

*Oral History Interview*  
*with*  
*Raymond G. (Ray) Eberhard*

This is a 183-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 **001891**

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.

California Department of Education  
Adult Education Oral History Project

Oral History Interview

with

**RAYMOND G. (RAY) EBERHARD**

California Department of Education, Sacramento  
State Administrator, Adult Education Policy and Planning Unit  
Director, High Risk Youth Unit  
Program Manager, Youth Employment Linkages Service  
Assistant Director, Office of Employment Preparation  
Assistant Director, Adult Education Unit  
Consultant and Administrative Assistant, Adult Education Unit  
1976 - Present

Simi Valley Unified School District  
Assistant Director for Adult Education  
1970 - 1976

Los Angeles Unified School District  
Instructor and Registrar, Chatsworth High School  
Administrator, Stoney Pointe Continuation High School  
1964 - 1970

December 7 and 13, 1995

Sacramento, California

**By Cuba Z. Miller**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

RESTRICTIONS, LITERARY RIGHTS, QUOTATIONS.....v

PREFACE .....vi

INTERVIEW HISTORY..... vii

INTERVIEWS December 7 and 13, 1995

[Tape 1, Side A] .....1

Characteristics of a successful adult educator - Overview of adult education system in state - Background and initial employment - Transition into adult education - Orientation and training for adult education - The 1970's, a period of extraordinary growth - Growth caps - Funding and the separate revenue limit - Networking - Professional organizations

[Tape 1, Side B].....33

Bob Rupert - Proposition 13 - Community service programs - Transition to the Department of Education - A new Adult Education Unit team - Roles and duties within the Adult Education Unit - State and federal funds - Leveraging federal funds - CBAE mandate - Two national and state literacy surveys

[Tape 2, Side A] .....66

High Risk Youth Unit and SB 65 - National Dropout Prevention Network - Aspen Institute - Adult education as a recovery system - Don McCune and Xavier Del Buono - Return to Adult Education Unit - Two strategic planning projects - Separate adult education fund - Five percent programs - Model standards - Start-up schools - Reform legislation

[Tape 2, Side B].....98

Reform legislation continued: increasing access, concurrent enrollment, revised funding - Litigation - Technology projects - Learning Networks - Adult Education Unit reorganizations - Consultants and their training - Developing policy - Adult Education Unit and the Department - Categorical programs and sunset legislation

[Tape 3, Side A] .....	130
Adult Education Unit and the Department (continued) - Field input: maintaining lines of communication - Role of professional organizations - Different roles of Unit and local agencies - Governance - Summary of major funding changes - Public policy initiatives: immigration and vocational training - Impact of changes in federal funding - Strengths of California adult education - National contributions	
[Tape 3, Side B].....	162
Weaknesses of California adult education- Predictions - Key driving forces of adult education in state - Rewards of work in adult education	
INDEX.....	167
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	173

## 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:

Raymond G. Eberhard, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1995 by Cuba Z. Miller in Sacramento, 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. As the century draws to a close, the growth and energy of California adult education in the sixties, the institutionalization of competency based education in response to the influx of refugees and immigrants in the seventies and eighties, and the innovative uses of technology of the nineties will be recorded.

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. Seven interviews were added in 1994 - 95.

Significant assistance to the project was initially provided by the staffs of both the California State Archives and 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  
June 30, 1995

## INTERVIEW HISTORY

### Interviewer

Cuba Z. Miller

### Interview Time and Place

Two interviews were conducted in Sacramento, California, on December 7 and 13, 1995.

### 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.

CALIFORNIA ADULT EDUCATION ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEWEE: DR. RAYMOND G. EBERHARD

INTERVIEWER: Cuba Z. Miller

[Session 1, December 7, 1995]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

MILLER: This is Cuba Miller interviewing Dr. Raymond G. Eberhard, State Administrator for Adult Education, California Department of Education. The interview is being conducted in Sacramento, California, on December 7, 1995, for the purpose of recording his recollections of significant events and trends in California adult education during his career.

Let's start with something easy here, Ray. What makes a good adult educator? What are some of the characteristics that lead to success in our field?

EBERHARD: The first point that comes to mind, in terms of success in the field, is that the individual involved in adult education absolutely has to care about the adult population. The equation is often that you hear people in the K-12 system talking about, you know, if they don't like kids, they don't belong in the program. That's absolutely true in adult education: you have to absolutely



want to make a difference educationally in the lives of adults. And first and foremost to me, that's the most critical. Secondly is that you really have to be sort of a visionary kind of a person, because the nature of the system allows for flexibility, and the system is not regulated and controlled as much as a lot of our other educational institutions. So, because I think of the flexibility, the individual will have success where in fact they do have visions, whatever those visions may be. I think coupling the caring part of adults and truly wanting to make a difference in people's lives with vision, really leads to a very strong public adult educator.

**MILLER:** And that flexibility is really a requirement. A rigid person isn't going last very long.

**EBERHARD:** Well, a rigid person can last, but a rigid person is not going to, I don't think, provide quality programming for adults. You always have to be looking at the constant changing needs of the population out there, and if you're not responding to those changes, which could be daily, weekly, in a very short period of time span, you're going to have a very stodgy program. And as all of us who have worked in the system know, if you're not meeting the needs of adults, they tend not to show up the

following Monday morning, unlike children who have to come on Monday morning.

MILLER: What is it we say, that our students vote with their feet?

[Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Absolutely, they vote. There's an awful lot of truth to that.

MILLER: Okay. Can you give us just a brief overview of the adult ed system in the state?

EBERHARD: Adult education is a base program, and by that, it's funded through the General Fund. And the very critical point which eludes a lot of policy makers and decision makers in state government is that it's an apportionment-driven system based on attendance, just like the K-12 system is. And therein lies one of the major controversies forever in adult education, that [of] adult ed being a categorical program versus being something other than categorical. Those of us in the system have argued forever that adult education is not categorical because it is based . . . it's apportionment, attendance-driven. And to further cement our definition that it's a base program, it has categorical programs stacked on top of it. It has all the different federal entitlements, it has other state money on top of it, and therefore—

MILLER: Like the GAIN [Greater Avenues to Independence] money and the. . . .

EBERHARD: Like GAIN and programs of that nature. It's very broad-based, egalitarian system, offering almost unlimited services to meet the unlimited educational needs of adults, with some restrictions of course. And it's a very accountable system: no students sitting in seats, no reimbursement from the state—it's that simple. So I think the comment earlier about students voting with their feet is extremely important. Because if, in fact, number one, you're not meeting the educational need of the adult, and, secondly, you're not doing that qualitatively, then that adult will not return to the program. So the system has inherent built-in structures that allow for continuing the promotion of quality education. Going back to the visionary thing and doing a needs analysis, if you're not on target with your community, you're not going to be in business very long as adult education. So the system itself, not a whole lot unlike K-12, but with a lot of other dimensions to it, I think, that make it very creative.

It's also, I think, real important to point out that unlike most other government-supported programs, adult ed is relatively free of regulation, policy constraint that truly allows

the system to be creative in meeting the needs of its clients. It's a real strength of the program, has been historically.

**MILLER:** Now, this is specifically about this base program, the one that is apportionment-driven. But adult ed is offered by other agencies in California, and you even have some administrative responsibilities for those through administering the federal program. What are these other segments that contribute to the total field of adult ed?

**EBERHARD:** My prior comments were directed exclusively to the adult education system which is administered by the K-12 program. And yes, we do have responsibilities for a much broader delivery system, but only as it impacts the flow of federal dollars for literacy purposes in the state. The other major providers in the state of adult ed are the community college system, which is almost exactly identical to the K-12 adult program, in terms of its apportionment system, its rates of reimbursement, the type of curriculum it offers, the skill and efficacy of the teachers involved in the system. They're really almost exactly identical.

Other providers within the system, we have the state library, which has grown within the last, oh, ten years, albeit still very small, playing a role in at least the literacy life of our adult

population. We then have volunteer organizations who primarily work within the parameters of the two major existing systems, which would be the community college system and the adult system. And finally, probably the fastest growing segment of the adult provider system are the community based organizations [CBOs], which are rapidly growing all over the state in response to critical adult education needs, as have the two major state-supported systems. So that's a definite trend of the future in terms of community based organizations, but only to the extent that non-General-Funded revenue sources remain available.

The community based organizations' primary funding source comes from a variety of federal entitlements: JTPA [Job Training Partnership Act], GAIN, National Literacy Act, and so on. They [have] become quite pronounced now with the increase of legalized immigrants in the state of California, and they play a very, very important role in parts of our community, and have, in some cases, more success in reaching certain client populations than the colleges or the adult schools do.

MILLER: Just to put that in some kind of perspective, about what percentage of the total is by the K-adult-public school system? We're by far the largest.

EBERHARD: Yeah, by far we are the largest. I'm trying to visualize a pie chart in my office. [Chuckling] But I think the K-adult system is pretty close to about 75 percent of the total noncredit adult education system in the state, with the other providers that I mentioned making up the balance of it.

MILLER: The balance of it. And of the balance, the community colleges are the next largest section.

EBERHARD: That is correct. To give some sense of benchmarking on that, the K-adult program last year served 1.4 million unduplicated count, and the community colleges around 300,000 unduplicated count.

MILLER: Yes. That does put it in perspective. [Chuckling] Okay. Ray, like most of your colleagues, adult education was not your original chosen field of work. Tell us a little bit about your background and your education and what your initial employment was.

EBERHARD: My initial employment was as a biology teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

MILLER: Los Angeles. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: The Los Angeles Unified School District. I began my employment there in 1964. And I'd like to add that it was never my intent to come to California. I did my undergraduate work at Arizona State University in Tempe, and truly fell in love with the state of Arizona and wanted to stay there. But in the early '60s it was nigh unto impossible to get employment in the educational system in Arizona without a master's degree. The waiting list of people wanting to come from all the snowy states to Arizona was just horrendous. And because I was in the process of getting married and needed employment, I had to look elsewhere. And because I had traveled a lot to California, I said that was my second choice, and wound up with a job in Los Angeles.

I was real fortunate during that period of time. I'll never forget walking into the science supervisor's office in L.A. Unified's central headquarters downtown and his saying, "Okay, you're going to sign your contract. Which high school do you want to teach in?" I knew that there were some places I didn't want to teach, but I wasn't sure where those were, and wasn't all that familiar with the district. So he had this huge map of the

district on his wall and sort of explained the harbor area and the valley area and the east valley, and I just sort of looked, and West San Fernando Valley sounded good to me. And he said, "Okay, now, in West San Fernando Valley we have all these schools." So we went through all the names of the schools and we came up with one called Chatsworth, which was the . . . in fact, fortunately, it was a brand-new high school.

MILLER: But he didn't tell you that. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: He didn't tell you that. I just liked the name and I said, "I'm going to Chatsworth." And he said, "Done deal," and so that's where I started my teaching career, at Chatsworth High School.

MILLER: That's kind of like betting on the horses based on their name.  
[Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Exactly. That's exactly how it happened. I was extremely fortunate because West San Fernando Valley [was] a very affluent area at that time, still is primarily. We had a lot of celebrities' kids there—Roy Rogers' children I taught, being the most famous.

MILLER: I had Shirley Temple's children. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: It was a wonderful experience. I really enjoyed it. I was also extremely fortunate to have as my first principal a lady by the



name of Dr. Gertrude G. Smith, a total educational radical, a woman way ahead of her time, in terms of experimenting and trying to go on the cutting edge, in terms of serving the needs of high school kids. And so I was real fortunate as my first experience to have a marvelous mentor, an administrative mentor in this person of Dr. Gertrude G. Smith. So I'll never forget her. She was a marvelous educator.

I was in L.A. through the end of 1969 and had through my . . . actually was only in the classroom for three years, at which point in time I started my movements in the administrative areas. I was working on my master's and administrative credential, and was offered at the tender age of twenty-seven a principalship at the first continuation high school in Los Angeles.

MILLER: That's very unusual for that, being that young.

EBERHARD: I'll come back to that in a minute. [Chuckling] So I opened up Stony Point High School in Chatsworth, California, and with a staff of myself and two teachers, and this is in 1967, right when the drug scene was reaching its zenith. My most vivid memories of being at Stony Point were having the police on our little tiny high school campus three to four to five times a day, carting

kids off who had inhaled, digested, ingested any kind of foreign substance they could find. It was an *extremely* anxious experience for me, I thoroughly did not enjoy it, and asked to be relieved at the end of that first year. For two reasons: one, for all the negative experiences—it was almost impossible to generate a positive learning environment—and number two, I was really too young to handle that. I had no experience and was sort of thrust in a place I shouldn't have been put. So I asked for a reassignment and was given the position of a registrar, which no longer exists in Los Angeles, or assistant registrar and assistant dean. So I had those administrative experiences. I never did return back to the classroom, so I only really had three years of classroom experience in Los Angeles.

MILLER: Okay. And the registrar was actually sort of over the counseling functions of a school?

EBERHARD: No. No, basically the registrar's responsibility was to enforce all the attendance policies and practices of a district high school, and sort of the function—the old term we'll say is a hooky cop—chasing kids down, finding out why they weren't in school and that kind of thing. Also, concurrently during that period of time I was taking the administrative exams in Los Angeles, and

had been placed fairly high up on the vice principals list, which is where everybody starts. [Chuckling] And was on the list waiting for my first assignment when, in fact, L.A. implemented a policy that had a number attached to it—I can't recall now, it was like Policy 5. In essence, what that policy was about is it was L.A.'s affirmative action program for management. And I was watching being reachable on the list but not being called because I was watching the affirmative action placements occur in Los Angeles of people who were not on the list, because that was L.A.'s policy. And I looked around and said, "This is probably not going to be successful for me in this process as long as L.A. stays with its affirmative action program." That, coupled with the fact that I did not have in L.A., which was of paramount importance, inner-city school experience. So they weren't about to take somebody whose only experience was out in a very affluent suburb—

MILLER: With three years in. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: —and send me down to Locke High School. And I understood that. But also I didn't want to go get the inner school experience, to be very honest with you. So that's when I started

looking for employment opportunities outside of Los Angeles.

But that was pretty much my career in L.A.

MILLER: Okay. So that was kind of the background then for your transition, the transition into adult ed, but how did that actual step take place?

EBERHARD: That actual step took place by accident.

MILLER: Which again is common. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Which is common. I was living in Simi Valley and commuting into the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles, so I was very familiar with Simi Valley and the wonderful little, at that time, sleepy little bedroom community of about 23,000 people. And looking around for job openings and new career opportunities, there was a position advertised in Simi Valley for . . . I believe the official title was Adult School Counselor. And since I also had a counseling credential, I said, "Well, here's my way out," and so I went and interviewed for this job. And I'll never forget briefing myself prior to the interview on adult ed. I didn't have a clue what that was about, and so I went to some reference source, and the predominant thing that popped out was this thing called a GED [General Educational Development test]. So I studied up on what a GED was, and I figured, well,

counselors should know about tests and diplomas and things like that. And the only intelligent response I could give during my interview in Simi Valley was, "Oh, but you didn't ask about the GED, and so let me tell you about the GED." Well, for whatever reasons, I got hired into this adult counseling position in Simi Valley in 1970, and therein is where my career in adult education began.

MILLER: Okay. Who hired you? Who was the director at the time?

EBERHARD: The director at the time was Will [Wilfred M.A.] Hopp, who had just gotten that job.

MILLER: He was new there, too?

EBERHARD: He was brand-new.

MILLER: Had he transferred into adult ed also?

EBERHARD: No, he came out of private industry, I believe. I believe this was his first educational assignment. He had been there before in sort of a counseling/assistant administrator capacity for the prior year or two and then was promoted to director.

MILLER: Okay, so he had been in the adult system there a couple of years?

EBERHARD: Yes.

MILLER: But not much.

EBERHARD: Not much.

MILLER: I was going to ask you about your orientation. Acquiring expertise in our field is usually sort of on-the-job training, but it seems like Will was still sort of learning the job when you went there. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Yes, he was.

MILLER: Do you recall anything specific about this early orientation that you had?

EBERHARD: Yeah, I do, and I think this is a really important point, in terms of the training of our personnel in the adult education system. Will had been preceded by a person who had become very prominent in adult education, Ted [Theodore] Zimmerman. Dr. Zimmerman [was] a very creative educational practitioner, and so Will had learned a lot of the ropes from Ted. And as I came into the system, Will starts to mentor me, but interestingly enough, Ted Zimmerman is still in the picture. He had gone on to another district, I believe it was Garden Grove at that time.

MILLER: Which is not too close to Simi Valley. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Not too close to Simi Valley. So what would often happen is that the three of us, Ted Zimmerman, Will Hopp and myself, would wind up in a local bar on the San Diego Freeway. I'll

never forget it, it was the Holiday Inn over there on the San Diego Freeway.

MILLER: Okay, halfway between.

EBERHARD: Halfway between, and we'd sit with napkins on the bar, napkins and pencils, and it was like football coaches. And we'd be dreaming up new ways to put program on line, ways to generate more income through the various apportionment systems that were in place, and that's sort of the way we learned. There were no workshops to go to; you called people who had the experience. So that was one of my initial contacts.

MILLER: Okay. Anyone else besides Ted Zimmerman at that time that really helped with your initial training?

EBERHARD: Yes, there was a gentleman by the name of Tom [Thomas] Johnson who I got to know very well through the Will Hopp and the Ted Zimmerman connection. What I would often do is take a day off during the week and go visit these other programs to see the kind of program they had in place, how they did it, why they did it, how they were funding it, and those kinds of things. And I often visited a lot of the programs at Hacienda La Puente where Tom Johnson was the director at that point in time.

MILLER: Okay. Did you go back to Los Angeles to visit any of their programs in adult ed?

EBERHARD: Interestingly enough, I don't recall ever going to Los Angeles during my tenure in Simi Valley for purposes of acquiring additional information. The hotbed—if I can use that term—of innovation, experimentation, prolific growth in adult ed, was in the San Gabriel Valley: the Haciendas, the Tri-Communities, the Alhambras, the El Montes. That's where the programs were really being developed very quickly.

MILLER: Okay. We'll talk about that growth in just a little bit, Ray, but you also picked up your academic background in adult ed, starting in on that very soon after you got to Simi Valley.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: Tell me about your doctorate program.

EBERHARD: Okay. The director I was working for, Will Hopp, was beginning work on his doctorate, and I had never really had any desire to do that. I had finished my master's and felt that was good enough, and so Will is actually the one that encouraged me to start working on my doctoral program. He had found . . . it's an external degree program in Dallas, Texas, called National Christian University, and it was a program where we could get



through in two years, without having to do a lot of the preparatory types of courses that you find in some of the more traditional institutions. So he talked me into it, and actually Will and I went through the program together at National Christian. We spent two very hot, humid summers in Dallas.

MILLER: Not a good place to be in the summertime.

EBERHARD: Not a good place to be. Taking our on-campus course work at the time, and actually finished it in about two and a half years. It was a program where you could actually tailor your doctoral major, and I chose to do mine in adult education. The topic of my dissertation is *Organization, Implementation, and Administration of Curriculum and Programs for Adult, Career and Continuing Education*. And I was really pleased that I was able to do that because, in addition to the practical experience I had in adult education, I was able to get a more in-depth grounding on a lot of the philosophical, theoretical bases, in terms of adult learning theory and program design, that's really carried me through to this day.

MILLER: That's when you first became familiar with Malcolm Knowles?  
[Chuckling]

EBERHARD: That is when I first became familiar with Malcolm Knowles, and I consider Malcolm probably one of the real heroes of adult education in the world. I put him up there with—there's just two people—Malcolm Knowles and Paulo Friere from Brazil. It's Friere's concepts on political involvement and empowerment that have guided me in a lot of my programmatic stuff, and Knowles' then, although he has gone away from it a lot now, concept of andragogy, as compared with pedagogy—

MILLER: It's still a good concept, whether you use the term or not, yes.

EBERHARD: Right. Which has guided me all these years in adult ed.

MILLER: What part of the program in Simi Valley were you primarily responsible for?

EBERHARD: Actually, I was turned loose, as it were, and I really appreciate Will Hopp's sort of vision of the program—

MILLER: Confidence in you.

EBERHARD: And confidence to be able to do that. And it's important to state that we were in a period of time, in the early '70s, when the system did not have a [growth] cap on it and the possibilities were virtually and literally unlimited. I can recall a period of time, probably from '72 through '74, when we were literally bringing a new program on line every day.

MILLER: I don't know how you kept up.

EBERHARD: Well, you talk about educational entrepreneurship, this was the ultimate. My recollection is that when I started at Simi in 1970, our a.d.a. [average daily attendance] was 300. When I left in 1976, it was 3,800. Now, if that's not phenomenal growth, there's no such thing as phenomenal growth. And this, keep in mind, was a little tiny community of only about 28,000, 30,000 people. So, it was truly probably the best time to ever have lived and worked in adult education, just in terms of the sheer ability for people who would have vision to develop and provide programs for adults.

MILLER: What were some of the new programs that you introduced? I mean, I know Simi Valley now has a large vocational component. Is that when that got started?

EBERHARD: Right, that's when all of that got started. The real emphasis of the Simi Valley adult program at that time was vocational education, with particular emphasis in the allied health fields. We started, in fact, one-of-a-kind programs: dental . . . I think it's called dental technician, those people who make false teeth?

MILLER: Yes.

EBERHARD: Okay, we had the only one in the state of California. We had started the—

MILLER: Probably dental lab technician.

EBERHARD: Dental lab technician kind of thing, yeah. We put on an operating room technician program, we had a respiratory therapy technician program, we had all the front office and back office dental assisting programs, LVN program, to name just a few.

MILLER: Did you have a major health center nearby that you were working in cooperation with?

EBERHARD: Interestingly enough, no, we did not. We created and built most of the facilities in Simi Valley, in terms of simulated laboratories and offices and that type of thing. So, while there was a small hospital available, our students really had to commute to other places like Thousand Oaks or over in the San Fernando Valley to pick up their practical experience. But that was the core—I mean, we really focused on that, and from that then created a very strong foundation to get into what might be felt as some of the more esoteric types of programs in adult education. Keep in mind, there were not a lot of restrictions during that time frame. I can remember putting a program on of how to be a comic

book illustrator as one, which probably would not fly today. We had another—

MILLER: Well, not under our restricted program offerings it wouldn't.

EBERHARD: Right. We had a class in parapsychology, to which there was a lot of public attention at that time in terms of what all of those deep, dark secrets meant. I'll never forget, one of the consultants from the State Department of Education came down to visit our parapsychology class, walked in and saw a pyramid in the middle of the classroom—and thought that a bit strange—with a group of students sitting in the pyramid literally trying to capture the energy from the pyramid. And then scattered around the big pyramid were little pyramids where they were actually sharpening razor blades. And that's another story, but. . . . You know, if there was a demand and somebody said I needed a class in parapsychology kinds of things, we started one.

MILLER: Who was the consultant who visited that class?

EBERHARD: I think his name was Warren Brenner.

MILLER: Yes, he worked in southern California. [Laughter]

- EBERHARD: Dear Warren, who has departed this life, is probably still chuckling, wherever he is today, about seeing that pyramid in that class in Simi Valley.
- MILLER: You think that may have been one of the things that prompted legislative hearings on course offerings? [Chuckling]
- EBERHARD: That may have contributed in a small way to that, yes.
- MILLER: This period of growth was certainly not limited to Simi Valley; it actually was going on statewide. Can you cite examples from other districts, in terms of creative things that they were doing? Is this when the apprenticeship programs took a big step?
- EBERHARD: No, the apprenticeship programs didn't take their big jump until the late '70s, through the [State Senator] Montoya legislation. My recollection there is that they were fairly stable but that the unions were starting to put pressure on the educational system. Montoya responded to that by creating the Montoya apprenticeship bill and then providing separate hourly funding for that, which was different from the base funding for other adult education classes. But I think the biggest growth was occurring in two areas: one, the vocational programs were growing very rapidly throughout the state; and, secondly, we were then just beginning the immigration waves that were

coming in. Keep in mind in the early '70s the Vietnam War was going on and we're starting to then get refugees from Southeast Asia.

MILLER: Yeah, the first of those were in '75, I think.

EBERHARD: Right, so that ESL [English as a second language] then starts to become *the* primary program in adult education, and that's just when it started. Then, of course, you get the federal legislation that comes—I think that's '77 or '78—to bring the federal resources into play, and of course that hasn't stopped since.

MILLER: It hasn't, yeah. Well, there was federal legislation in the late '70s dealing with the refugees.

EBERHARD: Yeah, the refugee act.

MILLER: Our main federal program, of course, got started in the '60s.

EBERHARD: Well, yeah, the Adult Education Act was '66.

MILLER: Yeah. Okay, now, you had mentioned that this was during the period of time that you were frequently meeting with Ted Zimmerman and Tom Johnson, and I know Hacienda La Puente also has a tremendous vocational program. Was that developed during the same period of time?

EBERHARD: Yes, the core there, although they've modified, they've added and deleted as one would with a vocational [program], but the

real core of their program was also probably [developed] about the same time frame, '70 through '75.

MILLER: Okay. Just to dramatize what we've been talking about, this tremendous growth, we had mentioned that in one year alone statewide there was a 34 percent growth—that was in '73-74, which you must have been in your heyday at that time.

EBERHARD: Absolutely.

MILLER: But that total period, actually while you were in Simi Valley, '70 to '77—you left in '76—there was 110 percent growth in the state, so that certainly was an important period of time for our system. Since it had to be paid for, however, [Chuckling] needless to say, that growth did attract the attention of the powers that be in Sacramento.

EBERHARD: Absolutely.

MILLER: What was the result of that attention? [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Well, as you mentioned, that growth did not go unnoticed by the legislature and other policy people in Sacramento. And essentially all they looked at was the growth, and they saw that additional millions of dollars were being pumped into this adult education system, really without understanding why. So a very common political device, which is used when government doesn't



understand necessarily what's happening and where they need to make decisions in a short period of time, is to cap a program, see? "Okay, we don't know what's going on, but we don't want to spend any more money than we're spending, so we're going to cap you at what you're currently funded at, and maybe we'll give you a little growth." So the cap—actually the first cap in adult ed—came in 1975, and that has basically been the governance, or the governor, on the program ever since.

It's real important to note, and this comes up time and time again, is that why some communities have little programs and why some communities have big programs. And there is absolutely no question that it is all by accident. It was attributable to, once again, the caring on the part of the local administrator, the vision that that individual had, the enthusiasm to develop programming for adults. And so what you'll see, and I use a specific example, is a district called Bassett that I believe is about four square miles in size, and I don't know what the population there is, that has a cap of over 2,000 units of a.d.a. You have one of the largest communities up here in northern California called Elk Grove, which has a cap of 300. So those are historical caps. Those are twenty years ago, and of course—

MILLER: And the fact that Elk Grove has quadrupled in population in two years. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: It is one of the fastest growing communities in California. So *the only rhyme and reason for those caps was because of the aggressiveness of a particular administrator during that very important historical time, because nobody knew the program was going to be capped. So the communities that didn't have the visionaries in place at that time are now trapped with the caps that they have, and that really is the cause for much larger policy discussion that's going to have to occur, in terms of the equitable distribution of resources for the education of adults in the state.*

MILLER: And it seems, in point of fact, Ray, that the schools, which obviously then were the administrators, in southern California were *much more aggressive during this period of time than the ones in northern California. Is that a fair statement?*

EBERHARD: I think that's a fair statement. While as a practitioner I was a practitioner in the south, I did get to interface with my colleagues in the north from time to time. But I need to qualify the south again from a comment I made earlier, and I qualify the south in the San Gabriel Valley. Geographically there's a

very close proximity as you move from Pomona to Whittier to Hacienda La Puente to Alhambra to El Monte. They're all real close, it's like just an ongoing neighborhood, and therefore they interacted on a personal level, I think probably more than anybody else in the state. They could have coffee together in the morning, or it was just a short phone call, and so I think they developed sort of a collective momentum in the San Gabriel Valley, in terms of development of programs. And that, I think, is the primary reason why, and of course, you know, there's a large population of people down there, too.

MILLER: Okay. All right, so we had the 5 percent cap in '75, and then another significant event was we actually got a separate revenue limit for adult ed in '76.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: So, can you talk just a little bit about what this separate revenue limit meant? What was the "before" and what was the "after"?

EBERHARD: The "before" was a dually-funded adult education system. You had a situation where in fact there was a limit of fifteen hours per week for certain academic subjects, or for the academic core subjects—my recollection. Then you had another situation for adults who were in the nonacademic areas that actually were

paid for out of the K-12 system. So you had this little core of academic funding and you had this other group of adults with unlimited hours of attendance, and that was sort of being perceived as a raid on the K-12 program. So, in '76, in another way after they put the cap in place and also to control it, they then created a singular revenue limit, and this is where the first separate adult line item in the budget came. And I believe the statewide average at that time was around eight hundred and some dollars, so that was another attempt to sort of reform how the funding would occur. Some would suggest that . . . and I can't recall the technical term for this unlimited pot of money for adults that was coming out of K-12, but that was actually the precursor of the concurrently enrolled situation.

**MILLER:** Okay. And even though this separate revenue limit was lower than what they had been earning from the K-12 system, some people considered it a real advance because they. . . . Okay, the adult systems had not always been able to use all the money they generated.

**EBERHARD:** That's correct. Yeah, but also somewhat considered advanced because it was a separate line item in the state budget for adult education, therefore, with visibility as a separate defined

program. Also, it's important to note that prior to '76, or '75—yeah, '75 when the cap came on—adult education also had access to a 10-cent tax, and that also was what contributed to the variation of funding throughout the state. Some districts chose to levy part of that tax, others did not, and therein lies once again how we got [stuck] with inequities. When this new foundation program for adults came into effect in '76, the districts that had taken advantage of the tax had some of that tax rolled in and therefore had a bigger revenue than those that said, "We're not going to tax our people for adult ed."

MILLER: And that 10 cents was local money.

EBERHARD: It was a local tax. So here's historically two inequities actually that came forward, one of which I believe has been fixed today. But the inequity first was how the caps got established. It was purely by accident. And then you have the inequity of the range of revenue limits where, in fact, the districts that have levied the tax, and then when the new revenue limit came into place, were able to have a higher revenue limit than those communities that didn't. So that, you could say, was all based on local decision and local control.

MILLER: Yeah. I believe there was some elaborate procedure at the time in determining how much money the adult schools had actually been spending in contrast to how much they had been earning to establish what the local revenue limit was.

EBERHARD: Well, it was involved in basic aid and foundation aid, and it was fairly complicated, and most of that detail has escaped me.

MILLER: Yeah, and probably isn't too important to us at this time anyway, except as an example.

EBERHARD: It's only important because what we have today is the result—

MILLER: Is based on it.

EBERHARD: Is based on what happened then.

MILLER: Okay. Now, we've sort of covered this, but there are probably some more formal networks as well. Simi Valley is at the northern edge of the Los Angeles Basin, and yet during this period of time you had developed these close relationships we've mentioned with Ted Zimmerman and Tom Johnson, but also with a number of other southern California adult ed administrators. What was the process? What was the network that was in operation at that time for southern California adult school administrators?

- EBERHARD: Okay, before I answer the network question, I do want. . . .  
You had mentioned earlier had I been involved with Los Angeles Unified or not.
- MILLER: Yes.
- EBERHARD: Later, in the mid-'70s, about '74 and '75, I did start to make very frequent contact with the people in Los Angeles—at that time it was Abe [Abram] Friedman, and then replaced by Bob [Robert] Rupert—and these were mostly informal networks. I can recall Bob Rupert had a group of people, a group of adult directors called the "white hats."
- MILLER: "White hats"?
- EBERHARD: The "white hats." Bob had an apartment in Torrance, California, and he would hold the "white hat" meeting, oh, three or four times a year. And we'd go to Bob's apartment [with] a big round kitchen table. Maybe ten or twelve of us would sit around, with no agenda, but just brainstorming and creating and visioning and trying to determine how we could make our programs better. Or if there was a fight going on with the state at that time, how we could beat the state. So that was a very important group, and the reason that was a very important group, because it was convened by the probably most important

director of [an] adult local program in the state, and that was Bob Rupert. And that's by definition: whoever is the director in Los Angeles is the director emeritus of the other directors in the state. So that was one of the networks.

Also, at that time CCAE [California Council of Adult Education] also played a role. But as we know, CCAE's broader organization involves teachers. And that was the early stages of ACSA [Association of California School Administrators]. When the old Adult Education Administrators Association was dissolved in 1970, ACSA was created. It had this new committee, and those original chairs of the ACSA committee were sort of struggling to find a presence and their source of power. . . .

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

MILLER: This is Tape 1, Side 2 of the Ray Eberhard interview. And Ray, you were talking about the new ACSA Adult Ed Committee.

EBERHARD: Right, the new ACSA. And with the new Adult Ed Committee, as I mentioned, they were looking for their base, in terms of how influential this new organization could be. But my sense of that is that the majority of information once again, and still to



this day, remains very . . . is informal networking of people who have respect for each other and a level of trust, and that's still how the majority of information gets shared.

**MILLER:** Okay.

[tape turned off]

**MILLER:** Ray, you had just mentioned Bob Rupert and his group of "white hats." I guess those were the good guys.

**EBERHARD:** Uh-huh, the good guys.

**MILLER:** But let's talk about Bob for just a minute. He was another very young administrator for the position that he had, but tell us about him.

**EBERHARD:** Well, Bob was a very strong leader, had a very strong public presence, excellent public speaker also, worked the external part of L.A. very well.

**MILLER:** What do you mean by "the external part"? The public relations part?

**EBERHARD:** Yeah, the public relations. Bob had a sense of L.A.'s role in the scheme of things, in terms of program, in terms of legislation, state policy, and used that role very well and used it very positively. But going back, I mentioned Bob would give a lot of public speeches; and when Bob spoke, people listened. And

that's real important in our system because he was well respected, first of all, for the competence that he had, and, secondly, who he represented, which was the largest adult system in the world, in Los Angeles. On the one hand.

On the other hand, Bob was very accessible. I had several private meetings with Bob, in terms of questioning him about the program and direction. And I'll never forget one day, because although you mentioned Bob was young, I was even younger, and I was in a meeting with him—I think it was another one of those napkin meetings, where we were drawing pictures on a napkin? And he looked over at me and he rubbed my sideburns, and he said, "You're doing okay," he said, "but as soon as you get a little white over here," he said, "you will have really arrived." [Chuckling] And I'll never forget that comment from Bob.

MILLER: You were mentioning his accessibility, and I know he did speak at the first adult education conference that I ever attended, and I was just really impressed with the man and what he had to say. And I know I called his office after that meeting, and I really just meant to speak to his secretary, but she put me through to

him. And all I wanted was a copy of his speech, you know, but he just sent it right out.

**EBERHARD:** Right, he was also very good at writing personal notes, thank-yous, *congratulations*, which was a nice touch for a person in a very responsible position.

**MILLER:** Yes.

**EBERHARD:** He also, not only in the state, but as you know, Bob was president of our national organization for one year, kept California's presence in that for a fairly long period of time as he went through the chairs on the now AAACE [American Association of Adult and Continuing Education] board to rising to the president of the national association. And that was very important for us because our own importance stayed in the scheme of things.

**MILLER:** Okay. All right, we'd been talking about the restrictions on adult ed before we sidetracked to Bob. The ultimate restrictions on adult education came with the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978. And sometimes I can't believe that almost twenty years later we keep referring to this just as if it happened yesterday, and I think that's probably testament to its continuing impact on our programs.

EBERHARD: Of course.

MILLER: Theoretically it was a property tax reform, but the results went far beyond that. Can you talk about the effects on education in general, and adult ed in particular, and what it did to our programs?

EBERHARD: Well, I can talk probably better about the effect of its impact on adult ed in particular, as opposed to education in general.

MILLER: Yes, sure.

EBERHARD: Because one needs to come fast-forward to today, in terms of other mechanisms that are in place now that may not be as negative as one would assume on Prop. 13, which has impact maybe on other kinds of governmental services but maybe not so much on education. It was probably the blackest day in the history [Chuckling] of the adult education system when Prop. 13 was passed, and the next morning the system literally was out of business. That was because of how our revenue limit mechanism was working based on local property tax, and those had basically been all wiped away; however, the state was now in a priority-setting mode. The resources from the local taxes had been reduced, therefore, the state coffers had been reduced. What has to go? And it was decided adult ed had to go. So,

for a short period of time there, and it seems like it was a much longer period of time, but I think the truth, if it were to be documented, is that the adult system was probably only out of existence for about a week, at which point in time then the special interest groups came to Sacramento en masse and applied tremendous pressure to the legislature. The two most significant groups were the Gray Panthers at that time, who were very well organized in terms of the demise of programs for older adults, and then the state parents' education coalition.

Now, two things were sort of happening at the same time: one, the state recognized that it couldn't do away with its literacy and language programs, so the legislature voluntarily reinstated a few million dollars—the sum escapes me at this time—for the continuation of those programs. But everything else was nonexistent. So here come the Gray Panthers, here come the parents, and very shortly thereafter, we had those programs reinstated back into adult education. But it was a very difficult process and actually set the way for the creation of the current reduced system that we have today in just the ten authorized areas, as opposed to a very broad-based "you can do anything you want to do" kind of system.

From that point then, in essence what Prop. 13 did was to establish a new funding base, a very limited funding base, for the system. My recollection on what the dollar value was there was about \$113 million back in 1979 for the base. Now, that's important to note that in 1979 at \$113 million to today, 1995, where the base of the program is \$450 million dollars, you have to put everything in perspective. [Chuckling] So that stayed pretty much that way until 1986, when we reformed the revenue limit structure, again, and created a little higher base for the program, which built in some COLA [cost of living adjustment] activities or some COLA mechanisms and some growth mechanisms.

But one thing we learned, that we all knew before but nobody really ever wanted to admit publicly, is that if in fact you have to line yourself up—if adult educators have to line themselves up with, first of all, other state priorities, and, secondly, with priorities of an educational system—we tend to fall fairly fast to the bottom of the priority list. Now, if you're going to save your educational system, and there's a financial disaster like Prop. 13, you're going to save the kids first.

MILLER: Some districts were hurt more than others in that year following Prop. 13. The money came to the districts in a block grant.

What happened that some districts lost more than others?

EBERHARD: The districts—and this is where in fact the scope of the program got narrowed down—the districts that were big in arts, crafts, music, drama, and had large numbers of units of a.d.a. there, lost those units of a.d.a., because no longer was that legally possible to offer those kinds of programs for state apportionment. So the districts that had the bigger bases in ESL, the academic subjects, in voc ed, they weren't hurt as much as the districts that were kind of soft in those areas and big in the other areas. So, when the state says, "You can't do that anymore, you can only do this, . . ." then they weren't able to bring those units of a.d.a. into their base, they just flat-out lost them. Simi Valley was one of those districts. Even though it had a cap of, I think, about 3,600 and a big vocational program, it still had a good chunk in the arts and crafts kinds of things.

MILLER: In the arts and crafts and the fine arts and humanities.

EBERHARD: Fine arts, right.

- MILLER: But also within that block grant districts did have the option of setting the size of a program, because that first year you had to offer ESL, but we weren't told how much ESL we had to offer.
- EBERHARD: That's right. Well, the block grant went to the district per se, and the district then could decide how much adult ed it wanted to do or not to do, and that's wherein those battles occurred, right.
- MILLER: Yes.
- EBERHARD: And some adult people were more successful than others in getting their, quote, fair share of the block grant that came down.
- MILLER: Yeah, and the unfortunate part about that then was that the districts who had not run their full basic program, the following year the legislation set size based on that year.
- EBERHARD: Based on that year, correct.
- MILLER: And adult ed funds were grandfathered to the district both in '76 when the adult ed revenue limit was established, and then again with these block grants.
- EBERHARD: Grants in 19 . . . it was 1979 or 1980. I believe it was '79. Yes, it happened twice.



MILLER: So it happened twice that our funds went into the districts' base programs.

EBERHARD: Well, one could also say that it happened three times, because beginning in 1992 there was created a legislative mechanism known as the "mega item."

MILLER: Yes!

EBERHARD: And categorical programs were placed in the mega item, and it gave the districts discretion to take up to 10 percent of anything in a mega item for purposes of their general fund. So actually it's happened three times.

MILLER: Yeah, I had forgotten about that.

EBERHARD: But the third time not as severe as the first two.

MILLER: With the loss of program scope, local administrators looked elsewhere to maintain viable programs. What were some of the new things that they did?

EBERHARD: Well, I think they weren't particularly new, but also once again keep in mind during that time is that we've got this big immigration wave coming into the state. So it's probably between '78 and '85 that you see a tremendous increase in the number of students taking ESL programs, and [that] becomes the predominant program all the way through the '80s and into

the '90s. So there was a program shift that occurred, and with whatever their existing cap was, then they just. . . . Most districts were running at cap without any problem. In fact, the majority of districts were running at over cap because of ESL. So ESL then becomes . . . we become known as the ESL system.

MILLER: And there was some additional federal money through the refugees, for awhile. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: There was, right.

MILLER: And then that's when we started our community service programs.

EBERHARD: Well, actually, adult ed has always had access to community service programs through the Community Service Act. If you'll recall back in the '70s, there was what we would call . . . they were called forums, public forums?

MILLER: Mm-hmm.

EBERHARD: Yeah, where they had a whole different set of regulations, where in fact you could charge people coming through the door fees. Lecture and forum series, that's what they were. Those were very popular for quite a long period of time, and then with the advent of reform in '76, the ability to do that statutorily disappeared. But the Community Service Act comes into play

and districts then looking at revenue streams find that the offering of fee-based classes is a good way to generate a revenue stream, even though by statutory control one is not supposed to be making, quote, profit from fee-based programs.

MILLER: Not supposed to. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right.

MILLER: Okay, we frequently talk about "program following funding," and when funds were cut as a result of Prop. 13, a couple of things occurred then. The colleges weren't cut as soon as the adult schools were after 13. Do you recall anything about that?

EBERHARD: I don't recall that sequence.

MILLER: Yeah, for a year or two the programs that we had lost funding for the colleges were still collecting revenue—I think it was just the one year—in the humanities and the fine arts and crafts. So a lot of teachers shifted from adult schools to the colleges that first year after Prop. 13.

EBERHARD: The fine-arts folk.

MILLER: The fine-arts folks, yes. And shortly after that was when we started the growth in concurrent, wasn't it?

EBERHARD: No, I think the growth in concurrent didn't start until the early '80s.

MILLER: Well, that's shortly after. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: It's shortly, that's right. That would be shortly after. But it had to do with sort of an informal policy decision that had been reached with Los Angeles Unified by the then Deputy Superintendent, Xavier Del Buono [Associate, then Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1974-86]. And L.A. was . . . of course, [as] the growth of at-risk kids become more predominate with the system, in the K-12 system they're struggling to find ways to meet the needs, and they knew that the concurrent provision was there. At that time, it was basically regulated by what was known as the 51-49 rule, that all classes still had to be [at least] 51 percent adults and [no more than] 49 percent kids. But it wasn't used too extensively until the early '80s, when in fact the financial crunch comes on. Of course, the attractiveness of concurrent is that they were paid out of the K-12 fund and the K-12 revenue limit. So where in effect the adult may have been generating \$1,500 income to the district, the child attending adult ed was generating over \$3,000 for the same number of attendance [hours] in the district, so obviously there was a wonderful funding incentive to see how many kids adult ed could serve.

MILLER: Okay, we'll come back to that a little bit later, but certainly it shows that program follows the funding. By the time Proposition 13 actually passed, you were already in Sacramento.

EBERHARD: That's correct.

MILLER: Coming here in '76. How did that move come about? Were you recruited? Was there an open job announcement?

EBERHARD: Yes. Yes.

MILLER: Okay. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Yes and yes. Evidently, I was fortunate in the situation I had in Simi Valley, that I was allowed to be visible as I moved around other districts looking at programs and had gotten some recognition for some of the programs I had brought on line in Simi Valley. I had made several trips to Sacramento to talk with a variety of policy people, etcetera. At that time, there was a new state director who had just been hired into adult ed, replacing Eugene DeGabriele [Chief, Bureau of Adult Education, 1970-74] in 1975, and that was Don[ald A.] McCune [Director, Adult Education, 1975-86]. And also, at the very same time, a new associate superintendent for adult ed was hired by the name of Xavier Del Buono, both very new but both dynamic and energetic individuals in their own right. And there

were two openings, two consultant openings that became available in the state, and they were both advertised for. I received a phone call from Xavier Del Buono, who I had met while I was in the field moving around, and [he] said, "Hey, we've got these positions. You might be the kind of person that we're interested in, if you're interested in it." So I went through the process and was fortunate enough to be placed number one on the list. And immediately thereafter got a call from Don McCune saying, "Are you still interested?" and I said, "Yes, I'm still interested," and I came to Sacramento for my interview, passed that, and that's how I got the job.

That year in the state budget. . . . The reason for the two positions, I think I erroneously said the two positions had opened. Actually, the state legislature had made available two additional positions for adult ed for purposes of compliance, and so I got one of the positions. The other position was filled by Tom [Thomas] Bauer.

MILLER: Oh, he came the same time you did then?

EBERHARD: Tom Bauer and I came at the same . . . well, within two weeks of each other.

MILLER: Somehow I thought he had been here quite awhile.

EBERHARD: He had been with the state in early childhood education, ECE, at that time. But then as soon as this position opened, because Tom had been an ESL teacher—

MILLER: I didn't know that.

EBERHARD: Yes, he was an ESL teacher in Los Angeles. That's where he really wanted to work, and so he applied for the other opening and got it.

MILLER: Okay. So he first came to Sacramento in early childhood [education]?

EBERHARD: Yes.

MILLER: And then came to the adult ed unit.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: Okay, maybe somewhere between there is how I got the idea he'd been with the department longer than that. One of your first tasks, as you had described it, in that first year as a consultant was drafting new allocation formulas for the distribution of federal funds. I know a little bit but not enough about how those federal funds were administered earlier, and so can you talk about that? The department didn't have full control of them before the mid-'70s, and. . . .

**EBERHARD:** Well, the department did have full control of it. However, what the department had done is let a contract, particularly for the—at that time called Section 309 [of the federal Adult Education Act]—teacher demonstration, research, and developmental funds, and that contract was let with the Far West Laboratories [for Educational Research and Development]. And at that time I believe because the federal grant was small, the actual 309 was a much bigger part of the federal legislation at that time. So the Far West Lab actually played a very important role as a contractor in the administration of the federal program than you would ever find a contractor doing today. And that happened, that was true till about 19 . . . I believe that ended around 1976, yes, at which time then we assumed greater responsibility for that, and the money from the federal government—

**MILLER:** Got bigger.

**EBERHARD:** Got bigger, too, which made it a more important program to administer. However, the actual funding formula in that period of time was not too different from what it is today, in terms of providing a discrete amount of money for ESL programs and a



discrete amount of money for adult basic education programs, which was, of course, the two programs in literacy at that time.

**MILLER:** Okay. You gained more and more responsibility rather quickly when you came to the unit, and after just a year you were serving as administrative assistant to Don McCune.

**EBERHARD:** Correct.

**MILLER:** That was an unofficial position at first, and then you were named assistant director in 1979, and concurrently you were assuming more responsibility for the federal program. How are the federal funds different from the funds that are allocated by the state?

**EBERHARD:** Let me add some clarity to my responsibilities you mentioned. When I came in 1976, my first assignment was that as a regional consultant, and I was assigned to the San Joaquin Valley, so I had a responsibility for everything from Bakersfield to . . .

**MILLER:** Sacramento. [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** Modesto, I think, yeah. A wonderful grounding at that point in time, but as a regional consultant, one had the opportunity to go out and provide a variety of workshops and training, which hadn't necessarily been done before. So the advantage I had is I was fresh out of the field, so the people that I was providing

consultative services to were people who had been my peers just six months earlier. So I was able to bring a direct, fresh experience, in terms of what it meant to be a practitioner. I focused primarily on program development with the people in that territory and on creative financing, which some of us in the south had learned maybe more than some people in the San Joaquin Valley had learned. So I spent almost a full year doing that. And at the completion of that, then my associate superintendent, who was Xavier Del Buono, asked Don McCune, who was my boss at that time, if I could come and be his administrative assistant, working up on the executive floor. And I said, "Yes, I want to do it." [Chuckling] And Don said, yeah, he'll let me go. So, in essence, although I worked directly for Xavier, I worked very closely with Don McCune at the same time. And that's where I became involved directly . . . almost exclusively in policy development and formulation for adult education. And it was a wonderful period of time, it really was.

**MILLER:** Yeah, it was. There were also . . . you had a lot of new people in the mid-'70s. You mentioned that that's when Don and Xavier came, and you came and Tom came, but also Dick

[Richard] Stiles and Bob [Robert] Ehlers came during that same two-, three-year period of '74 to '76.

EBERHARD: Yes, they did. Also Jim [James] Lindberg. Jim Lindberg was new. Don McCune had recruited him out of at that time the drug unit, and Bob had come over from his assignment as a consultant for continuation high schools, I believe.

MILLER: Well, yeah, I guess he came directly from continuation, because he had worked kind of in a planning unit also.

EBERHARD: Yeah, and he was in a planning unit, right. And Dick Stiles came from our research unit. And so, yeah, we all sort of came together within that two-year time frame.

MILLER: That was quite a team.

EBERHARD: Yes, it really was a team.

MILLER: Can you just kind of reminisce about that team? You seemed to be very close at that time.

EBERHARD: We were, and we are today. The reason that we were close, I go back to the opening comments of this morning, is that everybody cared about the adult population and what they were doing and that it made a difference. And you can never say enough about that. And so we all had sort of a collegial interest

in the population and in working together, and each of us brought our own strengths to the situation: Dick with his research assessment database; Bob having the planning experience and a very strong field presence also; and myself having actually been a practitioner of adult education in the field. Those ingredients made for a very strong team. And we had good leadership in McCune and Del Buono, who allowed us to kind of run a little wild and crazy and think the unthinkable. And you need that kind of an environment to come up with good stuff, and good stuff we came up with in a lot of cases.

**MILLER:** Yeah, you did. You did. And a lot of it dealing with the federal program. Again, let's talk about that a little bit, how the federal funds are different from the state funds.

**EBERHARD:** Okay, right. With the state funds, they are exclusively used for local assistance. That means that the General Fund dollars go out for purposes of running local programs with the apportionment revenue limits. The only state General Fund money that there is for state [level operation of adult education] is for some personnel, but very limited personnel. So we were able to utilize the federal funds, number one, to acquire some additional personnel, but also then to engage ourselves in some

very sophisticated research and developmental processes, which was not available within the General Fund program. So, under Section 309, 310, and now Section 353 of the federal legislation known as Research, Demonstration and Teacher Training Programs, we were able to bring some very powerful products on line, with CASAS [Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System] probably being the first one, which is now, I think, in almost every state and territory in the country. [Chuckling]

**MILLER:** I think it's now made it to that fiftieth state. The fiftieth one was Alaska.

**EBERHARD:** But how does a state develop an assessment system like that? You know, you go [look for] another one anywhere, you won't find a thing like that. California did that. If you know, it was originally called the California Adult [Student] Assessment System and it's now "Comprehensive." So CASAS was the early example of the kinds of things that we were able to do with federal money that we would have never been able to do with state money, because there was no state money to do it with.

**MILLER:** No state money for it.

**EBERHARD:** It's important also to emphasize a major policy decision that was made regarding the federal dollars. Unlike any other state, and

what I mean by the other states is that they chose to distribute their 309, 310, 353 dollars . . . sort of disperse it throughout their system. In other words, everybody got a little piece of it for purposes of research, demonstration, and training. In California we chose not to do that. We chose almost essentially to fairly well control those resources in Sacramento for "big bang" experiences, [Chuckling] such as CASAS, such as the ESL [Teacher] Institute, such as the Strategic Plan, the original one and the one that was done here just a couple of years ago. So we've utilized it through larger contractual processes to get bigger product, and as opposed to, from our point of view, let it dissipate throughout the system in dribs and drabs. I believe we've been extremely successful with that policy decision; not only for California, but the rest of the country has benefitted from that decision.

MILLER: And from the products that have been developed here.

EBERHARD: And from the products, yes.

MILLER: The federal money is in two pots, though; some of it does still go to the schools.

EBERHARD: Well, the majority of it goes to the schools, yes.

MILLER: I guess what we need to emphasize here is that the federal money is supplemental to the state money.

EBERHARD: Yes. Once again that was another policy decision that we made back in the late '70s or early '80s. And the reason that we did it, and why we are always different from other states, is that we have such a richly funded general base program.

MILLER: That no other state has.

EBERHARD: That no other state has. So it seemed silly for us to try and add a couple of more classes with the few million that we got from the Adult Ed Act as opposed to enriching the base which was already there. And so our policy decision was to make it purely supplemental, to let it add to the base so that you could reduce class size or hire additional personnel, provide more—

MILLER: Resource teachers or materials.

EBERHARD: Resource teachers, more staff development types of activities for the system. That was a very conscious decision on the part of those of us in Sacramento.

MILLER: Okay, and those policy decisions have actually expanded the influence of the federal money far beyond the amount of money itself.

EBERHARD: Very good. Yes, that's true because it allowed us, with policy that we could do on the federal program that maybe we couldn't do on the General Fund program, to lever. . . . Let me restate that. We levered General Fund policy in a lot of cases with the federal program policy—absolutely true.

MILLER: And a very dramatic step that you took, that I think really shook the nation at the time, was the CBAE [competency-based adult education] mandate in '82.

EBERHARD: Yes.

MILLER: Tell us what led to that decision, and do you recall any of the planning sessions or the conversations that led up to that?

EBERHARD: Yeah, I recall, I think, a lot of the pre-activity regarding the mandate, and I need to recognize Bob Ehlers. [He] was our consultant [who was] coordinator for Section 309. I think it segued into 310 while he was still there.

MILLER: Into 310 while he was still there.

EBERHARD: Bob chose to let out RFP [request for proposal] contracts that . . . many of them were dedicated to competency-based education or outcome-based education. Now we're talking here, the time frame is '76 through '80, and—

MILLER: Those were primarily curriculum contracts.



**EBERHARD:** Those were curriculum contracts, content contracts. And the reason for that is that there had been the big national assessment called the Adult Performance Level [APL] study, which was really the first national study that had ever been done in terms of what the literacy level of the United States looks like. That was done out of the University of Texas with Norville Northcutt and received an awful lot of national attention. We brought a group of people together and said, "Does the research design and the results out of the APL study seem to make sense?" Everybody said yes, but, California always being a little different, we said, "Well, we'd better go verify that." And so what we did through another contract that we let, which was called the NOMOS study [California Adult Competency Survey], and in essence we replicated, with some modification, the APL study that had been started in '72 [with the final report in 1975]. We did ours in '78-79.

**MILLER:** Seventy-seven, seventy-eight.

**EBERHARD:** Yeah, right in that time frame. And sure enough, the NOMOS study fairly well validated the percentages of nonliterate and partially literate adults in the population. But not only did it verify the population, but it also verified the fact that there are

functional competencies that as a result of illiteracy adults can't perform, which is what the APL study said. So, ergo, with our 309/310, we are sort of developing models and curriculum to test that. Also at the same time—well, a little later time frame, around '79—we began the development of CASAS and created the state consortium. The competency lists are developed based on the five domains that came out of the APL study. Well, you can see how this is all connected. It's very sequential but also very connected.

So this is a long way to get the answer to your question about the mandated policy, but we are now . . . the state of California is now heavily invested, beginning with the 309/310 competency curriculum programs, [and] with the creation, invention of CASAS. And now what are we going to do with all that? Go tell the field that "These are nice things. You should come . . ."

**MILLER:** Try them out sometime. [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** ". . . come to our dinner table and eat our food." So we made the decision at that time that we were, from a state level perspective, the state was absolutely committed to competency-based education. [We] believed in the two research bases—we

had validated [APL] through NOMOS. It worked, it was the right thing to do. So we then in our state plan, for the first time in the history of California, mandated a curriculum design and program operation in the federal program, and that happened in 1982.

MILLER: So it was just sort of a logical next step.

EBERHARD: And we had forty-nine states call us and ask, "Why did you do that?" [Chuckling]

MILLER: Did they feel it was putting pressure on them?

EBERHARD: Yeah. Well, the federal government had to check it out because, you know, in terms of a state mandating a particular programmatic design. The reason that we were able to do that and get away with it is that we had a way to test it, and we had a way to test it because we had the CASAS system. So that became the operational philosophy and programmatic design of the federal program, and still generally is today. However, I think it's important to note that—and this just comes from having lived through that period of time, and also today in the program—that essentially that mandate, in my opinion, did not bring about the massive program change that we expected it to bring about. Because while people were conversant in the

jargon and the vernacular of outcome-based education, and in fact would use the assessment system and the various tests to do that, that when one took a look then and takes a look today, you still don't see a proliferation of competency-based education or outcome-based education in the system.

**MILLER:** You did see a major shift in curriculum, though.

**EBERHARD:** Yes, to some extent. What you saw, no question, was an absolute change in process, a definite commitment to open entry/open exit, a definite commitment to individualized self-paced instruction. But when one actually probed deeper to take a look at student mastery in terms of those outcomes, that's where it fell short. And that is still true today.

**MILLER:** What I meant by the massive shift in curriculum, I think that the concept of functional competency was successfully communicated.

**EBERHARD:** No question about that, but not successfully implemented. However, it had great impact on the world of textbook publishing. I mean, if one looked at the major publishing companies that were extant back in the mid-'70s, and the kinds of materials they were providing in ESL and adult basic education, and the adult secondary education, and took a look

at those again in 1984, you will have seen a major shift in how those publishing materials actually addressed adult education. So, to that extent, what we did had a major impact on the publishing industry. And still does today.

**MILLER:** And still does today, yeah. So, along with the mandate, then the federal money, the federal projects then were directed towards supporting this implementation.

**EBERHARD:** That is correct.

**MILLER:** Staff development and dissemination and—

**EBERHARD:** Well, the dissemination and our staff development all had CBAE components to them—in fact, they were constructed with all the CBAE concepts.

**MILLER:** You talked about getting phone calls from forty-nine other state directors. What impact then did this go ahead and have on the rest of the country? You've mentioned that the textbook publishing industry responded.

**EBERHARD:** Right, and that's the primary impact. Because as California often goes with its adult system, the publishers of course respond to that, and that doesn't leave Iowa much choice, in terms of the kinds of textbooks that are available to them. So that was the major impact. The second major impact was then

the proliferation and acceptance of CASAS nationally. More and more states started to adopt CASAS as their assessment system, and of course if you adopt CASAS, then your curriculum and instructional program would change to align with that. Those were the two primary impacts.

There were still a lot of states who did not believe in the idea of outcome-based instruction, and to this day I still get into debates with a lot of my colleagues throughout the country—

MILLER: It's still controversial, for some reason.

EBERHARD: Well, of course it is. Well, but it's controversial for different reasons today, in terms of the more traditional curriculum that could be assessed with TABE [Test of Adult Basic Education] exams and ABEL [Adult Basic Education Levels] exams or other types of vehicles. But you see, after the National Adult Literacy Survey [NALS] was published two years ago, ETS [Educational Testing Service] immediately creates its new exam for adults that is based on the notion of functional context and is basically ETS's version of CASAS. So ETS is no small publisher. [Chuckling]

- MILLER: Yes. You mentioned this National Adult Literacy Survey, and again that was followed up by a state component [State Adult Literacy Survey, SALS] in California.
- EBERHARD: A state component, right.
- MILLER: Do you care to make any comparisons between the APL and NOMOS and NALS and SALS? Can you make general comparisons?
- EBERHARD: I can make some general comparisons. First of all, APL was done on a small sample. My recollection is a fairly small sample of just a little over [or] not quite 4,000 adults throughout the country. A fairly high percentage of those were incarcerated adults, which caused there to be some criticism of the APL results to begin with. Our NOMOS study in California, in fact, did about the same number of adults in California as the APL did nationally. So that's why we felt comfortable with what NOMOS validated.
- MILLER: And they were not all incarcerated. [Chuckling]
- EBERHARD: In fact, none of them were, I don't think.
- MILLER: Yeah.
- EBERHARD: So you go from '72 APL to '78-79 NOMOS, and then you jump all the way over until 1992, which is a good, well, twenty years

from APL, for the federal government to engage again in terms of assessing the literacy level of adults. The difference with NALS, the National Adult Literacy Survey, is that it took a much broader band and definition of what literacy was and broke it down into those which have a literacy capability but are not functional. Okay, so they added this functional context and they broadened it. What drives that is the definition of literacy.

MILLER: Yes!

EBERHARD: And I can't quote the definition, but the National Adult Literacy Survey had a definition of literacy different than what they came with for APL, and so your results, as you compare results, are going to be different. The National Adult Literacy Survey, in essence, says that about 50 percent of the adult population have some deficiency in literacy. Okay, which is a much broader stroke than the APL study said, that about 20-22 percent are functionally illiterate. Okay, so in essence, they examined a broader spectrum, they found that, not surprising to a lot of people, that people with high school diplomas, a large percentage of people with high school diplomas fell within that 50 percent band of deficiency, and so forth.

MILLER: Yeah. The NALS. . . .



[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

MILLER: This is Tape 2, Side A of the Ray Eberhard interview.

[tape turned off]

. . . [was] more difficult, in the sense that it seems that the lower levels of the NALS were the entire scope of the APL.

EBERHARD: Right, exactly.

MILLER: Okay, and then, of course, Tom [Thomas] Stitch [Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, Inc., San Diego] is always telling us when he's talking about the definition of literacy, that when they throw out these figures of the number of people that have deficiencies that, in point of fact, even those in the lowest portion can successfully complete almost 10 percent of [the tasks in] the highest category.

EBERHARD: That is right, yes.

MILLER: And so that the reporting mechanism itself is somewhat misleading.

EBERHARD: Yeah, the whole issue of literacy and functional competence is not as discrete as one might think when one looks at these results in these surveys. Because as we all know, you may have a deficit in one area and be low but be able to function as an

adult [and be] high in another area. So you've got to be very cautious in terms of how we paint this picture of who is illiterate and who isn't.

**MILLER:** Okay, in the mid-'80s you took a detour from the Adult Education Unit, but certainly not into a totally unrelated field. I believe it was a departmental reorganization that eliminated your assistant director position. Is that right?

**EBERHARD:** Yeah, that's right, and that's when Bill Honig [Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1982-93] became superintendent, and the year, I believe, was 1982. My boss at that time, Xavier Del Buono, was then being promoted to a deputy superintendent and asked me if I would form a new unit within the department called the School Intervention Unit [usually referred to as High-Risk Youth Unit], addressing the needs of at-risk kids and dropout prevention. And I said, "Okay." [Chuckling]

**MILLER:** "You want me to do that?" [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** "You want me to do that, I will do that."

**MILLER:** "That's what I will do." [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** "That's what I will do." So, in fact, that did happen, and I worked there for almost four years, I believe, and it was a very interesting period of time. My two biggest recollections of that

period of time were, one, the passage of SB 65 [Senate Bill 65], which was the—and is still today—the only dropout prevention legislation on the books in California, with its three major components: the Motivation and Maintenance Program, the Educational Clinics, and the AWEC, Adult Alternative Work Center Program for kids.

MILLER: Say that again. A-what?

EBERHARD: It's Adult . . . no, it's Alternative Work . . . it's Adult Alternative Work Centers [Alternative Work and Education Centers], and it addressed the dropout. . . . A young person who had dropped out for forty-five consecutive days could attend alternative work activities such as adult ed or ROP [Regional Occupational Programs].

MILLER: Okay. You actually wrote a lot of that legislation, didn't you?

EBERHARD: Yes, I did. I'm proud of that one. I have a signed copy of SB 65 from then-Governor [George] Deukmejian.

MILLER: Okay. And that position actually brought you a lot of national exposure. I mean, you'd had quite a bit from the CBAE mandate, but this—

EBERHARD: Yeah, from the CBAE, right. Yeah, that's true. And the reason is that during this period of time the whole issue of at-risk youth

and dropout prevention was receiving national attention. All the major newspapers were running editorials about what's happening to our children, why are they dropping out of school? And as a result of that, a lot of states were attempting initiatives like California was, which is why we created the unit. What was interesting, however, is primarily nobody knew what to do, and so you would start calling around. And so people from Florida would call me, people from New York would call me, or I'd call them and say, "Hey, I've just been given this job, I haven't a clue what to do"—

MILLER: "What are you doing?" [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: "What are you doing?" Exactly. So, as a result of that, I got to meet an individual by the name of Dr. Nancy Peck, who's the Director of the Dropout Prevention Center at the University of Miami, and Dr. Victor Herbert, who was the Superintendent of Dropouts for the City Schools of New York. And we for several months were involved in phone dialogue, who was doing what throughout the country, "What are you doing? What do you find that's worked?" and so we were just sharing over the telephone. The three of us accidentally met in March of 1986 at a coffee shop in a hotel in Miami, Florida, and—

MILLER: Pulled out some napkins. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right, exactly. And as a result of that meeting, it was agreed that we needed to expand our networks, because the three of us were in constant communication but we were then getting communication as individuals from other places. So it was actually decided that. . . . That is where the formation of the National Dropout Prevention Network started, and from that point. . . . Today I'm very proud to have been the co-founder of that network, [and] its first executive director. I volunteered as executive director at night for two years. It is to this day a very viable organization. It has over 3,000 members nationally, it has its own center now, Clemson University in South Carolina, that provides monographs, how-to documents, model programs, data research throughout the country.

MILLER: So, from your bedroom it now has a university setting.  
[Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right, from my bedroom it now has a university setting, exactly. And another interesting little anecdote there, our first national conference was held in San Diego, and our keynote speaker on the very first day of the conference in San Diego was Governor Bill Clinton from Arkansas.

- MILLER: [Chuckling] So you've actually met him?
- EBERHARD: I have actually met him, and he was fascinating, he gave a wonderful speech. And Hilary at that time was very active in education in Arkansas.
- MILLER: That's when she was doing her surveys.
- EBERHARD: Right, she was doing the surveys. She was very active in adult literacy in Arkansas, but also primarily working with at-risk kids in the public schools in Arkansas.
- MILLER: It was during this time, and it wasn't the network specifically but because of the interest in high-risk youth, there was a lot of involvement from business, and you became involved with this Aspen Institute, which was a wonderful experience. Tell us something about that.
- EBERHARD: Right. As a result, I guess, of some of the visibility that I had gotten forming this unit within the Department of Education and a lot of the networking that we were doing throughout the country, I got a phone call from Collin Williams, who was the executive director of the Aspen Institute, inviting me to be an Aspen Fellow for a seminar on Hispanic businessmen and the educational community as it relates to at-risk kids. First of all, I'd heard of the Aspen Institute but didn't know a lot about it,

and was very fortunate to be invited to this because only twenty-two people from throughout the country were part of this, were invited to be fellows.

MILLER: That sounds really impressive, Ray. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: It was. It was. It was one of the most impressive experiences I've ever had in my career. I was fortunate to attend two years—in Aspen, Colorado—with this group, and I was the only educational practitioner that had been invited to participate primarily with business people. There are the published manuals that came out of the institute after the second year, but of even more importance is that while I was an institute fellow with Collin Williams, he became aware of our work with the National Dropout Prevention Network. And we were looking for a home. We didn't want to create a new house. If we could find a house to move into to support our network, we'd do that, and so it was agreed that the National Dropout Prevention Network would become affiliated with the Aspen Institute. I was then invited to be a member of the board of directors of the Aspen Institute, and I attended my first meeting at the Wye Plantation on the eastern shore of Maryland in this most *glorious* retreat. It's one of the most spectacular settings in the

country, and it's of importance to me because also on the board of directors was Gerald Ford, Henry Kissinger, Senator Jack Clark. And I'll never forget attending my—

**MILLER:** I didn't know you had met with all those people! [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** I'll never forget attending my first meeting in this basement compound at the Wye Plantation in Maryland, and not ever having met any of these individuals before; in fact, I was the new person to this board. And I was seated next to Senator Jack Clark, former senator of Iowa, who at that time was the United States' prime expert in U.S.-Soviet relations. And so he looked and he said, "Ah, I see, what do you do with children?" and I told him, and he said, "Oh, that's interesting." I said, "What do you do with the Russians?" And he said, "Well, right now we're working on the SALT [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] talks, nuclear disarmament things. So it was a very heady experience, a very thrilling experience to meet those people. But also interesting for historical purposes, you need to know they had also just hired a new executive director. So the person that I had worked with, Collin Williams, who had set all this up, retires the month before I go to have my first board meeting, and their new executive director is the former president of



Dartmouth University, whose name escapes me at the moment. And as we're going around the table and all these important people are saying why they're on the board and what they bring to the table, it was my turn and I said that, and the new executive director said, "Yes, and we need to chat right after the board meeting regarding the Network's affiliation with the Aspen Institute." [Chuckling] And suffice it to say, it was very short-lived, because with bringing the new executive director on, they were changing the whole thrust of the Aspen Institute and we were not part of their new agenda.

MILLER: You were not in the new scheme of things.

EBERHARD: Right. So I attended one board meeting, and then our affiliation with the Aspen Institute ceased, but it was a very exciting time.

MILLER: Wonderful!

EBERHARD: And I think we accomplished some good things with the National Dropout Network.

MILLER: A wonderful experience for you. The adult ed system to me is sort of the ultimate recovery system for high-risk youth. I mean, if the programs don't work in the public schools and they leave, we're still there. More than that, it all comes under this rubric

of alternative ed, and maybe you could just elaborate a little bit about the relationship between alternative ed and adult ed and other things that fall under that umbrella.

**EBERHARD:** Sure. I think your use of the word *recovery* is appropriate. Adult ed is a recovery system. We have hundreds of thousands of people, adults who are coming back to get their GEDs and their high school diplomas or to enhance a vocational career, whatever it might be. The prevention part of adult education for children is where, in fact, the policy issues lie, so considering adult education as an alternative for youth is problematic. So we need to make the distinction between recovery, which means those who have severed from the system, be they young or be they old, as opposed to those children who are currently in the system utilizing adult education as an alternative vehicle to complete their high school education. The resolution of that is not yet clear. I have always been sort of a traditionalist in regard to the adult ed system with kids. And because adult ed by statute, by legislative intent, is first and foremost a system to educate adults. The law says then if a student, a high school student, can benefit from instruction, then it's okay for them to attend, to remediate, to accelerate, and so forth. The problem

with that is that the number of at-risk children in the public school system, in the K-12 system, if one is to believe the statistics, has in fact increased, and the public school system has probably not been able through the resources it's given to keep up with the demand of this increasing at-risk population. So, therefore, the K-12 people have had to find other ways to provide the services that these kids need, so they have to look outside their core program. Adult ed has been a very attractive alternative to look at because of the inherent flexibility in the system, the individual nature of how we provide service—a lot of reasons it's utilized as an alternative for children. In one of the hearings that was held, I'll never forget, there was a senator from Orange County, when the adult people were testifying in terms of how effective they were in serving children and why they were effective in serving children. There were some K-12 people in the audience and she looked down at them and said, "Why is it that they can do it,"—referring to the adult educators—"and you can't do it?" And nobody stood up to answer that question. [Chuckling] So it's a difficult policy decision. It is probably true that if the K-12 system were given all the resources that it needed to provide the appropriate

service to at-risk kids, they [still] would be sending at-risk kids over to adult ed—they just would. We have seen a tremendous decline in the number since the reform legislation went into place. It's been a huge decline. But as we see the decline of the concurrent students going to adult ed, it's like when you push it in here and it pops out over there.

MILLER: It pops out someplace else.

EBERHARD: Well, guess where it's popping out? It's popping out in independent study. So now we're watching the independent study—

MILLER: In high school.

EBERHARD: —in high school increase because of the decline over here. So there's just no way it appears that the, quote, comprehensive program, whatever that is—

MILLER: Is not comprehensive. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right, appears to be able to serve the needs of these kids. So it still remains a very large educational policy issue that's way beyond adult education. It's an issue in terms of how does the public school system provide appropriate and quality services to kids who are not necessarily mainstream kids?

- MILLER: Even some of these contracts from SB 65, though, for your Alternative Work Centers and things were picked up by adult schools.
- EBERHARD: Yes, they were. Yeah, a lot of the Alternative Work Centers were picked up by adult schools; some of the ed clinics have been managed by adult schools.
- MILLER: And I think maybe the similarity of the continuation schools and this self-paced and open-ended entry and exit and so on, these are similarities of—
- EBERHARD: Yeah, a lot of adult schools are sort of like adult continuation schools, for that matter, because of their need to really address and meet the needs one-on-one.
- MILLER: Okay, also in the mid-'80s, and we've done some talking about Don McCune and Xavier Del Buono and how you served as their assistants at various stages, and we mentioned some about your work with them. Is there anything else you want to say about what they were like to work for, what their mode of operation was?
- EBERHARD: Yeah, let me start with Don because he was my direct boss for two years. Don had a little plastic block on his desk that said "Trust the Process." And he would validate that every morning

by reading the sign. [Chuckling] He and I used to meet almost every morning for about an hour to set the day and to go through it, and Don would say, "Well, let's remember we're going to trust the process." And he literally meant that, that if in fact you had the appropriate well-designed process in place, the content often took care of itself. So his style was very much a process style. He was a very gregarious manager. Don was the first person to really reach out to the public library system at the time it developed [its literacy programs]. I think [that was] somewhat resented in the field in its early stages.

**MILLER:** Yeah, it was in the beginning.

**EBERHARD:** But he did reach out, and that turned out to be a very positive collaborative over time, in terms of the library system and adult schools working together. He was very active in the national scene. He paid a lot of attention to that, minded that store very well, and worked on the reauthorizations when they came up. He was a real dedicated steward to adult ed, and a good public spokesperson for the system.

Xavier, probably one of the brightest people I ever worked for, [was] an extremely visionary individual.

**MILLER:** Yes.

**EBERHARD:** If you've ever had a chance to work with him, he basically needed a board and a marker or butcher paper or something to be writing on because he was always designing things. He would design flow charts and schemes and [was] extremely creative at doing those kinds of things in terms of the system. I learned an awful lot from him in that regard, in terms of actually writing the vision out through diagram and process. Very personal. Xavier had no hierarchical barriers that he ever worked through. One of, I think, his very positive traits is that he would come to you and say, "Help me think this through." And he literally meant that, so you would think it through with him. I thought [that was] a very wonderful trait for a person of this . . . a quote, very high-ranking public official. He is very human in that regard, and a very enjoyable experience, a very, very creative individual.

**MILLER:** You were talking about him being a visionary and diagramming things out. I recall him talking about systems of delivering services to people that are reminiscent of these learning networks that you. . . .

**EBERHARD:** Right.

MILLER: I mean, coming at it from different directions, but the pulling in everyone who delivers service to a set group of people and getting them to work together.

EBERHARD: Yeah, and of course that idea is still viable today. They're referred to as "one-stop shopping centers" in a lot of other places, or "one-stop centers." So a lot of things, you know, there are so many variations on things and everybody has their own variation, depending on what the thrust is, or also what the organization or agency entity it comes from.

MILLER: We lost both of these men within a week in 1986. Do you want to tell us about those circumstances?

EBERHARD: Yeah, Don McCune was an avid pilot, and he had his own plane, it was a Thorpe T-18—I remember that, a red and white and yellow plane—I flew with him on several occasions—and very active in pilots' associations. Whenever he could fly on business, he would. If he could get to an airport close to like—

MILLER: To where he was going.

EBERHARD: —wherever he was going to go, then he'd have somebody pick him up or he'd take a cab, and he did that. We always used to tease Don because he was a very frugal, thrifty person.

[Chuckling] He was always walking around with airplane parts



in his briefcase or hanging out of his pocket that he was personally fixing because he didn't. . . . He said, "The difference between an airplane screw that says 'Certified' and this screw which I bought in a hardware store is \$300, but they're the same screw." Now, of course, none of us believed that, but he did. So, in that regard. . . . He was on a personal trip up to the state of Washington and his plane crashed and killed him and his passenger. And that was very tragic, a great loss to adult education for all of us when that happened. A very tragic way to end a career.

MILLER: Yes.

EBERHARD: Xavier then, shortly thereafter—

MILLER: It was actually a week before.

EBERHARD: Oh, it was a week before? Actually, he resigned. In essence, he retired. And everybody is not all sure of all the circumstances behind all of that, but he in fact did retire and became a private consultant and is still doing that very successfully today.

MILLER: Now, the reason I know that it was before is because he was not in place to name Don's replacement.

EBERHARD: That's true, he was not. That happened, then of course he was replaced by Shirley. . . . Xavier was replaced by Shirley Thorton [Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1986-94].

MILLER: Yes. So do you still see Xavier?

EBERHARD: Not too often. I saw him about a month ago. He was making a presentation—he's working as a consultant to Assemblywoman Ducheny—and was sharing with a group of adult administrators the framework for some adult legislation that Assemblywoman Ducheny is going to introduce in January, so we had a chance to speak for a few minutes.

MILLER: Good or bad legislation? [Laughter]

EBERHARD: No, most of it appears very positive, actually.

MILLER: Okay.

EBERHARD: Yes, it appears very positive.

MILLER: All right.

[Interview Session Ends, Middle of Tape 2, Side A]

[Session 2, December 13, 1995]

[Begin Tape 2, Middle of Side A]

MILLER: This second session of the Ray Eberhard interview is being conducted in Sacramento on December 13, 1995.

Ray, you came home, so to speak, in February of 1988, to assume your current position as State Administrator for Adult Education, and you almost immediately launched into a strategic planning process. This was the second long-range planning activity you had overseen for adult ed, the first being in the late '70s. What comparisons can you make between the two planning projects?

EBERHARD: The comparisons are really quite distinct. The first one that we did in 1979 was done . . . basically, most of the work was done with the statewide advisory committee that we pulled together. We did utilize some consultants on a contractual basis to prepare a few documents, but nothing to the scope of the one that we launched in 1988. The resources that were put behind

the most recent one were quite significant. Having a master RFP that we put out for a private company to do the research and most of the writing for us basically allowed us to get into much more depth and detail, in terms of all the various issues and long-range stratagems that one might look at in terms of the adult education system. They really were quite different, not only in process but in content and scope.

In detailing the process, the strategy that we used in 1979 involved just the K-adult education system; we were not interested in other providers per se of adult education. The 1988 strategic plan, however, was basically jointly administered and processed by both the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, and therefore our major policy committee consisted of representatives from both. So the major policy recommendations that came out of that were oftentimes a consensus and/or a compromise because it was a dual-agency recommendation as opposed to a singular recommendation from just the Department of Education.

MILLER: Okay. Do you remember any of the major recommendations from the '79 document [*A Planning Process for Adult Education: Report of the Adult Education Ad Hoc Advisory Committee*]?

EBERHARD: Yeah, two specifically: one, prior to our engaging in the strategic plan, the Title V regulations were fairly extensive.

MILLER: Tell us just briefly what Title V is.

EBERHARD: Title V, California Administrative Code, is the section in the state regulation code which deals with regulations dealing with public education, and in there, adult education had its own subset of Title V. They were quite extensive, many of them extremely archaic, either forgotten or not paid attention to, and one of the key recommendations of the committee was that these be reviewed for purposes of making recommendations for change. The primary recommendation, in my recollection, is that we reduced the number of regulations on the adult education program by about 80 percent, so there was a major housecleaning, in terms of the regulations coming out of that process.

MILLER: And you actually spearheaded that rewrite, didn't you?

EBERHARD: That is correct, and then my office was responsible for doing the rewrite, taking it to the Office of Administrative Law, doing the

public hearings, and finally having those regulations promulgated.

Another one of the significant recommendations from that '79 plan had to do with the creation of a separate adult education fund. Up to that point in time, the monies generated by adult ed were brought into the district's general fund and it became very difficult for adult education administrators to assure that they would get their fair share of the income they had generated to be spent back upon their adult ed programs—historic problem. So the recommendation was to establish a separate fund with some very specific controls, and that in fact did happen, but not right away.

MILLER: It sort of happened in two steps, didn't it?

EBERHARD: Yeah, it happened in two steps. The first step was in 1986 when, in fact, we had some other fiscal reform legislation that came into being with the revenue limit and at which point in time we also had some very strong language on the separate fund.

MILLER: You mean '76, don't you, not '86?

**EBERHARD:** No, actually it was . . . did '76 create the separate fund? No, we had the separate fund in '86. This was [seven] years after this recommendation on the strategic plan.

**MILLER:** But first there was a separate line item within the General Fund.

**EBERHARD:** Right, but that's not a separate adult education fund established in the district. Right, that is correct, there was a separate line item for adult ed established in '76, but that was only for purposes of the state budget. When that income went then to the district, it went into the district's general fund, and therein is where the problem [lay]. So, coming out of the '79 recommendation, it took a couple of years for us to get legislation for the creation of the separate adult ed fund, and I believe that was 1986. That has subsequently been tightened, with more restrictions on the fund, as a result of the second strategic plan which came forth, and in 1993 then, the additional fiscal constraints on the fund were put into place—with penalties, I might add, and the penalties were quite severe. To paraphrase, it said that if, in fact, a district did not give the adult education program all the money that it had generated, it must pay back to the adult ed fund twice the amount of money it didn't give the adult ed fund for the purposes of adult ed.

That's as strong a language you'll ever find anyplace in the Education Code. So that was quite a coup for the adult ed system, and primarily one of the major outcomes of the '88 strategic plan.

**MILLER:** Okay. So, in point of fact, some of the recommendations that were made in the '79 document have taken place over the years since then. Not as a direct result of the document, but keep working at it.

**EBERHARD:** Over the years, right. That is correct, keep working at it.

**MILLER:** Okay. And certainly the passage of Proposition 13 diverted attention away from the recommendations of that document at that time.

**EBERHARD:** At that time, right. Keep in mind that that first strategic plan in '79 was actually after Prop. 13, and there's no question that one of the motivating factors for engaging in the strategic plan was all the chaos that was inherent in the adult education system. So it was felt by the Department that if we could bring a group of people together we might be able to bring some cohesion



back into the system, with some direction coming out of all the trauma that was the result of Prop. 13.<sup>1</sup>

MILLER: Okay, and the major recommendations from the '89 document [*Adult Education for the 21st Century: Strategic Plan to Meet California's Long-Term Adult Education Needs*]? Which has had a lot of impact.

EBERHARD: Yes, it has, and it's still being reviewed today in the legislature, I'm very pleased to say. There were fourteen major recommendations. I am not able to repeat all fourteen recommendations at this point in time.

MILLER: You don't need to. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: But the ones that are most vivid in my memory are, first, and I believe it was recommendation number 2, which was funding for innovation and performance, which gave rise to a whole section of statute in the Education Code now called the "5-percent programs." We currently have about forty districts in the state that are running 5-percent programs, and it's really an extremely innovative piece of legislation. In essence, what it does is allows

---

<sup>1</sup>The advisory committee started its work in February 1978 and was nearing completion of its task when Proposition 13 was passed in June of that year. The committee then revalidated its previous work and made additional recommendations due to the impact of Prop. 13. The document was published in 1979.

a district to do whatever it wanted to do in the past but felt hindered by statute or hindered by regulation. They now may do that, because in essence the 5-percent program gives a district waivers to do non-a.d.a.-driven kinds of programs, to do distance learning programs, to provide workplace programs.<sup>2</sup> It used to be that you couldn't go onto a work site because it wasn't open to the general public. And that's still true, but if you have a 5-percent program you can now go into a corporation and provide direct instruction for apportionment purposes. We're only beginning to scratch the surface with this legislation. As time goes on, I think we're going to see it have significant growth, and particularly impact on the way adult education is delivered to adults. We're just beginning the revolution with this one.

MILLER: Okay. Also coming out of that, and sort of leading us into the '90s, were some recommendations on model standards.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: How. . . ?

---

<sup>2</sup>An amount equal to income generated from up to 5 percent of a district's total adult a.d.a. may be used for these programs. There is an application/approval process.

**EBERHARD:** The model standards came up with one of the four goals, which was improving quality and accountability for the adult education system, and since that time we have drafted six model standards documents. The English as a second language, although somewhat earlier than the strategic plan, actually was finalized during the strategic planning process and is now a document which is used for the standards in ESL in many of the states throughout the country. The other documents have not yet been officially published, but two are currently close to being published by the Department: the standards for adult basic education, high school diploma, handicapped adults, older adults, and a program, let's see, in parent education. Those will probably be . . . the ABE and high school diploma will be published sometime in February of '96.

**MILLER:** Very soon.

**EBERHARD:** And the other documents most likely before the close of '96. It just takes a long time for the Department of Ed to get documents from draft to full-fledged publications.

**MILLER:** The recommendations that came out of that document, since it was right at the turn of the decade, are actually the highlights of the '90s, and another one of those was increasing access. Now,

you've talked about the innovative funding which increases access, but there's another major chunk to increasing access as well.

**EBERHARD:** Right. Probably one of the most significant outcomes from the '88 strategic plan, in regard to increasing access, was as a result of that we had the three reform bills, which were introduced and passed and signed by the governor, that allowed for the start-up of adult schools in communities throughout the state that historically had not had adult schools. As a result of this legislation, in 1993-4 and 1994-5 we were able to start 175 brand-new adult schools in the state of California. The significance of that cannot be overstated. While those programs that are currently starting, have started, and are in progress now are small—up to 30 units of a.d.a.—over time and into the next millennium we are going to see, as additional state resources are put into those, the expansion of those programs to serve thousands and thousands and thousands of more adults in the state. That was truly historic, benchmark legislation, that people that go through this process in the year 2010 will look back on it and say it was really significant.

**MILLER:** Okay. How are the new schools getting along? Are there major problems associated with them?

**EBERHARD:** No, there are not major policy problems. I think there are major process problems, as is true with anything which is new. While adult ed is a fairly simple system, in terms of delivering services to its clients, it takes experience to be able to start enough classes and to sustain those classes so that one fully utilizes one's cap. The new people are learning that adults do in fact vote with their feet, and that you often have to oversubscribe to assure that you've maintained your income base. So that's the primary problem that the new adult schools are having. But they have in fact found each other. They call each other throughout the state to see what the little one's doing down in Imperial County so they acquire that knowledge in Shasta. Also, we were able to use a lot of our veteran administrators, who in essence adopted these new schools as sort of a tutoring kind of a process; and it was a very effective process for us, some of our real quality veteran adult administrators helping these new schools get started.

**MILLER:** I was going to ask about the logistics of start-up, but that was certainly part of it.

EBERHARD: Right, it was known as the PROS [Professional Resource Outreach System], and headed up by Dr. Ted Zimmerman on contract to the Department of Education. So the PROS people today, although we no longer fund that, many of them still maintain a very strong interest and relationship with their. . . . Well, they perceive them as their children; and as good parents do, they take good care of their children.

MILLER: And being true mentors, in the best sense of the word.

EBERHARD: And being true mentors, exactly.

MILLER: Okay. I want to go back just a bit, Ray, on the model standards that we were talking about. Are the standards advisory to the field, or are they going to become mandatory?

EBERHARD: No, the standards are mandatory. There is a section in the Education Code which gives the Superintendent of Public Instruction the authority to establish standards of curriculum, content, counseling and guidance, and administration and other services. And it is that Ed Code section that we are using then to require that the locals then adopt the standards as set by the Superintendent. In addition, the National Adult Literacy Program requires that recipients of federal funds adopt standards and quality indicators pursuant to California State

Plan. So there are really two driving forces here on the requirements to implement these standards: one is the Ed Code section for the Superintendent, and the other one is the federal requirement. So it's hard to dodge this one.

**MILLER:** I knew that they had to be adopted, I just didn't know what their status was going to be afterwards. How are you going to go about compliance on the standards?

**EBERHARD:** Two years ago we implemented within our compliance process, called the Consolidated Compliance Review [Coordinated Compliance Review] process, a requirement of a look-see when our consultants went out to do the reviews to determine that in fact they had an implementation time line in place. The ESL standards were to have been fully implemented in 1995.

**MILLER:** By this year.

**EBERHARD:** In fact, I just finished a discussion with several of our field consultants who have been out doing the reviews and said that in fact they were very pleased to see that there had been a high level of compliance on the ESL standards document. So that's the primary way.

**MILLER:** So, as the years go on, then these other fields will be added to the compliance document.

EBERHARD: Then we'll be adding . . . right, but we cannot add them to the compliance document until we have a fully published document from the Department. And as I mentioned earlier, that won't happen on their ABE and high school until February of '96.

MILLER: Okay. We've made two or three references to this package of reform legislation that came about in 1992-93, I guess it was.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: But I want to talk about that a little more specifically. It certainly, as you have indicated, was a major victory for adult ed. My guess is you would rank it rather high in your scope of career achievements. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: That's very true. I'd probably put it up there number one, right along with the SB 65 legislation. And the reason that this is true is that if in fact, you know, [as] people go through their careers and many people do an awful lot of wonderful things, but what is left behind is often forgotten. However, if it's law, then it does not get forgotten.

MILLER: [Chuckling] Yes.

EBERHARD: And the scope of this legislation was truly profound. It dealt with everything from a complete overhaul of the funding mechanisms for the system to, as we mentioned earlier, being



able to create 175 new programs in the state, to reforming some issues the system had had in terms of providing educational services to children, [and] the implementation of the innovation in performance legislation. Very comprehensive, very far-reaching, and I think it's legislation that's going to see the system well into the year 2000.

**MILLER:** Ray, there had been some persistent problems, some long-range problems that had led to the need for this legislation. Can you just review what those problems were that prompted the legislation?

**EBERHARD:** Yeah, and the problem has their solution in the specificity that I went through earlier. In no particular order, the problem of many communities in the state of California not having adult schools. There was a statute that said if you did not operate an adult education program on or before June 30, 1971 or '72, you may not operate one. That was state law.

**MILLER:** Which came about as part of Prop. 13.

**EBERHARD:** Prop. 13. So those communities got trapped. And many of them were the types of communities where there were some. . . .

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

MILLER: This is Tape 2, Side B of the Ray Eberhard interview.

EBERHARD: They were just literally not able to start up, so they were trapped—and, of course, in terms of equity, a very unfair situation. So the strategic plan then and the legislation allowed that to happen.

A second major problem was that there was a tremendous growth going on in the system in terms of the number of high school students that were taking adult education programs, otherwise known as concurrently enrolled. It was felt that that issue had to be addressed from both a fiscal and programmatic point of view to put some qualitative controls and restrictions on the program. And it's important to note that by addressing the issues of concurrently enrolled students we were also at the same time able to address an improvement in the overall funding mechanism for adult ed. The way that was done is that the concurrent students were actually funded out of the K-12 general fund, to the tune of about \$130 million annually. Even though the only access to [those] dollars, because of the separate adult ed fund, was by the adult ed system, it was still K-12 money and in the K-12 line item of some \$18-20 billion. We were able to make the case to the legislature that, in fact,

that was adult ed resources and therefore ought to come into the adult ed revenue limit base. That, in fact, is exactly what happened. We blended that \$130 million into the adult line item, in essence increasing the adult line item. We also blended in two other sources: one, the K-12 adult independent study apportionment; and also the categorical ESL apportionment dollars. So, by blending all of those four funding sources together, we were able to create a new revenue limit structure for adult ed which was much higher, and is much higher now, than it was prior to this legislation. So we had two problems: one, the programmatic compliance issues dealing with children; and the other, the lack of funding in the adult education program. We brought both of those together, created two solutions out of two problems that are very beneficial to the system today.

**MILLER:** Okay. I know that you went through a very detailed planning process before proposing this legislation, and particularly having to satisfy the needs of the schools who perceive themselves as losers in the new legislation. Can you tell us about that planning process and how you brought all the districts around to supporting the legislation?

**EBERHARD:** We convened a group called FACE, Future of Adult and Continuing Education, which consisted of fifteen of the largest adult programs in the state, representatives from the three major adult education professional organizations and their lobbyists, and we met many, many times as we went through the various iterations and drafts of this legislation.

Your comment on winners and losers is interesting. I believe in the long haul it will show that there were no losers in this case, that there were only winners, but it did require some sacrifice on the part of some districts early on to allow for the whole blended revenue limit process to take place. Our revenue limit range now in the state goes from a low of \$1,825 per revenue limit to a high of \$2,100. Beginning next year, that range will start to narrow so that over time as additional resources come into the adult ed fund there will be a singular revenue limit in the state. That may not happen until the year 2005, but the mechanism is in statute for that to occur.

How we were able to do that is that there was consensus on the part of everybody in the state, and also the thirteen districts who played a major role in "contributing" some of their resources for the greater good. And essentially they had no

choice. I will never forget the day that that decision had to be made. I convened those thirteen directors of the thirteen districts in the lobby of the Baldwin Park . . . I think at that time it was known as the Hilton Hotel. We sat down and I presented the scenario to them, and I said, "Gentlemen and ladies, here's the deal. And the deal is that you are all going to have to cap your programs on concurrent, and the amount over cap you're going to have to contribute to the pot for the rest of the state." It was presented in such a way that they agreed to the deal or they would lose the entire concurrent program. We had a unanimous consensus that they would do that, so we wrote the legislation. This is the last year of those districts' contribution to the greater good.

MILLER: I like the term "contribution." [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right. They will no longer . . . beginning in '96, they will have made their third-year contribution and they will then be at their 10 percent cap on concurrently enrolled. There was another group of districts also that contributed to the greater good, and those were the districts whose revenue limits were higher than \$2,050. They also over a three-year period of time, this being the last year, had to ratchet their revenue limits down to \$2,050,

and the amount of money there went into the pot for the greater good—in essence, the equalization of the lower-range revenue limits. So all of that has worked. We are finishing it this year, and next year then everybody will be on plan and target to go for full equalization up to the new single revenue limit sometime past the year 2000.

MILLER: Okay.

[tape turned off]

Not directly related, but in a sense partially coming out of this new legislation and various interpretations of that legislation, there's now a major lawsuit that's going on against the Department that was started by several school districts and taken over by the state school board association. Can you tell us a little bit about that lawsuit and how you think it may turn out?

EBERHARD: I can address basically the fact that you are correct. There is a lawsuit being proposed against the Department; it is my understanding that one has not yet been actually filed in court. The districts who are suing. . . . Actually, the suit, as I understand it, is being carried by the legislative foundation of the California School Boards Association on behalf of many

school districts. The districts who are seeking to sue are doing so because, in their opinion, the conditions of a waiver process that the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Department of Finance, have placed upon their programs, they feel, is outside the domain of statute and regulation. How this all plays out remains to be seen. There are still negotiations going on. I would not want to speculate either way what happens on that.

**MILLER:** Okay, but it does still have something to do with concurrent, does it not?

**EBERHARD:** Yes.

**MILLER:** And the interpretations of the new law affecting concurrent students.

**EBERHARD:** Right, that is correct. It does have to do with concurrent, but it has to do with other issues too, in terms of attendance accounting, laboratory settings and how one accounts for attendance there, but the primary issues have to do with—once again, still—concurrently enrolled students.

**MILLER:** Okay. You're currently funding three technology projects. Tell us what those are and how they relate to one another and how

you see the role of technology impacting our programs statewide.

**EBERHARD:** The linchpin of all of our technology projects is one known as OTAN, the Outreach and Technical Assistance Network, which is, I believe, in its fifth year, actually. The whole purpose of OTAN was: number one, to create the largest electronic database of adult ed information in the world, which in fact they have done; and to link all of the multiple providers within the adult education system electronically through a massive e-mail type of system, and that in fact has occurred.

OTAN has been adopted by the United States Department of Education and is currently being expanded through the National Institute for Literacy into the ten Western states and trust territories. It is currently going through its second major modification because it, when it was originally put into place, utilized a commercial carrier called CONNECT, Inc., which served our purpose very well. Now with the tremendous growth of the Internet, OTAN is now becoming an Internet . . . converting over to an Internet type of system, which of course opens our database up to all the other databases and communication systems in the world. So it's truly a spectacular



system, and I'm very proud to have been somewhat part of that, because it is the only system of its type for adults, that we're aware of, in the United States, and in the world actually.

The other major technology project, which we've just begun this year, is our distance learning project, and that is a contract with the California State University Institute in Long Beach. The major purpose of the distance learning project will be to pursue all available technologies and all currently available content to take adult education to the learner—any time, any place, any pace.

Most of us who work in this system daily are absolutely convinced that the future of adult education does not lie in the traditional classroom but lies outside of the traditional classroom. That's not to say that the traditional classroom is going to go away, because it's not, but the capacity of the system in traditional classrooms is probably at its peak. We know that we've got about 7-8 million adults in this state who, for whatever reason, do not come to adult schools, they don't come to community colleges, they don't go to CBOs, they don't go to libraries—they just don't go. It behooves the professional adult practitioner to then find ways to take our programs to them, and

that's the major thrust of our new distance learning project.

You had mentioned three. I'm not sure what—

MILLER: *Crossroads Cafe* was the other one.

EBERHARD: Well, *Crossroads Cafe* is not really a technology project, per se. It's content for technology, and it is the first major program, that we're aware of, that will have been developed for our adult population. And I need to qualify that. For years there have been video workbook series developed for the highly-motivated, highly-educated adult through community colleges and universities, but nobody has ever tried to target a content for our non-collegiate-educated adults, and that's what *Crossroads Cafe* is about.

It's important to note that in distance learning the technology is there. I mean, all the bells and whistles that one could ever think of in terms of how to send signals through twisted cable and fiber-optic and ISDN lines, it's all there. And we know how to wire those lines, and we know how to put those pipes together to get information to students. The major obstacle that distance learning has at this point in time is quality content, because what we currently have in our traditional systems has not necessarily been designed to go into the

distance. And that's why projects such as *Crossroads Cafe* and what L.A. Unified is doing with its ESL series, and now producing a parent ed series—

MILLER: L.A. is?

EBERHARD: Yes, is going to be most helpful. We're just now beginning to see, and the providers and developers of these products are just now beginning to understand this market, and so once again hopefully we're on the cutting edge with this.

MILLER: There's kind of a unique group that's working on *Crossroads Cafe*. Can you talk a little bit about that collaboration? I mean, it's more than one state.

EBERHARD: Yes, *Crossroads Cafe*, as you mentioned, is a multi-state collaborative. I've been involved with the federal program for over twenty years and have worked nationally with a lot of the other states, but to my knowledge, it's the first time that you have ever had a collaboration of states where in fact each state has taken its money and put it into a common pot for the development of a common product. And those states are, in fact, Florida, New Jersey, New York, Illinois, and California. In addition, the federal government has also entered into this collaborative, to the tune of about \$600,000, for purposes of

doing the formative and summative evaluation for *Crossroads Cafe*.

MILLER: Who's going to be doing that?

EBERHARD: The formative evaluation was a contract done by the University of Michigan, and that is basically just about completed now, and a new RFP is going out from the federal government on the summative evaluation. So it's a very exciting project and we're keeping our fingers crossed that the quality will bear out.

MILLER: And mode of delivery?

EBERHARD: Mode of delivery, once again, this is the first video series to be developed for the distance, for, once again, our target population of adults. The twenty-six half-hour videos will have complementary workbook materials and student/teacher materials that it's developed in another contract by Heinle and Heinle [publishers].

One of the innovations here, in addition to the videos, which are quite excellent, is the utilization of a format that was used in South America and Mexico for many, many years called a *foto novella* [photo stories]. And to my knowledge, this is the first time that a product used in this country will utilize the *foto novella* concept. It is due to be fully implemented—

MILLER: Can you explain that just a little bit more?

EBERHARD: The *foto novella*?

MILLER: Yeah.

EBERHARD: The *foto novella* is basically a comic book.

MILLER: A comic book, okay.

EBERHARD: Yeah, and the comic book, they're very popular in Latin countries, particularly South America as I mentioned, and what they utilize are a variety of different ongoing formats. The *foto novellas* that appear to be extremely popular, particularly in Mexico and South America, are soap opera *foto novellas*. But because of the literacy level of those countries, what they do is they utilize a lower-level literacy language coupled with the pictures, so that the adult can then put the low-level language with the picture and they'll get comprehension. We're utilizing that process with *Crossroads Cafe* because it is targeted. . . . While the content of the *Crossroads Cafe* videos is targeted primarily to an intermediate ESL student, by coupling it with a *foto novella* you can then take the level down to a high-beginning, lower intermediate kind of student. So, once again it's a pioneering activity in this country, and it's going to have a major impact, we think.

MILLER: Okay, and what's going to be its big introduction?

EBERHARD: Well, there's going to be several press releases and news conferences to introduce it. One of the collaborators, Intelcom from Pasadena, is entering into contracts with PBS [Public Broadcasting System]. There will be major announcements over PBS. In fact, interestingly enough, last Sunday morning I was fortunate enough to play golf with the director of the PBS stations in the state of Louisiana, who had just, in fact, finished a review of the *Crossroads Cafe* videos and was excitedly looking forward to being part of that process. So it's a small world.

MILLER: So they will be out on PBS?

EBERHARD: They will be out on PBS. Well, the distribution will be—

MILLER: In the fall?

EBERHARD: Well, it's targeted for the fall of '96. PBS will be a major vehicle for that, but so will each and all of the states who are in the collaborative. We look forward to utilizing them on a variety of cable channels in this state. The distribution is really only as limited as our creative thinking is.

MILLER: As our vision.

EBERHARD: Right.

MILLER: Back to vision.

EBERHARD: Back to vision.

MILLER: And speaking of vision, do you recall, and I don't even remember the name of the project at this time, but when Bob Ehlers had the 309 projects and Elsinore did a pilot of trying to develop kind of a soap opera kind of series for ABE instruction?

EBERHARD: Right, I do not recall the name of that. I believe that was back in '76, '77 [Telecentered Learning Experiences, TELex, 1980-82]. The format that was used, I believe, was a quiz show format at that time.

MILLER: They did a couple of them. They did a quiz show and then they did like a community center or a recreation center.

EBERHARD: Correct. There weren't too many of those developed, and also I don't think they had the companion work and student materials, they were just straight videos.

MILLER: No, they didn't.

EBERHARD: The teachers had to use them with their own creativity. But yes, it is not a new concept. But sometimes things are often before their time, and the Elsinore project was probably a little before its time, in terms of distance learning.

MILLER: Well, it had neither the resources nor the talent involved in developing it.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: Ray, in technology, and then we kind of left the strategic plan and went on to the things that are going on in the '90s as a result of the strategic plan, but going back to that, what's the status of the EduCard now? Is that just in dry dock, or is it before its time and has to wait for another cycle, or what?

EBERHARD: Not before its time. The EduCard became more famous than the network that it really was a part of. The EduCard was just a tool, a plastic-like device that had a smart computer chip in it that looked like a regular credit card. The EduCard, however, was part of a broader concept called the Learning Networks, which were designed to . . . actually, the precursor of what is now referred to as "one-stop shopping centers." The idea being that our students . . . the premise first of all being that our students were very transient and mobile and they moved around a lot. In order to keep them from having to be reassessed and retested and re-placed as they moved from place to place, they would have this information with them on this card. And then



as they entered a particular educational provider, the card would be read and they'd be placed wherever it was appropriate.

It was found, however, that, first of all, our premise that our students were extremely transient and moved from city to city was not true. They did move from program to program within a community, but not geographically, so no need for a card. Secondly, another premise was that the cost of these cards would come down significantly as we got into [them] over time and also into bulk purchase. That also did not prove to be true. Actually, the cost of the cards is increasing. So you can imagine we were paying \$6 to \$7 a card, if they are now \$8 a card and you're going to give them to a million students, you've got \$8 million worth of plastic out there and you haven't provided instruction yet. The other piece is you had embossing problems with the card to personalize them. And with the advent now of electronic communications vis-à-vis e-mail systems and the Internet, you can now send this information instantly over the Internet and do not have to worry about a student physically carrying a piece of plastic from point A to point B.

So that's a long explanation as to why the card has basically been discontinued as far as the Department of

Education is concerned. It is my understanding, however, that we still have seven viable Learning Network sites, and there are four more new ones coming on line after the first of the year.

MILLER: I didn't realize there was still any funding for them.

EBERHARD: Well, there isn't. They're now stand-alone, they're doing their own thing. So, see, good ideas that the state . . . we put the seed money out, so they have proven themselves, they like what they're doing, and they are now finding their own financial ways to stay afloat. Oakland is being added to the system, L.A. Unified is being added to the system, Visalia is being added to the system, and one other, so—

MILLER: So they're just developing their own.

EBERHARD: Right, because it's a wonderful idea.

MILLER: Based on the pilot that the state had funded.

EBERHARD: Based on the pilot that the state . . . and of course the software is out there and available to them for the program information component and the student information component. The only thing that's not there now is that card, and [we] just found that the card is really not necessary any longer.

MILLER: Okay. All right. One thing that's consistent about the Department of Education is its constant state of change, and

since we both entered the field in the 1970s there have been numerous reorganizations and title changes for personnel. But throughout all the changes, there's always been an Adult Ed Unit in one form or another—it's had various and sundry names, but it's always been the Adult Ed Unit—so I want to talk about the unit and the department a little bit. When you first joined the Adult Ed Unit in Sacramento, how did the unit function? How were assignments made and that kind of thing?

**EBERHARD:** Well, it was a decision basically of the unit director at that point in time. And it was a unit, we did have a director. That individual when I came aboard was Don McCune, who reported to an associate superintendent. We specialized by individual, not by structure per se, so we had within the unit at that time. . . . I'm just trying to remember the number of personnel, but I think we had about ten to twelve actual full-time consultants, some of which, by nature of what they chose to do, worked specifically in the field, were called field consultants. They did the site reviews, they did the technical assistance, the compliance reviews. Then some chose to remain in the office and focus more on the policy aspect and program developmental thing. So it was informally organized back when I first came to

the Department in '76. In '79, when I got my promotion to manager, then we started to specialize a little more. With my personal like [for] being involved in policy and program developmental work, I had a small cadre of consultants who worked for me. Then the director, Don McCune, had a small group working for him basically on the field stuff. But once again it was informally done.

**MILLER:** Okay. So a couple of years ago when the unit was officially split into a Policy and Planning Unit and a Field Services Unit, actually that had been done before on an informal basis. Is that what you're saying?

**EBERHARD:** On an informal basis, right. On the informal basis we had a director and a manager who actually worked as a team—not in separate units but with different responsibilities. The creation of the two units came about as a result of the new legislation and the start-up of the new schools. It was felt that this was a massive undertaking and that we ought to dedicate a unit to provide the care and feeding of these 175 new adult schools. And we were able then to go to the legislature and get authority to hire these additional positions, we created the Field Unit, and

that's where we've been. I think we did that in about . . . 1992, '93?

**MILLER:** I think this is the third year.

**EBERHARD:** That's about right, the third year, correct.

**MILLER:** I think this is the third year of the Field Services Unit. Ray, it has partly to do with growth, with the creation of the Field Unit, and you added a lot of new people to staff those positions. I have a question and then I want to give it some background before you answer it. Essentially, I was wondering how one can provide sound services to the field without a thorough understanding of what goes into policy development or what the field actually does? And along this line, in 1981 both Juliet Crutchfield and Lynda Smith were added to the Department, and both had extensive backgrounds in adult ed teaching, and in support and administrative services. Lynda had a doctorate and Juliet had done her course work for her doctorate [both in adult education], so they had the theoretical and academic training. But with the exception of one temporary visiting educator, they seemed to be the last adult educators to join the staff, and since then staffing has been done by transfer from other places in the Department. What impact has this had? When you don't have

either adult educators or content specialists that come in and mainly are fielding these Field Service positions, what kind of training has to be done?

**EBERHARD:** Before I address the impact, I need to address the why. You had mentioned Lynda Smith and Juliet Crutchfield—actually, I think, coming into the Department within twenty days of each other in 1981. They were the last ones to come in off of the separate adult education consultant list. I also came into the Department the same way. I was hired in through the civil service process, through an exam, got on the list, got in, and then nobody comes in from the field in adult ed until Lynda and Juliet come in in 1981. They were the last, as you mentioned, and we had one visiting educator for a short period of time. In about the mid-'80s, then the Department makes the decision to eliminate the Specialist Consultant classifications, adult education being one of them. It was basically a policy decision of then-Superintendent Honig that he wanted generalists at the consultant level to come in, and that as we went through these constant reorganizations you could move from this program to that program and be effective as you did that. That was the philosophy—

MILLER: The theory.

EBERHARD: —and that was the theory. And it was also then during that period of time when the adult list got abolished, as did other lists in the Department get abolished, that we started to experience our growth in the program. When we get into the '90s where we start these schools and create the [new] unit, we are therefore basically given the direction that you will first hire inside the Department and you make those openings available. And then, as you've mentioned, all of the new personnel through adult ed are not from the field, they are from other programmatic areas within the Department of Education. That creates a great challenge because most of those people worked in K-12 settings in the agency, and so it requires a *tremendous* amount of in-service over a long period of time to be able to have some affinity for and skill within the adult education system. And it's a constant challenge for us to provide appropriate learning activities and trainings. That's done two ways. You said, you know, with the impact of the change, it's significant, there's no question about that. First, you have to get them all the materials. [Chuckling]

MILLER: The starter kit. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Right, the starter kit, as it were, in terms of the handbook and the plans and the documents about adult ed and let them get their reading up to speed. That only works until you can actually go out and rub shoulders with real adult educators. So what we've tried to do is to give them as much time in the field without a specific responsibility, to go shadow, to attend staff meetings, to attend faculty meetings, to visit classes, until they start feeling comfortable that they have a good sense, in terms of what adult ed is about, before we actually ask them to go out and specifically become engaged in some kind of proactive adult activity.

MILLER: So you actually do send them to specific schools.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: Do they kind of have a—

EBERHARD: In fact, as a matter of fact, last week I had one of my most recent. . . . I just had her come back from a specific visit to a specific program to get her knowledge base up on older adults.

MILLER: Okay, that's what I was going to say. Do you send them out with specific tasks in mind when they go?

EBERHARD: It could be both. If they're brand-new, first of all, you have to have the bigger picture, in terms of what an adult school is like



and all of its offerings, and as that comes, then we do like to have our consultants specialize in certain areas, and so then they start to focus on . . . let's say, parent ed. Then to go know who the parent ed network is out there, go visit some quality parent ed programs so they have a better sense in terms of what they're talking about.

**MILLER:** What do you do to maintain a liaison between the two units? I mean, are all of your staff meetings together, or just part of them? And what kind of regular in-service goes on here in Sacramento?

**EBERHARD:** Liaison is both formal and informal. It's incumbent upon me and the other manager to get together as often as we possibly can, so that if that individual is doing something that she so notifies me, and if I am, I notify her, so the left hand and the right hand are aware of what's going on. Secondly, we do hold joint staff meetings. We do that at least once a month, where both of the units come together and we go through a common agenda. We also have our separate staff meetings because my unit tends to focus on the policy and the other unit focuses on more technical assistance/compliance activities.

MILLER: Okay. Do you get much feedback from the field on your consultants?

EBERHARD: Yes, I get feedback, both good and bad, and I think that's healthy. When we have people out there who have done a particularly good job or have helped somebody in a particularly very positive way, the field will call and often send a note up to that individual, or send a note to me and copy that individual, so that everybody knows that good work has been done. And like any organization, we also get complaints from the people out there. Complaints usually come in the terms of compliance activities. Nobody likes to have an audit done, nobody likes to have a compliance review necessarily. And if we come down and an individual sees something that they think is wrong, and let's say you're the practitioner and you don't think that's right, then you're not necessarily happy with that person. And that's just normal operating procedure.

MILLER: Okay, you've got this Policy Planning Unit now, and what role do consultants have in the development of policy? And I don't just mean interpretation of policy, but actual development of policy.

[tape turned off]

**EBERHARD:** Policy is developed in a lot of different ways. Probably the most common way is that there is an issue or a problem that has surfaced in the field or within other state agencies that needs to be fixed. What we will do is sit down and write issue papers on whatever the issue or the problem is, and flesh that out to the extent that research has to be done on that. Then we will make a variety of recommendations, option A, B, C, with our final option recommendation. That then will go on up through the system, depending on the scope of the issue or the problem. Sometimes it can stop at my level, sometimes it has to go to the director, sometimes it has to go to the superintendent for a really big statewide policy implication. That's the most common way.

The other is what we call proactive policy decision making, and it's the one—

**MILLER:** Which is more fun. [Chuckling]

**EBERHARD:** It is actually more fun. It's the one that I think one gets the most pleasure out of, and that often starts with an idea. A good one, a more recent one would be the strategic plan, to do that and what might be some expected outcomes. So we will go to the big magic greaseboard in my office and start to put diagrams

up there and ideas up there and synthesize that down over time until we get that down to, once again, an issue or a concept paper that we will float up to say we would like to pursue this. And we get sign-off on it or we don't, and if we get a sign-off, of course we pursue the agenda.

It is also from that kind of a proactive stance that I mentioned the strategic plan, [which] came out of that. We [also] got some of our better 353 projects, which have proven to be very substantial over time. We talked earlier about OTAN and, of course, CASAS. Those all generated that way. Also, for real big ones on the proactive stance, it's always been my method of operation that if we're going to do it because we think it's going to be good for the field, then once we have it fleshed out in terms of its detail, we'll take it to the field then and get input—Is this a good idea? Do you think we ought to pursue it?—develop a consensus, and after we've got that, then we'll go forth and mount the agenda or initiative.

MILLER: Okay. And then depending on whether it's legislation or something that can be done without legislation determines what path it takes when you send it up.

EBERHARD: That is correct, right. The legislative, of course, follows the process of either the Department or an outside legislator introducing it for us. Inside, it often takes the form of what's called a program advisory, in terms of what is permissive, what you can do, what we would encourage you to do, like that.

MILLER: Okay. This current administration hasn't been in office very long, but do you feel comfortable making any general statements about the level of understanding and support for adult ed through the years by prior departmental leadership? You've been in since, I think, Riles was superintendent, Wilson Riles, when you came in?

EBERHARD: Correct. It's not that I don't feel comfortable in terms of saying where this administration is or is not on adult education—you did mention they're new—we don't have any evidence of anything either orally or written from this administration regarding any specific agenda [on adult ed]. Or I could use the *V* word, the vision word, of the administration in regard to adult ed. That's not uncommon, however.

I think, to put it into perspective—field people would understand this—adult education in the Department is basically no different than adult education is in the local school district.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction was elected on a platform and agenda to provide leadership basically for children in the educational process, and to the extent that there's enough time after that for the executive branch to address some visionary things in adult ed, then sometimes that happens. But once again it's very similar to our local school districts. Superintendents are hired by boards to provide leadership for children—and yeah, you've got to take care of that adult thing over there, too. So that's historic. I don't see that changing anytime soon as long as adult education programs are attached to the main agenda, which is K-12, and it's just logical for you to not necessarily be a mainstream program.

**MILLER:** Was there anything then either positive or negative during Riles' administration? I know when he first came in, one of the adult ed consultants, Bruce Babitz, became one of his top lieutenants.

**EBERHARD:** Yes, in fact, Bruce— Not Bruce Babitt.

**MILLER:** It wasn't Bruce. [Chuckling] No, that's the Secretary of the Interior. What was his name? Well. . . . His last name was Babitz [Milton Babitz].

**EBERHARD:** I can't recall it myself. That was maybe when Wilson first came in. Wilson had been in office already for, I believe, one term

before I was actually employed in the Department. Wilson did, however, appoint. . . . He was the first one to create an Associate Superintendent position just for adult ed, and that's when Xavier Del Buono got his position.

MILLER: Well, that's a very positive step.

EBERHARD: Absolutely a very positive step, in 1975. So it created a much higher level of visibility for adult ed in the Department other than a bureau. Adult ed had always been a bureau, going back to, I think, 1926, when it first had a presence in the Department of Education. So that was very positive with Wilson. I'll never forget, I don't know if I mentioned this earlier, I was in a briefing with Wilson and all of his executive staff people on the issue of adult education?

MILLER: No, go ahead.

EBERHARD: And it's as vivid today as it happened twenty years ago. We were in to make a case for adult ed, and I don't even recall the specific issue at this time, but I do know that the issue of categorical programs came up. And Superintendent Riles said, "Well, because you are a categorical program, such and such will need to happen." And I said, "Mr. Riles, we're not a categorical program," blah, blah, blah. . . . And I'll never forget this as long

as I live. He is a very large man, and he was sitting in a chair and he stood up to his full six-foot-four or whatever it is, and he pounded the table and he said, "You *are* a categorical program, you have always been a categorical program, and you will remain a categorical program. *Do you understand!?*" I said, "Yes, sir." [Chuckling] And from that point on, that was fairly well established, that we would be a categorical program in the Riles administration. I do believe it was during that period of time when all the sunset legislation was introduced, where they brought in the twenty-six categorical programs and we were in there to debate whether we should be in that long list.

MILLER: In existence or not, yes.

EBERHARD: Well, no, not in existence, but whether or not we should be in the list of programs [to] be sunsetted, and the decision was made and supported by the administration that yes, we would.<sup>3</sup>

MILLER: Now, we have in fact been taken off of that list in the past year or so, haven't we?

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

---

<sup>3</sup>Categorical programs have to make periodic reports to the legislature to determine if their effectiveness is such that funding for that program will continue—or if the program will "fade away into the sunset."



MILLER: This is Tape 3, Side A of the Ray Eberhard interview. Sunset.

[Chuckling]

EBERHARD: We are just about ready to submit a massive report to the legislature on January 1st. As a requirement of the three reform bill package, the legislature required us to report to them on the effectiveness of the implementation of these three reform bills. Inherent in that report will be a recommendation to eliminate adult ed from the sunset provisions once and for all. We have been poked, prodded, pushed, analyzed upside-down, inside-out, and it serves no good purpose any longer for the system to be in that list of the, quote, other categorical programs. So I think this is the time when we will be successful in that.

MILLER: Okay. Now, Bill Honig did take an interest in the strategic planning process in the late '80s.

EBERHARD: Yes, he did. We were discussing how policy comes to be [developed] a little while ago. We had detailed the strategic planning process in a policy issue advisory to Bill Honig at that time. We wanted his full participation and buy-off and support of this process. He, in fact, did that and was active in the actual strategic planning process.

- MILLER: He read the papers that were sent to him. [Chuckling]
- EBERHARD: He read the papers, but he was visibly active in the process. He attended the first meeting and established the charge with a representative from the Chancellor's Office, he was present at another one of the meetings where in fact we made several of the recommendations that were to come out. And so it was very good to have the superintendent's support on a very visible process for adult ed, and I think it made the adult education people feel more important.
- MILLER: Okay. Ray, you have a number of ways of receiving input from the field. You have various and sundry official advisory committees, there's the liaison with professional organizations, and you have your own unofficial advisors. What roles do each of these play, and what's their relationship to one another?
- EBERHARD: The role that they play is basically one of keeping information flowing, in terms of being able to get an accurate reading on the pulse of the system out there. The informal network roles often overlap with the formal network roles. For example, when I'm talking to the chair of the ACSA Adult Ed Committee or the president of CCAE or the president of CAEAA [California Adult Education Administrators Association], it is also most

often to solicit their opinion [on a policy issue] vis-à-vis their organization. I also then talk to those people as part of the informal network outside of their role in the organization that they're representing. So it's very difficult to separate that, saying any one of those sources being more important than the other. I use them all extensively and frequently. It's always been my style to have a close relationship with the field, to understand what their concerns are, their needs are, their desires are, and that's how you get good, I think, input when one has to come with a major policy recommendation or decision.

**MILLER:** Okay. Do you attend all of the professional organization board meetings?

**EBERHARD:** To my knowledge, I have never missed an ACSA state Adult Education Committee meeting. I may have missed a couple of CCAE State Board meetings, but I usually try and make all of those. It's important, one, for visibility, to show that the Department cares about adult ed, even though your presence there is somewhat limited because they're doing a lot of board types of things in terms of their conferences and their membership and so forth, but also to carry the message from the Department, in terms of what's hot and what's not and what

we're supporting and what we're looking for. That's extremely important. This new organization, or maybe not so new now, the CAEAA, is holding its first conference in January, to which I've been invited to make three separate presentations. So I'm looking forward to that.

MILLER: How large is that now, Ray?

EBERHARD: My understanding is they have up to about 100 members now.

MILLER: Really?

EBERHARD: Yes. And there's another informal group that's meeting called the Adult Ed[ucation] Consortium.

MILLER: That's the public relations group?

EBERHARD: No, this is a group that started about a year and a half ago, I believe, in response to the new policies of the Department of Education regarding concurrently enrolled and waivers and recalculations [of a.d.a. and income].

MILLER: Okay, so a group of administrators then?

EBERHARD: Yes, it's also the group from which the lawsuit. . . .

MILLER: Originated?

EBERHARD: Yeah, originated. But they're addressing other issues besides that, in terms of the program, and it's an ad hoc group, but their "ad hococracy" has gone on for over a year, so there's something there.

- MILLER: Okay. Has the CAAEA [*sic*] expanded beyond southern California now?
- EBERHARD: It is my understanding they have. There are members up here in northern California as well.
- MILLER: Where is their January conference?
- EBERHARD: It's at the Red Lion Inn in Ontario.
- MILLER: Of these various and sundry advisors, formal, informal, and so on, who do you turn to when the chips are really down?
- [Chuckling]
- EBERHARD: You mean organizationally or individually?
- MILLER: Individually or . . . I mean, you know, what's your instinct when you really need. . . .
- EBERHARD: It depends on the issue. It needs to be said, and I need to say it however, that first and foremost and always I go to Los Angeles. By nature, of course, of the size of the program, one does not make any policy decision without considering its ramification and impact on 25 percent of the students in this state, which happen to be in Los Angeles. I then always go to whomever is the chair of the ACSA committee, and I've had wonderful relationships with all those people over the years, and also the

president of CCAE. Those are usually my first three phone calls.

MILLER: Contacts.

EBERHARD: Right, I call currently now Jim Figueroa in Los Angeles, and Larry Timmons in Grossmont, and Virginia Donnellan in Ventura. That's always my nucleus. Then, depending on what the issue is, then I'll maybe go and I'll talk with somebody from . . . if it's a small school problem or a big school problem, or urban or rural, depending. . . .

MILLER: We were talking about the roles that each of these groups played. You might want to make some comment on the role of CCAE and ACSA in legislative matters? Like they can do things that you can't. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: Sure, or choose not to.

MILLER: Or choose not to.

EBERHARD: Right, it's important to say "choose not to." I mean, the Department can do almost anything it chooses to do because of the resources it has behind it. You know, we have our own lobbyists and our own Governmental Affairs Office, and we can promulgate regulation. So if the Department chooses to initiate

legislation we can certainly at least get it introduced. That doesn't mean we always get it passed. [Chuckling]

But sometimes it's more convenient to [have an outside group introduce legislation] if we perceive the Department's position may be somewhat neutral or lukewarm—where they wouldn't necessarily support but they wouldn't oppose. Then you often go to the field, and the two places in the field where we go for that are either CCAE or ACSA. They both have their own extremely competent lobbyists and they have their own network of support. So it's been my experience that within the past four to five years CCAE and ACSA are working much more closely together from a public policy point of view in regards to adult ed. I think a lot of that has to do with the relationship and the respect of the lobbyists between those two organizations, being Kathi Davis and Bob Wells, who have very high regard and respect for each other. [That] means they work together very well and can reach a consensus on a policy issue related to legislation.

In that regard, to give you an example of how that often works, with the three-bill package, the Department introduced one of the bills, CCAE introduced another one of the bills,

CAEAA introduced another bill, and ACSA took a support on all three positions. So everybody took a little piece of the pie, got a little piece of the credit for a massive piece of legislation, and so that's how you can cut certain deals so it's a win-win for everybody.

MILLER: For everyone, and everyone gets credit.

EBERHARD: Correct, everybody gets credit.

MILLER: Speaking of legislation, and it's not just adult ed but I think it's worth mentioning, tell us a little bit about this . . . is it Monday night group, Tuesday night group? What's this. . . ?

EBERHARD: The Tuesday night group, and I'm not sure that it meets any longer, but for years, every Tuesday night, all of the educational lobbyists would get together to discuss whatever the legislative agenda was, all the educational bills that were currently going through the session, and any that they all had some general common interest in. Because sometimes, you know, CTA [California Teachers Association] doesn't care about a lot of other educational bills but only related to them. But sometimes there's a bill in that impacts most of the educational coalition, and therefore the Tuesday night group was kind of an informal sounding board for that process. It became, and I know



particularly when I was working on SB 65 back in the mid-'80s, I had to go to the Tuesday night group. Gosh, I was going every Tuesday night, it seemed, for a year explaining the progress of SB 65. And we got support from that group, collectively, although they themselves are not an organization.

MILLER: If you weren't a lobbyist—

EBERHARD: I think it's now called the Education Coalition.

MILLER: Okay. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: And they may not meet on Tuesday night anymore.

MILLER: It sounds a little more professional than "Tuesday night group."

EBERHARD: Right.

MILLER: But if you weren't a lobbyist then, you had to be invited to the group, did you?

EBERHARD: Generally speaking, right. It's not that it was a private meeting, but if you were to walk in off the street, people would probably look askance at you and say, "What are you doing in this meeting tonight?" Yeah, it was mostly by invitation.

MILLER: Okay, so there weren't regular members of the Department that met with them?

EBERHARD: Well, no, there would . . . our lobbyists would be regular members.

**MILLER:** Your lobbyists.

**EBERHARD:** And also it had the executive directors of some of the educational organizations were also part of those meetings.

**MILLER:** Okay. Ray, sometimes people in the field get frustrated with the Adult Ed Unit because they don't perceive the unit as being advocates for them in Sacramento, or an advocate for whatever their needs may be. Can you talk a little bit about the limitations that are on you and your consultants, and what you can and cannot do, and generally how you handle or what can be done to relieve these periods of tension that crop up between the field and the state?

**EBERHARD:** Well, it's important to set the framework, I think, for any remarks I might make about that. [It] is that the state has a different role than local school districts have. We, by nature of being a state organization and part of state government, have oversight responsibilities, which means that one of our jobs as stewards of half a billion dollars is to make sure that that money is spent according to law and regulation. And oftentimes it's the part of a local provider or practitioner to spend that money as flexibly and creatively as possible, and therein lies a dissonance by definition, which often puts us at odds with the field, as it

should be. If we see something wrong, through our eyes, and it's verified and validated, we must then call that and say, "That's wrong and thou shalt not do that." That is often perceived as being a non-advocate [Chuckling], but also on the other hand, that's what our job is, part of our job.

Another major part of that is that we have a different set of eyes than the field has. When we open our eyes at eight o'clock in the morning in our office, we see the entire state, which means I see little teeny programs up in Susanville and Shasta and the Trinity Alps and down in the desert communities, and I see Los Angeles and I see Fresno, and everything in between. When the field opens its eyes at eight o'clock in the morning, they see their community. And that is a very different perspective, as it should be, by definition, and therein lies, I believe, another part of this comment about "Well, you don't advocate for us." We have to advocate for an entire state. And if, in fact, taking a position in support of a small piece of that state's geography is not in the best interest of the state, then in fact we are not an advocate for that small little piece of geography. So those are historic problems, and by definition and function they are not going to go away. They're

going to stay there because of the different roles and different perspectives that the two have. Where we can get a common agenda going, which we often do—and I go back to the three-bill package—there was a common agenda, there was a common advocacy on the part of everybody, it was the right thing to do. We get an awful lot accomplished that way.

**MILLER:** And then it always goes back to this communication, your ties to the field and how well you stay in touch.

**EBERHARD:** Absolutely. Correct.

**MILLER:** Okay. Governance is an issue that never dies [Chuckling] in the adult ed system in this state. What has been the history of the controversy between the adult schools and the community colleges?

**EBERHARD:** I guess I'm integrally knowledgeable about the controversy. I have to say up front, from a personal opinion point of view—but personal opinion shaped by twenty-five years of experience as an adult educator—that the controversy is one that has not a lot of substance to it. It's always been my perspective, even as a practitioner in the field when I supposedly was doing battle with Ventura Community College, that the issues there were not all that substantive in terms of providing

service to adults. Yes, in fact there's turf, but turf was blown out of proportion to the reality of the situation. With all the various meetings that I attended when I was in the field, I never really saw anybody stepping seriously on anybody else's foot, or denying service to anybody else's so-called client base. It's just not really as big a deal as it is often made out to be.

**MILLER:** Why do you think it hangs on so much then?

**EBERHARD:** I think it hangs on so much because it is a serious point of view with a few of our practitioners in the field who, from their perspective, perceive it to be terribly serious. And once again, I'll go back to my comments earlier from how we look at the state as opposed to [how] you look at your little community. Where in fact those communities say they have a serious problem, my view of that is: "I don't see the big deal down there." We're still fighting over historical events that occurred twenty years ago, fifteen years ago, and its analogy is that there was lack of communication and hatreds that developed out of all of it. It's not unlike what's happening in the Balkans today, almost. You know, those folks lived together for a long, long time, and all of a sudden they changed, they're not totalitarian anymore, and then these old, religious hatreds surface again, and

people get real serious about that stuff. You know, that's an analogy that may not be an appropriate one here, but to me it makes an awful lot of sense. I've been part of the Behr Commission,<sup>4</sup> I went through that whole process, I heard the testimony on all sides, and if one would go back and read the testimony of the Behr Commission with all the horror stories that came down, if anybody went out and validated those horror stories, I'll bet you'd find that a lot of them . . . most of them didn't exist. This is still an issue today. I get calls saying, "Wow! Gee, we've got somebody down here who wants to introduce legislation on this community college issue." I say, "Yeah, and what do they want to do with it?" And the person I'm talking to says, "Is this a problem for you?" "No," I say. "Is it a problem for you?" "No." "Who's the problem?" "Well, we've got this person. It's a problem for this person." So, from a statewide perspective, it generally is not that serious. I don't mean to say it's not an issue, but it's always been my sense it's been a very overblown issue.

---

<sup>4</sup>In 1980 the Adult Education Policy Commission, chaired by Senator Peter Behr, was to review and develop policy recommendations on delineation of functions between public school adult education and community college noncredit education. Although some fiscal recommendations were implemented, there was no change in the division of services between the two systems.

- MILLER: I find your response really refreshing. Because as I've been going around doing these interviews, and most of them have been done with retired people, and I had thought that from a distance that there might be some softening of these stands, [Chuckling] and by and large there has not been. It's amazing. It's absolutely amazing.
- EBERHARD: Yes, it really is. You know, you go out there and you look today, and I defy you to find unnecessary duplication. [Chuckling]
- MILLER: Not with our seven or eight million people that still need to be served.
- EBERHARD: Absolutely. Absolutely. If my ESL 1 class on the north side of the street is full, and your ESL class on the south side of the street is full, what's the problem?
- MILLER: Yeah. Just one more question on this. In retrospect, do you think the matter could have been handled better?
- EBERHARD: No, probably not, because once again the emotions are stronger than the facts. While there have been forums that were created to address this issue, they were still very emotional forums; and when you have more emotion than you have fact, you're not going to get too far.

MILLER: Adult educators stay on a constant roller coaster from legislative changes or public policy initiatives that are suddenly there. And we've sort of mentioned this throughout our interview, but I'm just wondering if you can summarize the funding changes that have taken place since you entered the field in '70? The major funding changes that have. . . .

EBERHARD: Yeah, I think we can do that. In probably somewhat of a chronological order, the first one would be the creation of a separate revenue limit for adults, coming off where we combined the defined adult and the non-defined adults and brought them together in a singular revenue and created the revenue limit concept. We did not have a revenue limit. We had equalization formulas before that, with basic aid and equalization. So we create the adult revenue [limit]. That's a key benchmark in the funding of adult education.

MILLER: And that was in the early '70s?

EBERHARD: Mid-'70s. Yes, that was '76.

MILLER: Mid-'70s, okay.

EBERHARD: From that point on then, the discussion and ultimate implementation of the separate fund for adult education. Then with its ultimate modification, in fact, where penalties were



placed upon the system—that if thou violates the fund, thou is going to get into serious fiscal trouble by doing that—that was a significant piece. And then we get, I think the third would be the three reform bill package where in fact we were able to bring additional resources into the adult ed base, elevate the revenue limits, and then create a mechanism where equalization and growth then could go on into the year 2000. I think those are the key components of funding.

MILLER: The key components in the base program, and, of course, in the midst of that was the loss of a lot of the programs from Prop. 13.

EBERHARD: Yes.

MILLER: Loss of categories of classes.

EBERHARD: Loss of categories but not necessarily funding. It did narrow the scope of the program, which in essence, if one plays that out, you [could] create a richer base because you didn't have to spread the money as far across instructional areas.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Many local districts did not give the adult programs their earned share of the block grant in 1978-79, which statewide did result in loss of funding in the system. From the post-Proposition 13 legislation in 1979 until the passage of the reform legislation in 1992, local agencies could not depend upon consistent funding guidelines. It was common during the annual budgetary process for the legislature to withhold either or both of the statutory 2% annual growth allotment or the cost of living adjustment. Frequently the statutory growth was legislatively targeted to

MILLER: Okay, and then in addition to the funding, there have been the public policy initiatives that have had tremendous impact on our programs, for example, starting with the refugees. Can we go over some of these others, or do you want me to feed them to you?

EBERHARD: Well, no, you can start, but the refugees in the late '70s [were not the first]. If one goes back and looks at the history of the system, you see history repeat itself. This system was based on a "refugee" [program] in the citizenship system, and we do that for a long period of time.<sup>6</sup> Then we go into a war and we have a need to provide vocational training.

MILLER: Right, because World War II, there was—

EBERHARD: And then the war is over and those people come home from war and they have a need for broader educational activities, plus vocational training again. Then the refugees come again. They

---

specific purposes such as GAIN (welfare reform). There were also years in which the state Adult Education Fund was not fully funded, which meant districts did not receive the full revenues to which their a.d.a. would ordinarily entitle them. The mega item came into play in the 1990s. One or more of these factors could be in effect in any one school year, making local budgeting an inexact science.

<sup>6</sup>Historically the first adult education classes were for teaching English and citizenship to immigrants.

start to come again, and so you see refugee education, you see citizenship education.

And we're about ready to change it again. What's happening now when the new block grants come down from the federal government, the system is going back to workforce preparation again, and so everything that we do is going to have to be dedicated to that and welfare reform. But the motivations, they change somewhat, the needs change somewhat, but, you know, the [programs] that the system [provides] don't change. We still do literacy, we still do language, we still do citizenship education, we still do vocational training, but it's now for a different purpose. And so your outcome is a little different, but the input is pretty much the same.

MILLER: It's much the same.

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: And the cycle of employment programs and education for immigrants goes through again and again.

EBERHARD: That's correct.

MILLER: We might just mention, and I know they separated it out from the Adult Ed Unit, but that the amnesty program in itself doubled our ESL population in about a year's time.

**EBERHARD:** Yes, it did do that. And as we found once again, and I'm going to segue over to distance learning, is that amnesty people were making their very first contact, because the fear factor had been taken away, with a free, supported public education adult system. Those that came and ate at that smorgasbord and started at the end of the table decided they wanted to eat the whole meal.

**MILLER:** To continue.

**EBERHARD:** And so they stayed in the system. And that's often true. I think we're going to see the same thing happen once we're able to expand our infrastructure into distance learning, where we're going to attract some of these people, albeit at home or at the workplace, into a learning environment, and over time they may want then to come back and take advantage of those traditional classroom kinds of programs.

**MILLER:** Okay, and we might just mention that the flexibility of our system is what makes it possible to accommodate these different waves.

**EBERHARD:** Well, yeah, local programs can offer only one area of instruction or they can offer all ten areas of instruction. They can do it just

in the morning or they can do it twenty-four hours a day. There is tremendous flexibility, there's no question about that.

MILLER: Okay, you mentioned what was coming with the block granting of the federal funds, and that happened to be next on my list to talk to you about. What is expected from the federal cutbacks, and what kind of contingency planning are you doing at this time?

EBERHARD: What is anticipated from the new federal program is, and maybe it's important to set the base here a little bit, is that what they're doing with the block grants is very similar to what the state of California did with the categorical programs of mega items five years ago. It is very difficult for elected officials to cut individual programs, because then they go home and their constituents would say, "Well, you cut adult literacy." "Well, yeah, I did." "Well, I'm sorry but you're out of here." So they found a device to be held not accountable for cutting any particular program, and in the case of the state government that would be the categorical mega items, in the case of the federal government it's called a block grant. In those new block grants that are coming are a plethora of federal entitlement programs all lumped together, and so they put these blocks together, then

they cut the block. So, when Representative XYZ goes home [and they say], "Well, you cut adult ed." "No, I didn't cut adult ed." More like he cut the block, but he didn't cut adult ed, per se. So it's a very interesting political device.

Having said that, however, two things are happening: One, first of all, the amount of resources that will be coming from Washington are going to be significantly reduced; secondly, the locus of control is going to shift from the state education agency to the governor, whoever he/she is.

**MILLER:** And I was particularly interested in what impact you thought that might have.

**EBERHARD:** Well, it all depends on which version of the block grant comes down. These two bills are going to conference committee. The Goodling bill will definitely go directly to the governor, but he must create a council, to which the Superintendent of Public Instruction should be invited. In the Kassebaum bill, there is a 25 percent set-aside that goes directly to the state education agency for vocational and adult education. Whichever version comes out, or amalgamation of those versions, it's going to be a *very different world*. As I mentioned, there will be less money, and there will be many more people fighting to get to a smaller

pot. If the state education agency doesn't have as much of a role, then the locals are going to have to do the best they can to fight [for their share] through these local councils.

The other major point is going to be the thrust of this legislation. And it's in two fronts. One is that it will be either called workforce or careers education. It's really inherent on adult educators to move away from this bigger idea of lifelong learning, that education is good for education's sake, literacy is good for literacy's sake, language is good for language's sake. They are going to have to redirect their language and their reading programs for a very specific outcome, and that's for work. And they're going to be held accountable for that. So, you teach reading in the work context, you teach language in the work context. And not that we don't know how to do that and haven't done it before, but that will be the exclusive emphasis. It is my personal opinion that this is also going to shape the base General Fund program, where we [now] have a \$450 million line item of apportionment for adult ed, which cuts across a lot of different program areas. I think that [for] the state of California the days of that luxury are over. In order then for the system to hold onto \$450 million, I think it's now

going to have to take a rifle and direct those resources specifically to work and welfare reform, maybe family, but not the broad-based program that we have today. No more shotguns.

**MILLER:** You think that we may lose things like older adults or handicapped or health and safety?

**EBERHARD:** I need to put my response in context. I think as areas of instruction, yes, but not as populations, no. Because as the system focuses on work and it focuses on family, you have handicapped people that work, you have older adults that work, you have older adults involved in family, you have handicapped involved in family. So it's a refocusing, okay? As opposed to, say, we're doing older adult programs or we're doing parent ed programs or handicapped programs. We're doing workforce preparation, we're doing family, literacy, and improvement, and all of those people may participate, and should, in those endeavors.

**MILLER:** Right now, nearly all of your consultants are funded through the federal funds. Do you anticipate the cut in funding affecting the units, and is it going to be possible to convert some of those positions to state funding?



EBERHARD: First, yes, I anticipate a *significant* reduction in personnel in the Department of Education working in adult ed. I don't see any crystal ball out there that gets around the block grants that are coming. The block grants have provisions for different kinds of programs, number one; they have reduced administration caps, number two; and a combination of those two, I believe, is really going to be devastating to the personnel in the Department of Education. I think you will see . . . and what that means then is, if that's true, that there will be a diminution of the Department of Education's role in these block grants, with a concomitant increase of responsibility from other agencies such as Employment or Health and Welfare, where they will pick up more of the responsibilities for our literacy kinds of programs.

MILLER: Just as now JTPA contracts for certain educational services, or GAIN contracts for certain. . . .

EBERHARD: Correct.

MILLER: And Health and Welfare let out contracts for the big wave of refugees. So you see them doing more?

EBERHARD: Right. I think at best the Department will be able to retain somewhat of a skeleton staff, almost like a little mini bureau, just to make sure whatever resources and money it has, that

those go out. Whether or not they'll be able to go to the legislature on BCPs to get more state-funded positions is . . . it remains to be seen.

**MILLER:** What's a BCP?

**EBERHARD:** It's a budget change proposal. It's the process that we have to use to get additional personnel.

**MILLER:** Okay. Ray, with the cut in the amount of federal money that adult ed will be receiving, would you anticipate that the unit would maintain significant support services, the 353 projects, and do the cuts in the local assistance grants, or do you think that. . . . Well, what do you think?

**EBERHARD:** What I think is, first of all, if one looks at the proposed legislation, there will be reduced local assistance money. One of the versions has vouchers, so money will be given directly to students and they can go shop wherever they want. Now, who knows how much those vouchers are worth.

**MILLER:** How much would it cost to administer that, for heaven's sakes?

**EBERHARD:** That has a great impact. When you take away a base for your infrastructure, then how does the infrastructure respond to students shopping around for services? That's an interesting idea. Secondly, regarding—

MILLER: But that would be the federal money?

EBERHARD: That's the federal money, correct.

MILLER: Yeah, and our federal money per student is not a lot.

EBERHARD: No, it's not, given the size of our need here in this state. But the 353, of course, will cease to exist.

MILLER: It won't be there at all?

EBERHARD: No, it's gone. It's gone. And that's an interesting proposition all by itself, because state government has historically never put out General Funds for R and D [research and development] and training. It gets to local assistance, and then to the extent that the locals want to engage in [staff development or assessment] or whatever, they may do that. But given there are going to be fewer resources, that's going to be an interesting notion in itself. But the OTANs and the CASASes and the Staff Development Institutes and distance learning, those are all history no later than June 30, 1998. They will cease to exist.

MILLER: In '98?

EBERHARD: In '98. It could be as early as '97.

MILLER: Because we're forward-funded to that extent.

EBERHARD: Right, and it could be as early as '97. I think that's sad. As you're aware, and many people are, and as I mentioned earlier

in my remarks, we have used the 353 to shape an awful lot of programmatic policy in this state, and that will disappear. So where those resources will come from for that positive kind of programmatic policy is an interesting situation.

**MILLER:** A few years ago, Ray, you floated an idea which was shot down pretty fast, but with loss of 353 monies for delivery of support services, I wonder if it might not be time to renew it. You were thinking of trying to establish some kind of a statewide staff development fund, and I think you were thinking of one-fourth of 1 percent. Can you. . . .

**EBERHARD:** Well, yeah, we've explored that, in terms of . . . and I believe the community colleges actually have that kind of a mechanism in their apportionment base, where you set aside. . . .<sup>7</sup> In other words, let's say that here is a Los Angeles block entitlement. And by statute, one-tenth of 1 percent of the block entitlement is put into a fund for purposes of training and R and D, okay? And so you lump together all the districts' one-tenth of 1 percent, and that fund might be of an amount equal to the

---

<sup>7</sup>AB 1725 provides that upon submission of a staff development plan the Chancellor's Office may approve up to 15 days for staff training within each community college district. The K-12 public schools are allowed up to 8 days for staff training under approved School Improvement Plans.

current value of 353 for purposes of maintaining those kind of things. But that would require some special statute to do that. What's going to be interesting is that when in fact all this service disappears, how real was the need in the field for staff development, for OTAN kinds of services, for CASAS kinds of services, and so forth? One would assume that altruistically that that need is truly manifested and deeply felt, and that something's going to have to come in to replace and fill that void somehow. What's been interesting is that we have fed the system from both sides. We have given the money to the field to buy the service or product that we created with our own money here. So, in essence, it really hasn't cost the field anything, if in fact you look at it that way. So all that is going to crash on the floor here very shortly.

**MILLER:** Well, maybe this is something that the professional organizations ought to start thinking about.

**EBERHARD:** Well, I certainly know CCAE has been very aggressive in doing its own staff development, and so to the extent that they can do that, sure.

**MILLER:** Certainly one thing, and it's one thing that got knocked out of the reform legislation, were the staff development days that the

K-12 schools have but that the governor did not approve for adult ed, and with our part-time staff in adult ed, the need to continually train people hasn't gone away.

**EBERHARD:** No, there's no doubt that that need is very strong. However, one has to test the political waters on that, and this current governor just in this session vetoed another similar proposal that the ROP people put forth to get in. So it's the second time and it would appear that unless you have a change of administration, that that's not something that's going to happen in state law very soon.

**MILLER:** Okay. Before we lead into our concluding questions, Ray, are there other topics that we should cover? We've been talking for quite some time. Has that stimulated your memory, brought up other things that you particularly want to cover?

**EBERHARD:** It appears as if we've been very comprehensive up until this point in time. Those ideas that have been stimulated as we've gone through, I believe I've brought them into the discussion.

**MILLER:** Okay. All right, in summary then, what do you consider the real strengths of California adult education?

**EBERHARD:** The real strength of California adult education begins with the state constitution, which has as its very first article that there

shall be a system of free public schools for every citizen in the state of California up and through a high school diploma. That constitutional guarantee is what sets the framework for the marvelous system of adult ed we have. You will find no other state that pays a system for people—for adults—to get a free high school diploma at the age of whatever, and so therein is the first piece. The second piece is that we have been very fortunate over time to have a separate line item in the state budget worth . . . now getting close to a half a billion dollars of General Fund money. Number three, is adult ed has been very fortunate to be part of Proposition 98, so whatever children get adults get. We don't have to negotiate our own line item in our budget, as long as Proposition 98 remains in effect. Three extremely important points in terms of the viability of the adult education system. Fourth, a long, proud history and tradition of service in this state. That generates a base of support over time. When we have such documents as *Meeting the Challenge* [a history of California adult education] that are allowed to go back and make the case of the millions and millions and millions of adults who have been served in this state, it is no little thing. So I find those to be the major things that provide for the

strength of the system. And of course, all those people out there that I mentioned earlier. You've got to have vision, and you've got to love people and you've got to love adults.

**MILLER:** With this strength in our system, how have we carried that over into national leadership through the years?

**EBERHARD:** We have been able to do that primarily through the federal system. If we had not had an Adult Education Act or a National Literacy Act, California would not, first of all, have met with the other state directors, we would not have had the products that have given us recognition and notoriety throughout the country, such as CASAS and OTAN and the ESL Institute, etcetera. I think we would have remained quite isolated with not too many people knowing too much about us had it not been for the federal money. So we cannot diminish the importance of that federal money, and that's where the future looks shaky.

**MILLER:** Okay, and we have provided some AAACE leadership as well.

**EBERHARD:** Yes, we have. Yes, but that's almost a historical artifact now.

**MILLER:** Yeah, because it's been ten years.

**EBERHARD:** Yeah, we have not done that in a long, long time.



MILLER: Okay. From our strengths then, where do we still have weaknesses? What do we need to work on?

EBERHARD: That's a great question. I think that still remaining is the weakness of the system wanting to be all things to all people.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

MILLER: This is Tape 3, Side B. Being all things to all people.

EBERHARD: Right. The times they are a-changing very rapidly. And going back to my earlier remarks, I think the system needs to really sit down and have a serious chat with itself in terms of what its new scope ought to be, and it may be that that needs to be a narrower scope, retaining the resources that you have but narrowing the scope of that. Secondly, there is still, I think, a paranoia on the part of field practitioners on their connectivity with their parent district, and therein lies, I think, part of the issue of concurrently enrolled, that "I serve these kids because it makes my superintendent and my board feel good." I think that we've got to get over that. Once again, we are a system designed for adults, and the statute said, and it was put in there, "if an occasional kid can take advantage. . . ." Well, we went way beyond occasional. And I think that that whole issue still

needs to be resolved. It's not resolved. We've come a long way but it's still there, it's hanging out. And what's inherent in that is the directors of adult ed say, "But if I just do adults, what's my connection? Why does my parent district want to keep me around?" Well, there are some very good answers to that. The answer is, of course, that you have created some very happy adults who, when election comes, tend to vote positively and in favor of that school "because I took advantage of that school and it did good things for me." Secondly, there are new kinds of connectivities. There is the connectivity of family literacy. What a marvelous connection of bringing the adult and the preschool and kindergarten child together in a positive outcome. That's legitimate, positive connectivity. And there may be others, so. . . .

**MILLER:** Also the idea that when parents become involved with their children in a school setting they tend to stay; they're the ones that become the volunteers at school throughout the child's career.

**EBERHARD:** That's absolutely true, and also those preschool children tend to hit school ready to go to school and tend to be much more successful in their educational program. Everybody wins on that

one. So those are new directions that have to be looked at very carefully.

**MILLER:** We've touched on this, but let's just bring it into focus again. Aside from the elements in our most recent strategic plan, which was designed to take us into the twenty-first century, do you have any predictions about what our programs will look like in ten to fifteen years?

**EBERHARD:** Yes, I think that what I addressed earlier regarding the focus of the system down to a narrower scope is probably where it's going to be. We will continue to do literacy and language and job training and parent ed, but they've got to be focused for a more specific outcome. I think, and we've been trying to engage the system in dialogue, that there are three domains that need to be looked at: the domain of work and how all of our programs relate to work—either requiring work, upgrading work, or improving my work; the domain of the family, and what are those competencies within the family so that we can show that as a result of participating in our programs the family is a stronger, better institution, a better entity; and the community. How is the result of instruction in our programs making communities better? Are people more. . . . Do they participate

more in the democratic process? Do they vote more? Do they attend more community meetings? Are they more involved in public safety issues? And so forth. And I think those are the domains of focus. We've got SCANS [Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills]. There's a lot of framework to look at, but we have not articulated that yet. We still have ten areas of instruction. I think we need to look at our base, our core, and what our strength is historically in terms of literacy and job training and parent education and see how it focuses on those three domains. Those are winners. There is no political opposition to those domains at all.

MILLER: Okay. As you review your career thus far, can you identify who or what you consider the key driving forces of adult ed programs in California? Who or what has made things happen?

EBERHARD: The who we've mentioned already in terms of California. Within my time frame, the who has been Don McCune, the who has been Xavier Del Buono, the who has been Abe Friedman, the who has been Bob Rupert, the who has been Tom Johnson, the who has been Ted Zimmerman. You get into trouble when you get into the whos because you leave out whos. [Chuckling]

MILLER: Yes. [Chuckling]

EBERHARD: And all those individuals who by title, not by name, have led their professional organizations, in terms of ACSA and CCAE. I think those are the critical ones because they have created the events, they have created the legislative opportunities, or at least supported them as we've gone through the '70s, the '80s, and the '90s.

MILLER: Okay. And what do you find most rewarding about your work?

EBERHARD: Having had some role in a policy decision that leads to a law or a regulation or a written policy that in fact makes an opportunity available for an adult that they didn't have before, or improves the quality of an opportunity for them. That's what it's all about.

MILLER: Okay. Well, thank you, Ray, both for the interview and for the contributions that you have made and are continuing to make to California's adult education programs. You've certainly been our most eloquent spokesman for these past twenty years.

EBERHARD: We'll see what the tape says. [Chuckling]

MILLER: This interview was completed as a part of the California Adult Education Oral History Project.

## INDEX

- 51-49 rule, 45
- 309, 310, or 353 projects (sections of the Adult Education Act), 49, 54-59, 125, 156, 158
- AAACE/American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, 36, 161
- ACSA/Association of California School Administrators, 33, 131, 132, 135-137, 166
- Adult basic education, 50
- Adult Basic Education Levels (ABEL), 63
- Adult Education Act, see also National Literacy Act, 24, 49, 56, 161
- Adult Education Committee (of ACSA), see also ACSA, 33, 131, 134
- Adult Education Consortium, 133
- Adult Education Unit (Policy and Planning; Field Services), 46-48, 50, 53, 116-123, 139
- Adult education fund, 87, 88, 145
- Adult education system, 3-7, 25, 37-40, 74, 75, 160, 161
- Adult Performance Level (APL), 58-60, 64-66
- Alhambra, 17, 28
- Alternative education, 75
- Alternative Work and Education Centers (AWEC), 78, 68
- Amnesty, 148, 149
- Andragogy, 19
- Apportionment, 3, 4
- Apprenticeship, 23
- Arizona State University, 8
- Arkansas, 70, 71
- Arts and crafts, 40, 44
- Aspen Fellow, 71, 72
- Aspen Institute, 71-74
- Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725), 157
- Association of California School Administrators, see ACSA
- Babitz, Milton, 127
- Bassett, 26
- Bauer, Thomas (Tom), 47, 51
- Behr Commission, 143
- Brenner, Warren, 22, 23
- CAEAA/California Adult Education Administrators Association, 131-134, 137
- California Department of Education, see Department of Education
- California School Boards Association, 103
- California State University Institute (Long Beach), 106
- California Teachers Association, 137
- Cap (growth cap), 26-28, 43
- CASAS/ Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, 54, 55, 59, 60, 63, 125, 156-158, 161
- Categorical programs, 3, 42, 128-130

CBAE mandate, see also competency based adult education, 57-63, 68  
 CCAE/California Council of Adult Education, 33, 131, 132, 135, 158, 166  
 CDE (California Department of Education), see Department of Education  
 Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, 85, 131  
 Chatsworth (and Chatsworth High School), 9, 10  
 Citizenship programs, 147, 148  
 Clark, Jack (Senator), 73  
 Clemson University, 70  
 Clinton, Bill (Governor), 70, 71  
 Clinton, Hillary, 71  
 Community based organizations (CBOs), 6  
 Community college system, 5-7, 44, 157  
 Community Service Act, 43  
 Competency based adult education (CBAE), 57-63, 68  
 Concurrent enrollment, 44, 75-77, 99, 102-104  
 Coordinated Compliance Review, 96  
 Cost of living adjustment (COLA), 39  
*Crossroads Cafe*, 107-111  
 Crutchfield, Juliet, 118, 119  
 Dallas, 17, 18  
 Davis, Kathi, 136  
 DeGabriele, Eugene, 46  
 Del Buono, Xavier, 45-47, 51, 53, 67, 78-83, 128, 165  
 Department of Education, 22, 85, 104, 108, 115, 119, 120, 126, 128, 132-135, 138, 150  
 Department of Finance, 104  
 Deukmejian, George (Governor), 68  
 Distance learning, 106, 149, 156  
 Donnellan, Virginia, 135  
 Dropout Prevention Center, 69  
 EduCard, 113, 114  
 Education Coalition, 138  
 Educational Clinics, 68, 78  
 Educational Testing Service (ETS), 63  
 Ehlers, Robert (Bob), 52, 53, 57, 112  
 El Monte, 17, 28  
 Elk Grove, 26, 27  
 Elsinore, 112  
 English as a second language (ESL), 24, 40-43, 48, 49, 148  
 ESL model standards, 96  
 ESL Teacher Institute, 55, 161  
 Family literacy, 163, 164  
 Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 49  
 Federal adult education funds, see also Adult Education Act, 48, 49, 53-57, 108, 109, 161  
 Federal funding (changes in and impact), 150-156  
 Field input, 131-135

Figueroa, James, 135  
Fine arts, 40, 44  
Five percent programs, 90, 91  
Florida, 108  
Ford, Gerald, 73  
*foto novella* (photo stories), 109, 110  
Friedman, Abram (Abe), 32, 165  
Friere, Paolo, 19  
Funding, 28-31, 39, 41-44, 99, 100, 145-147  
Future of Adult and Continuing Education (FACE), 101  
GAIN/Greater Avenues to Independence, 4, 6  
Garden Grove, 15  
GED/General Educational Development, 13, 14, 75  
General Fund, 3, 53, 57, 156, 160  
Governance, 141-144  
Governmental Affairs Office, 135  
Gray Panthers, 38  
Hacienda La Puente, 16, 17, 24, 28  
Heinle and Heinle, 109  
Herbert, Victor, 69  
High Risk Youth Unit, 67-69  
Honig, Bill, 67, 130, 131  
Hopp, Wilfred M.A. (Will), 14-19  
Humanities, 40, 44  
Illinois, 108  
Immigration, 23, 42  
Intelecom, 111  
Johnson, Thomas (Tom), 16, 24, 32, 165  
JTPA/Job Training Partnership Act, 6  
K-12 system, 3-5, 29, 45, 76, 77, 99  
Kissinger, Henry, 73  
Knowles, Malcolm, 18, 19  
Learning Networks, 113, 115  
Lecture and forum series, 43  
Lindberg, James, 52  
Los Angeles Adult Education, 33-35, 48, 134  
Los Angeles Unified School District, 7-13, 17, 32, 45, 108  
McCune, Donald, 46, 47, 50-53, 78-82, 116, 165  
*Meeting the Challenge*, 160  
Mega item, 42  
Mexico, 109, 110  
Model standards, 91, 92, 95  
Montoya, Senator, 23  
Motivation and Maintenance Program, 68  
National Adult Literacy Program, 95  
National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS), 63-66



National Christian University, 17,18  
 National Dropout Prevention Network, 70-74  
 National Literacy Act, 161  
 National Literacy Act, see also Adult Education Act, 6, 161  
 Networks (professional), 31-34  
 New Jersey, 108  
 New York, 108  
 NOMOS study (California Adult Competency Survey), 58-60, 64  
 Northcutt, Norville, 58  
*Organizaton, Implementation and Administration of Curriculum and Programs for Adult Career and Continuing Education*, 18  
 OTAN/Outreach and Technical Assistance Network, 105, 125, 156, 158, 161  
 Parapsychology, 22  
 Parent education, 38,108  
 Peck, Nancy, 69  
 Policy development, 123 -126, 130, 131  
 Pomona, 28  
 Professional Resource Outreach System (PROS), 95  
 Proposition 13, 36-39, 44, 89, 146  
 Proposition 98, 160  
 Public Broadcasting System (PBS), 111  
 Reform legislation, 93, 97, 98-103  
 Refugees, 24, 43, 44, 147, 148  
 Regional Occupational Programs (ROP), 68, 159  
 Revenue limit, 28-31, 39, 45, 100-103, 145  
 Riles, Wilson, 126-129  
 Rupert, Robert (Bob), 32-36, 165  
 Sacramento, 25, 46, 48  
 San Diego, 70  
 San Fernando Valley, 9, 21  
 San Gabriel Valley, 17, 27, 28  
 San Joaquin Valley, 50, 51  
 SCANS (Secretary's Commision on Achieving Necessary Skills) , 165  
 School Intervention Unit, see High Risk Youth Unit  
 Senate Bill 65 (SB 65), 78  
 Simi Valley Adult Education, 13, 14, 17, 20-23, 40, 46  
 Simi Valley, 13, 15, 31  
 Smith, Gertrude G., 10  
 Smith, Lynda, 118, 119  
 South America, 109, 110  
 Staff Development Institute, 156  
 Staff development days, 158, 159  
 Start-up (new) schools, 93-95, 117, 118  
 State Adult Literacy Survey (SALS), 64  
 State Department of Education, see Department of Education  
 State library, 5

Stiles, Richard, 51-53  
Stitch, Thomas, 66  
Stony Point Continuation High School, 10  
Strategic plan, 55, 84-93, 125  
Sunset legislation, 129, 130  
Superintendent of Public Instruction, 126, 127  
Technology projects, 104-115  
Telecentered Learning Experiences (TELex), 112  
Ten cent tax, 30  
Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), 63  
Thorton, Shirley, 83  
Timmons, Larry, 136  
Title V, California Administrative Code, 86  
Tri-Community, 17  
Tuesday night group, 137, 138  
University of Michigan, 109  
University of Texas, 58  
Vocational training programs, 20-24, 40, 147, 148, 164  
Volunteer organizations, 6  
Wells, Bob, 136  
"White hats", 32, 34  
Whittier, 28  
Williams, Collin, 71-73  
Wye Plantation, 72, 73  
Zimmerman, Theodore (Ted), 15, 16, 24, 31, 165

## RESUME

**Raymond G. Eberhard, Ed.D**

### Education

Doctor of Education: Adult Education Administration, National Christian University, Dallas, Texas, August 1974.

Dissertation Title: *The Organization, Implementation and Administration of Curriculum and Programs for Adult, Career and Continuing Education*

*Masters of Arts:* Secondary Education Supervision and Administration, California State University, Northridge, June 1970.

*Bachelor of Arts in Education:* Major - Biology; Minor - Psychology; Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, June 1964.

### Experience

#### ***February 1988 - Present: State Administrator, Adult Education***

- Administer a four hundred million dollar (\$400,000,000) general fund adult education program in 390 school districts serving 1.9 million adult students.
- Administer federal programs involving the National Literacy Act with funds totaling \$28,000,000; and the McKinney Literacy for the Homeless program with funds totaling \$600,000.
- Develop policy and legislative initiatives to provide improved educational leadership for all non-college credit adults in California.
- Supervise a staff of 11 persons and fiscal contracts and grants exceeding \$30,000,000.

#### ***May 1985- February 1988: State Director, High Risk Youth***

- Developed and administered SB 65, California's major dropout prevention and recovery legislation.
- Developed policy to provide improved educational leadership for all high risk students.
- Disseminated model programs and promising practices for dropout prevention and recovery.
- Coordinated with other State Department of Education units regarding the needs of high risk students for purposes of maximizing initiatives.
- Developed and established networks and linkages for funding model programs for both in and out-of-school at-risk youth.
- Supervised a staff of 13 persons and budget in excess of \$20,000,000.

***July 1983 - April 1985: Program Manager, Youth Employment Linkages Service***

- Developed and articulated a state policy that guided the direction for all youth education/employment training programs conducted by the State Department of Education.
- Provided advocacy and leadership for programs designed to assist high-risk youth make the transition from school to work.
- Developed a set of expectancy standards for identifying skills and competencies needed by students leaving school and entering the workplace.
- Identified, promoted and disseminated effective strategies for working with high risk youth in transition from school to work.
- Identified and promoted effective partnership systems between business, education, industry, labor, private industry councils and other government agencies.

***October 1983 - June 1984: Assistant Director, Office of Employment Preparation (Dual Assignment)***

- Established and maintained a system for the dissemination of JTPA funds to service delivery areas.
- Provided liaison and coordination with the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the Education Subcommittee, Employment Development Department and the Chancellor's Office.
- Provided leadership for program improvement and program development activities in:
  1. Occupation specific job training programs.
  2. Competency-based benchmarking programs for youth.
  3. Assessment and evaluation.
  4. Employability skills.
  5. Job development, placement and follow-up.
- Supervised a staff of 32 persons that delivered field services to JTPA Service Delivery Areas.

***July 1979 - June 1983: Assistant State Director of Adult Education***

- Established and maintained a system for the dissemination of funds to public and private non-profit agencies from the federally funded Adult Basic Education Act.
- Interpreted the federal Adult Education Act, rules and regulations to applicants.
- Facilitated participatory planning for the State Plan.
- Developed and implemented the State Plan.
- Administered the necessary data collection.
- Designed, scheduled and implemented, compliance visits to the federally funded projects.
- Supervised nine field consultants in their work with the federally funded projects, including: setting priorities for the work of the unit and individual staff members, and approving individual workplans and travel schedules.

- Developed and monitored experimental and demonstration research projects funded under the Adult Education Act.
- Developed the first State Plan in the United States that required all applicant agencies to implement a competency-based adult education system as a condition of eligibility for funding.

***August 1977 - July 1979: Adult Education Planning Consultant (Administrative Assistant)***

- Designed the format and process for the statewide planning effort for adult education.
- Coordinated all time frames and oversaw the delivery of all written products.
- Chaired the broad-based advisory committee appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- Advised the Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction on all matters relating to the management of a major education delivery system.
- Guided the division in the planning process through a complete policy review of adult education; a complete review and revision of California Administrative Code (CAC), Title 5 in Adult Education and comprehensive series of policy, regulation and legislative recommendations submitted to the State Board of Education.

***August 1976 - July 1977: Adult Education Field Services Consultant***

- Developed technical assistance and compliance reviews.
- Supervised budget revisions and processed final claims.
- Recommended changes in policy that resulted in a new allocation formula for the distribution of federal funds on a statewide basis.

***September 1970 - August 1976: Assistant Director for Adult Education, Simi Valley Unified School District***

- Managed and developed literacy and vocational training programs.
- Developed and managed the growth of the program for the community by over 2000 units of ADA.

***September 1964 - August 1970: Los Angeles Unified School District***

While working for the Los Angeles Unified School District I was a teacher, a counselor and an Administrator.

- Taught biology, Chatsworth High School.
- Administered Stoney Pointe Continuation High School.
- Counseled.

## **Professional Organizations**

American Association of Adult Education and Continuing Education  
 Association of California School Administrators  
 California Council of Adult Educators

National Adult Competency Education Committee  
 National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium  
 National Council of State Directors for Adult Education  
 National Dropout Prevention Network

### **Professional Activities**

Arizona Department of Education - Consultant on Adult Education  
 Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, Alumnus and Fellow  
 California Lutheran College - Lecturer on Adult and Vocational Education  
 Dothan, Alabama City Schools - Consultant on dropout prevention  
 Florida State Department of Education - Consultant on dropout prevention  
 German Marshall Fund, European Adult Education Delegate  
 Hawaii Department of Education - Consultant on Adult Education  
 Maryland State Department of Education - Consultant on dropout prevention  
 Miami, Florida - Keynote speaker, Miami BICE National Conference on Dropout  
 Prevention  
 National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University, Consulting Advisory  
 Board  
 National Dropout Prevention Network- Co-Founder  
 National Dropout Prevention Network- Executive Director  
 Pago, Pago American Samoa - Workshop coordinator of federal programs for  
 USDE Region IX  
 San Antonio, Texas - Keynote Speaker, Seventh National Conference on  
 Competency-Based Education  
 Texas State Education Agency - Consultant on dropout prevention  
 United States Department of Education - Member Management Review Team for  
 Adult and Vocational Education  
 University of California, Berkeley - Lecturer on Adult and Vocational Education  
 University of Kansas - Presenter at First National Conference on Adult Life Cycles

### **Honors**

Founding director of the National Dropout Prevention Network  
 Inaugural award as Outstanding Representative from a Human Resource Agency  
 presented by the Industry Education Council of California  
 Outstanding achievement award for service to Adult Education in California from  
 the Association of California School Administrators  
 "Original Chaptered Version of SB 65" presented by the Honorable Art Torres,  
 California State Senate, for drafting SB 65  
 Outstanding Unit Award by the California Department of Education  
 Robert W. Rupert Award from the California Council for Adult Education for  
 Exceptional Leadership in Adult Education  
 Outstanding Administrator Award by the California Department of Education  
 Distinguished Service Award by the National Dropout Prevention Network

### **Publications**

Education for the "Era of the Adult," The Futurist, May - June 1990.

CALIFORNIA ADULT EDUCATION ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

RELEASE FORM

For and in consideration of the participation by the *California Adult Education Oral History Project*, funded by the *California Department of Education*, in any programs involving the dissemination of tape-recorded memoirs and oral history material for publication, copyright, and other uses, I hereby release all right, title, or interest in and to all of my tape-recorded memoirs to the *California Adult Education Oral History Project* and declare that they may be used without any restriction whatsoever and may be copyrighted and distributed by the *California Department of Education*, which may also assign said copyright and publication rights to serious research scholars.

In addition to the rights and authority given to you under the preceding paragraph, I hereby authorize you to edit, publish, sell and/or license the use of my oral history memoir in any other manner which the *California Department of Education* considers to be desirable, and I waive any claim to any payments which may be received as a consequence thereof by the *Department*.

PLACE Sacramento, CA

DATE December 7, 1995

Raymond L. Shepard  
(Interviewee)

Emilia J. Miller  
(Interviewer)  
(for California Adult Education  
Oral History Project)