clara Unified School District
1976 – 1981	Principal, Adult Education, Fremont Union High School District
1974 – 1976	Vice Principal, Homestead High School, Fremont Union High School District, Cupertino/Sunnyvale, CA
1968 – 1974	Dean, Cupertino High School, Fremont Union High School District
1972 – 1973	Sabbatical, University of California, Berkeley, CA
1963 – 1968	Chair and Teacher, Mathematics Department, Cupertino High School, Fremont Union High School District, CA
1959 – 1963	Tactical Instructor, Connecticut National Guard Military Academy, CT
1958 – 1963	Math & Science Instructor, Windsor High School, CT
1956 – 1957	Math Instructor, Bloomfield High School, CT

EDUCATION

Doctoral Candidate - 1975, Educational Administration, University of California, Berkeley, CA

Administrative Credential -1971, San Jose State University, CA

Mathematics Summer Institute - 1963, University of Santa Clara, CA

Mathematics Summer Institute - 1962, Boston College, MA

Master of Arts - 1962, Mathematics, Central Connecticut State College, CT

Bachelors of Arts - 1956, Mathematics, Teachers College of Connecticut, CT

CREDENTIALS

Lifetime Secondary Administration (7-12), CA
 Lifetime Pupul Personnel Services (K 12), CA
 Lifetime Standard Supervision (7-14), CA
 Lifetime Teaching (7-12), CA
 Permanent Teaching Certificate (7-12), CT

BOARD AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES

President, California State Consortium for Adult Education (CSCAE)
 Consultant and Conference Presenter: Fiscal Management, Marketing Programs, Quality Customer Service and Care, Team Effectiveness, Meeting Strategies, Leadership Styles, Strategic Planning, Problem Solving Techniques, Continuous Improvement Process
 Consultant, California Distance Learning Project (CDLP)
 Trainer, Competency Based Adult Education (CBAE)
 Trainer, Total Quality Management and Quality Leadership – SCOE
 Program Auditor, Independent Study Programs
 Charter and Emeritus Member, Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
 Centurion Member, California Council of Adult Education (CCAEE)
 Member, California Consortium for Independent Study (CCIS)
 Member, Phi Delta Kappa (PDK)
 Member, American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE)
 Member, Association for Supervision and Curriculum (ASCD)
 Member, Western Accreditation of Schools and Colleges (WASCS)
 Member, Learning Resources Network (LERN)
 Member, Planning Committee, State Adult Education Leadership Academy, CDE
 Member, Planning Committee, Professional Resources Outreach System (PRO'S)
 Member, Adult Education Strategic Plan Committee, CDE
 Chairman, Finance Committee