

Oral History Interview *with* *Roland K. Attebery*

This is a 82-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 **000861**

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

ROLAND K. ATTEBERY

Consultant, Adult Education

San Jose Unified School District, Adult School Principal, 1969 - 85

Fresno State College, Adult Education Instructor, 1968 - 72

Consultant, Bureau of Adult Education, California SDE, 1967

Hanford Joint High School District, Adult School Principal, 1960 - 69

President, State, California Council for Adult Education, 1970-71

December 7, 1992

San Jose, California

By Linda L. West

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| RESTRICTIONS, LITERARY RIGHTS, QUOTATIONS. | v |
| PREFACE. | vi |
| INTERVIEW HISTORY. | vii |
| INTERVIEW December 7, 1992 | |

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

Federally funded programs for adult basic education and adult vocational education in the 1960's--Nursing education in Hanford--Role of State Department of Education, Vocational Education Division--Role of Bureau of Adult Education--Construction, welding, tractor repair, and farming in Hanford--Profile of adult students in the San Joaquin Valley in the 1960's--Personal health competency instruction--Concerns of local programs regarding state and federal control--Interagency coordination in the 1960's--Curriculum development for adult subjects in the 1960's--Student assessment in the 1960's--*Precursor to competency based instruction in the 1960's--Stories about American Indian adult students--Graduation ceremonies in the 1960's--Adult literacy students at Hanford--Adult education funding--Adult administrators' associations--Adult curriculum development.*

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| [Tape 1, Side B]. | 26 |
|------------------------|----|

Networking between adult education and the junior colleges in the San Joaquin Valley in the 1960's; Training out-of-work students in the 1960's; Role of adult education advisory committees; Characteristics of adult education in San Jose in the 1970's; Adult education credential issues in the 70's; Governance of the Metropolitan Adult Education Program (MAEP); Effects of Proposition 13 (1978); Adult education programming after 1978; Adult education funding after 1978; Bureau of Adult Education in the 1960's; Regional Occupational Program in San Jose in the 1970's.

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| [Tape 2, Side A]. | 50 |
|------------------------|----|

Governance of the Metropolitan Adult Education Program--Instructional aide training program--Community support for adult education programs--Characteristics of the California Council for Adult

Education (CCAE) in the 1960's and 1970's--Role of CCAE in legislative issues after Proposition 13--Delineation of functions between adult schools and community colleges--Effects of influx of Indochinese refugees on adult programs in San Jose in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| INDEX..... | 72 |
| BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION..... | 74 |

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
201 N. Sunrise Ave.
Roseville, California 95661

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:

Roland K. Attebery, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1992 by Linda L. West in San Jose, California, for the California Adult Education Oral History Project

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 SAN JOSE, CA.

DATE 12/7/92

Roland K. Attebery
(Interviewee)

Anne R. West
(Interviewer)
(for 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 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.

Significant assistance to the new project was 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 Unit, California Department of Education, and the support of Lynda T. Smith, Consultant, Adult Education Unit.

Linda L. West
June 1, 1993

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer

Linda L. West

Interview Time and Place

One interview was conducted in Roland K. Attebery's home in San Jose, on December 7, 1992.

Editing

The interviewee reviewed and edited the transcript. No information was deleted. When the tape was inaudible or when necessary for clarification, some information was added and is indicated by brackets [].

Tapes

The original cassette tape was 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: ROLAND K. ATTEBERY

INTERVIEWER: Linda L. West

[Session 1, December 7, 1992]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

WEST: This is Linda West interviewing Roland Attebery in San Jose, California, on December 7, 1992. I'm interviewing Roland to record his recollections of significant events and trends in California adult ed during his career.

Roland, beginning in the mid-sixties, various types of federal funding became available to adult ed. What were the types of federal funding and what were the effects?

ATTEBERY: Up to that point in adult education, generally we had to take whatever leftovers were available from the day school instruction, as far as our materials and so forth. And so, when federal funds became available, we became an important part of the day school system, too. For instance, when MDTA [Manpower Development & Training Act (1962)] came along, I began writing projects in this area and provided for the training of individuals, whereas before we didn't

have equipment or facilities to offer much of this in the smaller districts in the state. So, oh, probably one of the first things was like vocational nursing, which we trained people in the nursing field and opened up a nursing school. The nursing school is still in operation today after all these years.

WEST: What district is that?

ATTEBERY: That was Hanford Joint Union High School District. And the way I got involved here was I had written a little project. I can't remember what the first project was for adult education, it might have been MDTA, and so when ESEA [Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Adult Education Act (1966)], the superintendent said, "Well, you're the only one that's written projects in this district. Why don't you go ahead and be the federal project writer for the ESEA?" And he said, "Just write whatever time you spend on that in overtime." So that's how I began being the federal projects director, due to no one else having written projects.

And, of course, one of the most important elements was to answer all the questions. You eliminated writing in a narrative fashion.

That's how we used to write a lot of things prior to that time, but we found that it was important to the state government and the federal government to answer each, 1A, 1B, and 1C, and make sure all spaces were filled. So we offered the MDTA and the ESEA and then we had. . . .

Then the VEA [Vocational Education Act (1963)] came along, and remember some of the important things that were happening in those days, too, was the equipment. We had the MDTA program, which we offered the nurses' aide training along with the LVN [Licensed Vocational Nurse] training, and when my MDTA program was finished, I had a VEA project which started a new nursing program. However, the MDTA officials called me and said, well, they'd be picking up the equipment. So I was a little concerned, so they. . . . I called them, they said, "Yes, we need to pick it up because you aren't going to be offering MDTA any longer." So, at that point, we needed to coordinate our efforts in vocational training; therefore, I contacted the person in charge of vocational education at the state level and he . . .

WEST: Who was that? Do you remember?

ATTEBERY: [It was Wesley P. Smith, California State Director of Vocational Education from 1949-1973.] I'm trying to remember his name, but I can't remember it. He and I were both speaking at a state conference, and we both arrived early for a meeting one day and I was talking to him for awhile and I told him about the MDTA official and he said, "Well, I want to assure you, Roland, if you're offering one of these training programs, no matter under what federal project, that you'll be able to keep your equipment." So I believe this may have been probably the intro to coordinating the efforts so that one project wouldn't come in and terminate . . . where you'd have to bring in new equipment at that time for the other projects.

WEST: And so the state was providing some leadership then to coordinate the different federal efforts?

ATTEBERY: Right, yes. Otherwise each segment would have been coming in and picking up equipment, then another one would be delivering it. Of course, it's a common, normal procedure when you're beginning a lot of new operations. He [Wesley Smith] was very influential in voc ed in those

days and a lot of adult ed was dependent upon the voc ed department and what they would do.

WEST: So there was a close coordination there between the two departments.

ATTEBERY: Right. Stan [Stanley] Swarder was the head of the . . . well, what they called the Chief of the Bureau of Adult Education at that time. And I think they only had about four consultants throughout the state: Larry [Lawrence E.] Koehler and . . . let's see . . .

WEST: Was Gene [Eugene M.] de Gabriele there?

ATTEBERY: Gene de Gabriele. Let's see, and there were two other real important names [Joe Simms and Milton Babitz]. [Milton Babitz] became Assistant to the State Department Superintendent [Wilson Riles]. He passed away soon after getting that job, however, but he was very good.

But then we did have a . . . I mentioned Title V [WIN Program] in the papers that I sent you, and I think Title V came through the County Welfare Department, which allowed us to train individuals to do any job that was needed in the city. Therefore, we began our training programs, and one of the things that I remember most about that was I was granted fifty acres of land [by

our district] on one of our sites to offer a training program on. So I didn't have any building on this land, so I got an approval to use the trainees to construct the building. So we constructed the building, pouring cement, wiring the building, making welding stations, and we had a drive-through in this building where we could bring tractors in and taught tractor repair. And also, these men were taught farming, because it was a farming community, and so the neighbors said, "Well, we really like what you're doing for the community," so they gave us fifty more acres of land with a pump, a water pump, for \$1 a year. And so we planted our crops, and [at harvest time] I was out trying to sell my dry and my wet wheat.

In those days, you could use this money for anything you wanted to. You could put it in the kitty, and if you decided to do this you could. So I had those stipulations where if you brought in four people from a neighboring township in the county that we would give [the driver] gas money. So we gave people gas money for bringing individuals to school and so forth at that time.

WEST: That makes me think. This is in the sixties that we're talking about.

ATTEBERY: Right, yes.

WEST: What was the profile of your students in the adult ed program, the men that you were teaching these skills to, as far as their ethnicity and their age?

ATTEBERY: In this community there were a lot of transients at that time--I'm talking about the agriculture transients--and we had a lot of concerns at that time. Many of these people were blacks, a few Indians. In fact, we had people who came in from the Indian reservation there and we picked them up and . . .

WEST: So an Indian reservation in California that's near there?

ATTEBERY: Right, it was near Hanford. And also we had a lot of Mexican-Americans in the community, so that's . . . and then we'd also have the Anglos in the program, so it was quite a combination. And at the time I started the program we didn't have any buildings either, so . . .

WEST: So there were really no limits on your creativity at that time.

ATTEBERY: You could do almost anything. And the state, when the school districts had loans, if they rented out any of these buildings in their community, they had to give the money back to the state, so they leased an entire school to me for \$1 a year, also. [Chuckling] Which was kind of nice, you know? I didn't pay for the maintenance and so forth, but to lease it for \$1 a year was great. So we did open up a school with a lease of \$1 a year.

WEST: Give me an idea of the size of the program there at Hanford at that time.

ATTEBERY: Well, when I first began the program, I'd say when I took it over it had 23 a.d.a [average daily attendance - 1 a.d.a. = 525 student hours], and I know in a few years' time. . . . I left there in 1967 as the adult educator and we had a few hundred a.d.a. I can't remember specifically how many we had, but it was a growth . . .

WEST: It grew dramatically though.

ATTEBERY: Oh, yes, it grew rather quickly. I might mention some of the things we were concerned about in those days, too. We were concerned about when a lot of these people came in we found that they didn't have. . . . A lot of them didn't have

very good health habits, and we were concerned about hair lice, we were concerned about their health. When the weather got warm, in those classrooms it was very smelly. So we would have our nursing staff who taught the LVNs, they would come in and put on a little training session. And we talked to our local druggist and other companies in the town, and they gave us little health kits, where we'd teach people how to use soap and how to use deodorants.

WEST: Personal hygiene training.

ATTEBERY: Personal hygiene. In fact, it went into. . . . We actually worked with them also on how you took medicines, because some forms they were taking orally, when they were not supposed to be taking the medicine orally. [Chuckling] And so we worked with them very closely on this and we did work very closely with the health association, too, there in town when we did these things.

WEST: Was there some controversy at that time regarding accepting federal funds?

ATTEBERY: Yes. The districts at that time. . . . I sat in on all of our board meetings, and at that time the local funds exceeded what was being received from the federal and state funds. Therefore, at

each meeting there was a lot of discussion on, well, if we take federal funds, the first thing you know people are going to be coming down, approving certain things in our programs and probably eliminating things. And we don't want anybody controlling our programs except our local government. Therefore, it took a while before our district decided to use the funds, and there were many districts in there who were still rejecting the funds in the Kings County area, but eventually I think. . . . I don't know whether 100 percent, but gradually almost all of them took federal funds, and I think they probably all did eventually. But it was a big question in those days, and of course we recognize what was going on at this point because I am a compliance coordinator with the state right now part-time, and I realize we do come in and kind of review the programs and approve and call things out of compliance and so forth.

WEST: So their concerns were not really that unreasonable, huh? [Laughter]

ATTEBERY: No, they were pretty true. And so, when I look back now and think of those board meetings, it's pretty much what they had . . .

WEST: Had anticipated, huh? [Chuckling]

ATTEBERY: Right, anticipated. Really, I had a lot of support for the program. In fact, they made a grand jury report on our program, and if I can find that report I'll hand it to you.

[Chuckling] I looked through my file. It's probably there somewhere, but I haven't been able to find it. But they wrote very complimentary things about us during the entire page or page and a half that the grand jury wrote on our program.

And I might mention, in those days, too, in the small communities you had very good cooperation from the welfare department and the local legislators. Where I'd call a meeting and I'd have legislators there, I could have the county health groups and the board of supervisors and. . . . In fact, I remember our first graduation of the LVNs. We were trying to operate on a low budget; even though we did have funds, we tried to conserve our money. And one of the supervisors found out that we were going to take the pins back from the ladies that were in the program, and he bought all the pins for the LVNs at the conclusion of the ceremony. So

we had great support from the total community and the county. The agencies worked so closely together. I guess that was probably what the federal funds did for us.

A little later on in your questionnaire I mentioned materials, too. And we were so proud when we first started the program because we had gathered up a lot of elementary textbooks and materials and many things that, like I say, the day school had discarded, and we were so proud of having a full library of these books to use, and when the federal projects came along we were able to develop adult ed materials.

And of course this was one of the early programs that I had there, and one of the first AB [Adult Basic (Education)]. I think I was one of the first twenty-five to make application to the state at that time. And what we did is our organizations were helped then, too, because we contacted, or I contacted, the people around the valley there and said, "Well, I'm writing a project. Would you like to come over and we'll talk about how we write a project?" And so we started writing projects and then we started getting materials and so forth. And then people

began to think. . . . The book companies started contacting us saying, "Say, do you have teachers that would help us write books?" And of course they were looking for somebody to write these books, but eventually then we had a wealth of materials that were . . .

WEST: What were some of the areas of curriculum development? Was it all basic education or was it vocational? What kinds of areas?

ATTEBERY: The ones during the early part were mainly in the academic areas, the English, the math, history and so forth, and so they were mainly towards the academic. . . . And as I remember some of these things, I remember the testing was a little difficult then, too. When I first started the program, being the only one there full-time in adult ed, I was looking for testing materials and I settled for what you call the "Gray Oral Reading Test," which was twelve cards where you'd ask questions. You'd have them read a card, then you'd ask the questions on the back and then you'd put them into categories. It was amazing because I had enough money to start four classes, and so I put these people into classes and labeled them either 1-minus, 1-plus, 1, 2-minus,

and 2 and 2-plus, and so forth in the four, 1, 2, 3, 4. So I found that I had too many 4's for a class, so I moved some of those to the 3's, and without saying anything to the teachers.

And when they started the classes, the one with the 3's indicated, "Roland, you know I have two distinct groups in my class. And I was wondering if you knew why." And I said, "Well, who are they?" And when she identified these people, sure enough they were the ones I had pulled back from the 4's. So it seemed to say that even though we've gone a long way in the testing, some of those real simple devices we used back in the beginning were pretty effective in measuring where you would place people. So it didn't have to be quite as difficult as we probably thought it would.

WEST: When the teachers were developing the curriculum specifically for the adult, how were they. . . . What were they looking for to distinguish those materials from materials for children?

ATTEBERY: What we really were looking for were . . . oh, it was in the form almost like the objectives. Remember when we went into objectives? When was that, in the seventies? We formed the different

skills that we wanted them to be able to perform at each level, and tried to identify them in these four levels, and wanted them to. . . . For instance, in English and math and so forth, those were our two concentrated areas, was English and math, although we taught, you know, some history, [health, and vocational]. But the main concentration was: What did we want them to learn in the elementary? What were the objectives and how would we know if they achieved them? And then when they achieved these objectives, then they moved them on to the next level, which sounds kind of current, you know? If you heard that in the seventies, you thought, well, gee, this is all something new. But I believe a lot of educators were thinking that way ever since time began. [Chuckling] But that was how we designated what would be taught at each of those levels. And of course the health came into it, too, you know, after we had discovered, hey, we need to go into this health program.

And one little incident that might be interesting. I had this one black lady that used to come in from one part of the county. I think she got money for bringing in some people, and

she actually dropped by the Indian reservation to pick up this Indian. And so one day she went by to pick him up and he wasn't out there. So she went to the door and knocked on the door to see if he was there. And the wife said, "Yes, he's in the bedroom. He hasn't awakened." And so she said, "Well, I'll wake him up." So she went in and got him up and brought him to school. However, the one thing, whether she knew or didn't know, was that he had been drinking.

WEST: Oh, no! [Laughter]

ATTEBERY: So, when it got hot in the classroom, and he had been drinking, so my coordinator called me and said, "Roland, what do I do with this gentleman? He's intoxicated over here." So I said, "Well, take him over to the faculty room and give him some coffee, because we have to take him home later." So, of course, she took him over to the faculty room and then the faculty showed up for break time. [Chuckling] And it was an interesting day anyway, but those are some of the things we ran into back in those days.

One day I had a . . . Well, this happened to be another incident. We had the chief of the tribe, who was graduating from our program, at

graduation, and somehow she had run into trouble with the law--I don't know whether it was drinking or what--but she wasn't going to be able to make her graduation. So what we did, we had her . . . well, paroled. Not paroled, but she was under our custody at graduation. So we got her excused to go through the graduation ceremonies and it was kind of a happy occasion for all the people that came in to see her graduate and so forth.

WEST: When you had the graduations, was this for eighth-grade diploma or GED or high school?

ATTEBERY: Well, we used to have a high school graduation for the people; GED, we did have a little certificate program; and for the . . . like LVN training we would have kind of graduation ceremonies. But the high school graduation was always an exciting event, you know, even though we may only have twenty or thirty people. When I first started the program, they would fill the auditorium with the . . . you know, the mothers and the grandmothers and the grandchildren and so forth, because you had people of all ages. And age wasn't a barrier in those days either,

because many of the people wanted an education very bad.

There were a couple little incidents I would like to point out, too, some of the things that I experience at that time, too. I had people coming in. . . . Well, he was in charge of the Ford garage in town where they sold the Fords and also maintained them, and he was the head of maintenance--a very big operation. The only thing, he didn't know how to read or write. And so his boss was the only one that knew that he couldn't read all these things that were coming in front of him, and so he was enrolled in our program.

Then I had another person who enrolled and he was working on a job and they wanted to promote him, and he knew in this new job that he would have to read. Therefore, he resigned from the employment because he couldn't read. And of course I had numerous instances, like people working for the bank, and also they were . . .

WEST: So these were students that you knew that came to learn to read, and then hopefully went back to employment.

ATTEBERY: Right, to employment. They would maybe be working for a bank and they wouldn't have a diploma. And they maybe said they had a diploma when they applied but now they had to try and get the diploma on the QT. And so they had come back to get their diploma, and we would wouldn't mention it or make any big thing out of it if they got their diploma because they didn't want to let the employer know that they didn't have it prior to that time. But those are some of the incidents at least I remember. I know I got a little off the federal projects on that.

[Chuckling]

WEST: Oh, well, that's okay. Before we completely leave the topic of funding for adult ed in California, in 1968, California enacted legislation that authorized the 10-cent tax level for adult education and addressed the issue of the definition of an adult student. What can you tell me about the effects of this?

ATTEBERY: What happened prior to this was many districts were subject to the whim of the local school board, you know, whether they wanted to. . . . They were required to offer certain basic things--I believe it was ESL and maybe. . . . I

know it was citizenship but I think maybe ESL, too. But they were rather restricted over what they had to offer. Therefore, if a board decided, well, that's all we're going to offer, that was it. So if a board decided they really wanted to support adult education, then they would support it and it would go. My district was supporting mine, so we were able to go.

However, when the 10-cent tax override came along, then people could vote for that tax. That was the only thing the money could be used for was adult education, and so most of the boards chose, well, gee, if it's going to be a separate fund, that's great. And so the 10-cent tax override kind of specified that this money is to be spent on adult ed and nothing else. So I imagine that was probably the first money that was designated just for adult ed, and that was the first time we identified, "Hey, we have our own money," you know? [Chuckling] And so at that point you knew you could depend on it. When the tax was, they'd tell you how much you were going to get from the 10-cent tax override. I don't think there was any restrictions at that point from the day school coming out of the

general fund supporting adult education just in addition to the 10-cent tax override. I think they could do that also, but at least the 10-cent tax override would go for adult ed. So that was our support.

WEST: What were the other sources of funding for adult ed at that time, or that could be used for adult ed?

ATTEBERY: Well, you could get money from the general fund, of course, from the day school--that was probably the biggest source--and we had a lot of projects at the state level. Sometimes they might call me and say, "Hey, Roland, there are some funds that are left over here. Do you have any project that you might like to submit in the next week?"

[Chuckling] Or one time they called me on a Friday and the funds had to be used, you know, prior to that. And so you'd have funds from this source. Locally you might have somebody who would donate things, but that didn't amount to too much money at that time. So I think that was just about all of the funding that we would have.

I remember contacting Stan Sworder or the chief one time and it was coming to the close of time and I said, "Stan, I don't. . . ." His name

was Stan Sworder. Oh, one of the other persons was Larry Koehler who was one of the consultants at that time.

WEST: Right.

ATTEBERY: I contacted him and I said, "Stan, I have \$15,000 here. I just can't use it according to the guidelines, and so what should I do?" And he said, "Well, Roland, I know you have a good program there. You just use it to buy something that's needed in the program and that will be fine." So we had this informality that could work in those days when we were just beginning that is probably more difficult now to vary. When you say you're going to spend money in a certain area, usually those guidelines are pretty rigid and it's hard to get them to deter from that.

WEST: We started talking about adult ed curriculum development. That curriculum development accelerated in the late sixties and in the seventies--you alluded to that.

ATTEBERY: Yes.

WEST: What can you tell me about that time, the seventies and. . . ?

ATTEBERY: In that particular era they had an organization which. . . . Do you want me to get into the organization, too, about that era?

WEST: Sure.

ATTEBERY: We had an organization, the California Association of Adult Education Administrators, a very strong organization, very influential. We had a lot of splendid leaders at that time in the state. Oh, I remember people like Roy Stone from L.A. We had a gentleman from Sacramento that was very influential. So there were several of these people that. . . . And Jud [Judson] Bradshaw, of course, was another strong one that I remember. I was very impressed by all these people when I first came into the organization. [Chuckling] But these people. . . . Ed Stanley from San Jose was another one, and I think he was a leader with the CCAE [California Council for Adult Education] in legislation. So these people kept in touch with the legislators and were up in Sacramento a lot and actually helped us during those periods to let people know in the state what we were doing.

That organization existed for several years and they had a board of directors, which I was

on, and they would meet and the chief of the bureau would always be there. I think he chaired. . . . Well, he was usually there, but we had a president of the association, too, but Stan and the bureau was always represented at those meetings, too. And so, in that era, prior to the forming of ACSA [Association of California School Administrators]. . . . I think ACSA came about in 1971, from my notes here, then ACSA was formed and there was really some question whether we should really be a part of ACSA. But of course then we thought we might lose our identity. But it's worked out and we've had a good relationship with ACSA and they pushed for legislation for adult education during the years, so the relationship turned out to be pretty good after all.

But that era was also one that we were constantly growing and constantly moving. I remember we had. . . . Oh, we used to have some regional meetings here in the state of California, too, of the regional states when they had this Title V. I remember going down and putting on a presentation and showing slides. I still have the slides in here of all the stuff we

did in adult ed. I hadn't even thought about going back through those. [Chuckling] But it was a set of slides that told some of the things we were doing in adult education and how they could set up projects. The one thing I remember them being amazed at when we constructed these buildings with the trainees, which was always interesting to people, but we had set up a training program which involved doing all this building and so forth.

So the era of '62 through '71 was a fast growing time where we were moving so fast curriculum-wise. There were just tons of curriculum being produced and trying to determine what was good and what was bad. It's always been difficult with adult educators in these fields getting books that were satisfactory to all levels, especially in the ESL area, and so you would pull in book companies that would be supplying the books and show them to your faculty and have them look them over and try and determine, well, we're going to use this text. It looks like this is the best one for all four levels. At about the time you got it, there would be one or two of us that would say, "This

isn't good at my level at all," and you might come back and change what books you were using the following year. But finally you were trying to develop a commitment that, hey, we're going to at least use these for a period of time. But I believe where most of us wind up is using a textbook and using a lot of supplementary material, where teachers who aren't satisfied with the material can use other supplementary books and so forth.

WEST: Expand a little bit . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

ATTEBERY: I might mention two things in the sixties that happened, too. One was I mentioned that when we first started we got a group of three or four together to write the projects, and a lot of interest started developing in regards to people getting together to talk about these things. So at first we started with agendas, talked about the nuts and bolts of putting together projects and other interests in adult education in this group of three or four. Then I expanded and sent it to some other people and it grew to ten, then twenty, and we ended up having about eighty

people all over the valley, the San Joaquin Valley, that attended these meetings, where we'd send out prior to the meeting things that we wanted to talk about, and one of them included curriculum and so forth, what we were doing. And then we began to share ideas and the people would come and meet with each other, and this tended to be a meeting place.

And we had a lot of cooperation at that time between the adult educators and the junior colleges. They were also attending these meetings. We attended them together, not worrying about who did what. And we'd say, "Well, gee, this might be very appropriate for a junior college to do," and the junior college might say, "Well, gee, we've had this kind of request. How about you handling this rather than them coming to the junior college?" So we had a lot of this give and take at that time and a lot of cooperation, not much dissension in the San Joaquin Valley regarding the junior colleges.

WEST: And this was in the late sixties?

ATTEBERY: That would be in the late sixties. And so then there was another organization called the Kings County Community Action Organization, and they

had these organizations throughout the state-- they were county. And as I recall, one of the biggest decisions that was made at these meetings was whether you should require people to be trained if they're going to receive some welfare monies. And it seemed like the decision always wavered toward: No, it might be beneath their self-esteem to either work or be trained in some of these occupations. So generally the forces that wanted people to work or be trained in order to receive monies usually lost, and when I left the valley, they were still losing. So the majority of the people on the Community Action Organization didn't feel that way.

But I would say . . . I might mention some of the trainees felt differently. For instance, an example was one gentleman who came into our program and he was trained to do jobs. And so he was very successful and he started putting money in the bank, and so once in awhile we'd have him come and speak before groups. I remember the one story he used to tell--it used to kind of bring tears to some people's eyes--he said, "You know, the biggest thing that this training has done for me is that when I used to come home at the end of

the month my boy would ask me, 'How much did they give you, Dad?'" And he said when he. . . .

"Now he says, 'How much did you make, Dad?'" And he said, "That makes all the difference in the world to me." He said, "It just makes me feel so good inside when he asks me that question."

And you had to be careful when you put these people on an advisory committee, because the trainees seemed to be a little harder on the other trainees than anybody else. For instance, if somebody wasn't attending or somebody wasn't working hard, they'd say, "Well, let's drop them from the program. You know, this is an opportunity for them. If they aren't going to take advantage of the opportunity, they shouldn't be in it." So some of the rest of the committee usually had to convince them that, well, maybe they slipped once, it might be wise to give them another chance. So they tended to be very hard on people, but most of the. . . .

I might mention this, too. A lot of advisory committees began at this time, too, and we mentioned curriculum, so. . . . And you had good attendance. Good attendance because money was forthcoming and changes could occur due to

the money, so people on advisory committees were making very important decisions and so you got a lot of attendance from the communities.

WEST: Could you tell me a little bit about a typical advisory committee? Who would be on it?

ATTEBERY: Well, on an advisory committee you might put somebody. . . . Well, it depended on the area you were in, but usually you might want to get a representative from the superintendents' group from the county on the committee, you might want to get some personnel directors from various industries on the committee, legislators, maybe a representative from the county welfare department, EDD, teachers, students, and maybe former trainees would come back and serve on the committee, or just somebody from the general public. And you tried to get a broad cross-section to come from each so you could get full support.

And I might mention that when I did come to San Jose from the small community, not knowing that sometimes they have a hierarchy, I found this in the larger communities. In fact, when I started to go to a larger community from a small one and they said, "Well, Roland, I'm not sure

whether you'll be happy there because you're so much of an activist that you might . . . things move slower." And so when I came to a larger community I did find that things did move a little slower here.

WEST: What year was it that you made the change?

ATTEBERY: I made the change in 1969 and I came to San Jose. I called home when I had a group of baseball kids off to a playoff and they said, well, a Lee Clark had called from San Jose, and so I called him to see what was happening. He said, "Well, Dr. McCall resigned and they've called the state for a recommendation and they have given me. . . ." my name, and so they asked me to come by and interview. And so parts of this job, which was a larger job than what I had before--a lot larger because . . .

WEST: And how was it different?

ATTEBERY: Well, in this job here they had things roped off a little bit. Like the voc ed, I was disappointed I wouldn't be as closely involved in the voc ed in the Metropolitan [Metropolitan Adult Education Program, MAEP], because there was what they called the vocational principal, something like the big cities, you know, have

their big facilities for voc ed, so we had a vocational center. So we would be involved with it but we didn't get to play the major part that we did in the smaller communities.

So, when I moved here, we had . . . oh, we had hundreds of centers. I can't remember how many there were when I first came here, but I know I was supposed to be called a "division principal" here, and at that point I had. . . . Oh, eventually I had over 200 locations and something like 40,000 students, and I was the only administrator in the division. [Chuckling]

They had what they called teacher coordinators at that point, and they served the centers, where they'd coordinate the centers and also be in charge of a curriculum area. And so this is one of the biggest things I think we had going at that time was a lot of emphasis on curriculum, where half the time might be spent on coordination and half on curriculum. So you may have as many as ten different curriculum coordinators who headed up the curriculum groups. And what they would do, they would interview and hire. . . . Well, they would tentatively hire the teachers. They must have the formal approval

of the principals, though. They'd always have to run it by the principal, but by that time they had pretty much decided that person would be the teacher of a class. So a lot of times as principal you may not really know your staff too well because of the . . .

WEST: Because you didn't hire that much.

ATTEBERY: You really didn't hire them, the curriculum department did, but they'd run them past you. Something like when I worked for the state. They interviewed me and then I'd run up and they'd introduce me to Max Rafferty, the Superintendent [of Public Instruction, 1963-70], and he'd say, "Well, I want to know who is coming up and down the elevator," you know? [Chuckling]

And so, like I say, these departmental people were very important to our program, and I believe that I'd give them credit for a lot of the development of curriculum that was occurring during that time and a lot of emphasis on it. And eventually though they found that these people didn't have administrative credentials. Eventually it was ruled that, hey, these people are working illegally and they need to have [administrative] credentials.

WEST: Because they were involved in personnel.

ATTEBERY: Right, and a lot of their time was not in the teaching. So they were all credentialed [as administrators] and. . . . Well, my wife happened to be one of those that was credentialed at the time. [Chuckling] So we appreciated them being credentialed [as administrative] personnel working out in the field. So, at that time, it was . . . oh, I'll say we probably tripled our administrators in our program at that moment in time.

WEST: Tell me about the Metropolitan Program. Is it just sponsored by one unified school district, or are there a number of school districts and adult ed serves them?

ATTEBERY: Yes, they had a contract agreement. Oh, there's a name for it [joint powers]. And we had members of the Milpitas Unified School District, and East Side High School District, which is one of the largest high school districts in the state--I think there are ten or eleven high schools--and then San Jose Unified School District, and then Campbell. Campbell is . . . I believe that's a high school district there, Campbell High School District, and Santa Clara Unified School

District. So all these. . . . We had six different ones. I think there were six. Is that six? Oh, we have five. So, let's see, we had . . . I'm leaving out one of them. Let's see, Milpitas, East Side, San Jose, Campbell, Santa Clara, and. . . . Oh, well, we had Los Gatos as part of that program, as far as they eventually came in as part of the ROP, and so they were the sixth member but we didn't do their adult ed.

But our total program at one time. . . . It grew from the time I came aboard to. . . . The total program, we had over 120,000 different students enrolled in a year, which was rather large and a very comprehensive program. And then we had something like twelve different languages that were taught in the program and numerous sewing classes and arts and crafts and physical education--well, physical conditioning classes--and cooking classes were very popular--oh, lots of cooking from all nationalities. And we kept growing, and we were growing by leaps and bounds every year and it was just hard to stay up with all the new classes.

I was kept busy just locating new facilities that could be used. We were using about every

church and school and storefront buildings. And of course, the important thing was to make sure they didn't have any fire hazards, and you'd have your fire marshal that was constantly coming to meet you at a location, seeing if it met the proper specifications, of course. Some old buildings that had a front and rear entrance might be qualified, but a new building didn't have the proper entrances. The entrances may not be acceptable as a classroom. So we did use about all the facilities in town. And as I said before, the curriculum departmental supervisors were very instrumental in developing curriculum at this time, and I believe this should be the major emphasis of all programs. However, your day-to-day operation, when the plumbing isn't working and something like this. . . . You have to keep the plumbing working; therefore, it takes priority over doing the most important things.

And I'm going to jump a little ahead just to mention that when Prop. 13 hit, the departmental supervisor was one of the first things to go, a number of those people, which was unfortunate but many of those. . . . Usually what happened, they didn't leave us completely but were moved to

other administrative positions when they were cut back. The program did suffer. Because after Prop. 13 hit, we probably dropped to around 50,000 to 60,000 enrollees in the program from the 120,000 that we originally had.

And unfortunately many of the programs that we were offering changed to what they call fee-based or tuition programs. That meant that the students often paid for the program. And the communities that suffered the most from this. . . . Well, with the areas I supervised mainly-- I used to have Milpitas and half of San Jose was my territory, and that included the East Side High School District. And my area had the lower economic group and a lot of the ethnic people, and so our area suffered more than the others because people couldn't afford to pay.

WEST: Couldn't afford the fee classes?

ATTEBERY: They couldn't afford the fee classes. Therefore, the fee classes survived in the higher socioeconomic areas and then they lost out in the other areas.

WEST: And were there were some programs, though, that even in fee classes didn't really come back, some kinds of things?

ATTEBERY: Well, I'd say some of them, if I were to go over the ones that were hurt the most, would be the cooking classes--very few cooking classes came back that were being offered--a lot of your languages, the music classes suffered tremendously, and I think, oh, sewing and this type of thing. Those were the classes that suffered a whole lot, and they still haven't returned to the days they were . . .

WEST: Did your area have any community forum kinds of programs in the sixties that were on political topics?

ATTEBERY: We did have a program and that was. . . . One of our departmental supervisors was in charge of that particular one, but we didn't have a heavy emphasis on that at that time. There wasn't a heavy emphasis.

WEST: Not as much in your area?

ATTEBERY: Not much. Of course, we had . . . oh, what did they used to call it? It's on the history of . . . oh, like California history. We had the local historian who was our teacher, and those are always exciting classes that people are in.

And then they had this one travel group. I can't remember their name, but one of the

departmental supervisors who was in charge of the historical things used to have this travel group that would tour many places, and they'd be made up of adult [students], and the [San Jose] historian would very often go with these people. And he could go back and quote, "Well, this happened in 1901 on this site here. In 1903 this happened, in 1910 this happened. . . ." And he was a very interesting gentleman and you could sit and just talk to him on the porch maybe for three or four hours and never get bored, because he always had a story to tell about. . . . Oh, even if he'd go to any grounds in town he would know what happened there. But those were some of the things that we were able to do there.

We could almost do anything. You were very busy and usually you had a big stack of things you'd like to do sometime if you had the time, so we never ran out of ideas and suggestions. Of course, with everything else, sometimes you have certain programs that are difficult to cut back in communities which you don't think are very good programs. And of course, during [Proposition] 13 there was an opportunity to cut back on some of those things that really weren't

good programs, too, but you have a difficult time cutting them at other times.

WEST: Prop. 13 was the tax reform measure passed in '78 by the voters of California. Tell me a little bit more about how the structure of funding changed for adult ed as a result of Prop. 13.

ATTEBERY: After 13, we were receiving of course some funds for education and I was trying to remember just how our funding changed after 13. We were cut back on the amount of money we received considerably, and I was trying to remember just what happened after that point. Of course, the 10-cent tax override kind of went by the wayside. I can't remember when that went by the wayside. Maybe you have it. Did you have the year there?

WEST: Well, it's a part of all of this process, I think.

ATTEBERY: Yes, we lost the 10-cent tax override and then we began getting our [state] funds. And one of the important things was concurrently enrolled students at this point. And I was trying to remember, we had this separate. . . . Oh, when we got the a.d.a. and the adult ed [tax override], we were able to grow and grow and grow, and when we got this cutback in

funding. . . . I can't remember just how it was cut back though, but we had a tremendous cutback in the funding, how much we could offer in adult ed.

WEST: Not coming through the local property tax anymore, just from the state and whatever they would give you.

ATTEBERY: Right, and then, of course, during this time we developed a cap on the ESL [1975 5% growth cap], too, you know, in the state, which was whatever you were running before. They used that or a percentage of that amount for how much you were to receive in the future. I just can't remember the details on how that cutback occurred, but I just know we lost a lot of funds at that point in time.

And concurrently enrolled began to be a very important element in the state of California. Because when they did have a limit on funds, what you could do, concurrently enrolled students, or students who attend both the day school and adult education programs, and they received the funding at the level of the high school program. That is, minus the add-ons, such as for the extra-long day and longer year and this sort of thing, so

this meant the schools could actually help the program by offering concurrently enrolled programs. When they were first offered, you had to look at every class in the program, and it was by the classroom. You couldn't have more than 49 percent enrollment in a particular class.

However, the judgment really came down to the a.d.a. at the final count in the semester, so you always had to look at each classroom and say, "Okay, we enrolled twenty concurrently enrolled and maybe fifteen adults. Out of those concurrently enrolled who are going to drop out of the program, therefore, our a.d.a. will be. . . . We'll have more adult a.d.a. in that classroom than the adult."

Well, this was very tedious to watch every class like this, and then eventually we went by program. And that made it much easier to look at a program and then see how much a.d.a. you had by program and keep it at least 49 percent. Or keep it below 50 percent concurrently enrolled, so it had to be 49 [percent]. And some of the districts in the state, actually you operate very close to that for the programs: 49 percent of them are concurrently enrolled. And for awhile

we were really working with the districts, and we watched that very closely, you know, not too many concurrently enrolled. However, it made them have a great many concurrently enrolled in them, and so we're just in the transformation right now. . . .

Next year, due to some new laws [adult education reform bills, 1992], they're going to establish one base for your funding, and a part of that base will. . . . Since you'll receive the same amount for concurrently enrolled that you received for your adult a.d.a., it's going to mean some very important decisions for school districts. And decisions because you want to probably put emphasis on your adults out of this money, so they're going to have to make some decisions regarding where does this money go for the adults when they are being pressured to bring in more concurrently enrolled.

WEST: You mentioned that you had worked for the state. Tell me about that, working for the state.

ATTEBERY: Okay. In 1967, the state called me and wanted to know if I would work for them full-time for awhile, and so. . . . They were expanding. At that time, they still only had about three or

four consultants in the state, and so they wanted to have somebody come and coordinate--I believe they called them consultants still--in ABE. And so I think about three or four of us went down to. . . . Well, some of us went to Sacramento, some of us went to L.A., and they gave me a territory of ABE. I think I had from L.A. on up to Madera as my territory, and that was it as far as ABE.

Then I had another assignment, to organize all the workshops throughout the state for teachers. And so what we tried to do was establish these workshops where we pulled teachers in for . . . I think it was two or three days, for workshop sessions, and go over the curriculums that we had. Let's see, we had four sections, as I remember. We had one for . . . I think there was a curriculum section, counseling session, administrative session. . . . I think we had three or four. I can't remember if there was a fourth one, but. . . . So we held these all over the state so people would understand the ABE program. [The program] for teachers [was very successful].

WEST: Well, this was right after the federal legislation that established the ABE program, so it was probably that money that was funding it.

ATTEBERY: Right. And I went to L.A. in '67, and at that time they indicated they were going to send me out to Santa Monica. They were going to decentralize, and eventually. . . . That was during Rafferty's term, and I think [Eugene] Gonzales was the assistant superintendent, and during that period of time . . . in the next six months they decided not to decentralize. Somebody died back in Hanford again, and so for a short spell I went back to Hanford as the vice principal of the day school program. Then I guess it was a year and a half later that I got the. . . . I told them I would go back and stay there until an adult ed job opened up, and then the job in San Jose opened up and I went back to San Jose.

WEST: So you were kind of in and out of the state there for a couple of years.

ATTEBERY: Yes, I just went for. . . . Well, I used to work for them just part-time. Then I did that full-time stint, and the smog in L.A. was. . . . [Chuckling] I don't want to run down L.A., but

the smog was so bad down there that the breathing was terrible. So, when I was offered a job back home, knowing that I was going to be in L.A. on a permanent basis until Santa Monica opened up, I came home.

WEST: I saw some materials from that southern California office. Was Gene de Gabriele down there in charge of that for awhile?

ATTEBERY: No, that was . . . Oh, Roy [W.] Steeves was in charge of the ABE at that time.

WEST: Roy Steeves? But that was just a short time that they had an L.A. office?

ATTEBERY: Well, I know I was down there and I thought that L.A. office stayed in existence for awhile maybe.

WEST: Oh, was it?

ATTEBERY: I left it very quickly, but I think it stayed in operation and they worked out of L.A. when they were going up, like I say, up to Madera and that valley there. And Roy was in charge of all the ABE people, I think, people working. . . . Since then, Roy has gone to another department, I think, in the state there. But we had very close ties at that time with all the people out in . . . in the programs, too, adult educators. Probably up to that point we all knew each other

in the state, but gradually it got to be an expanding . . . we don't know as many people.

WEST: Right. You mentioned ROP. What was your involvement with ROP?

ATTEBERY: Well, in the smaller communities you didn't notice whether it was. . . . Of course, you'd just offer the whole program when you were in a small district like Hanford where I was. But when you come to a large city like San Jose and the more metropolitan areas, you have the programs that are offered on campus and off campus, and so in the large cities I wasn't involved too much in the occupational program, but maybe the academic, as we mentioned before on the tape. But you have a lot. . . . In many of the districts the same leader for the occupational program is the same leader for adult education, and a lot of them will have one person in charge of the academic, one in charge of the vocational portion of it. But I think the priority kind of almost. . . . If you're in a large city like L.A., I know they have to make their organization a little different because they are so large. But I think a lot of times the

priority went to vocational people rather than the academic people.

WEST: How are ROP and vocational programs different?

ATTEBERY: Well, it's funny, I'm not sure just what their difference is at this time in the ROP. I know that it was regarding off-campus and on-campus was one of the main differences there. As far as what they were offering, I don't know if there was a significant difference in their offerings.

WEST: Do they serve the same kinds of students?

ATTEBERY: Yes, I think they serve the same kinds of students in mainly on- and off-campus programs. I think in L.A. they refer to it as the ROC Program and . . .

WEST: Yes, ROC having a center, and P being a program.

ATTEBERY: Right. And I think that's just the main difference, as far as there being . . . mainly about their offerings and where they are.

We eventually here in San Jose. . . . I might mention what happened to us eventually, too, is that we were part of the San Jose Unified School District. Then eventually we pulled out and became the Santa Clara County Regional Occupational Agency, and that was our district title. We were a district. Let me repeat that:

Santa Clara County Regional Occupational Agency. What happened when this occurred was during this time when Prop. 13 came along the district was having a hard time with all the financing there, and so they thought it might be wise to pull out the MAEP and the vocational center activities. Therefore, that whole program pulled out of the district, and so teachers in that program no longer had a hold on San Jose as far as positions.

WEST: Santa Clara separated out [started their own adult ed program]?

ATTEBERY: Yes. Well, I think eventually what happened to this five-district MAEP program and the six-district ROP program was that Milpitas eventually pulled out to form their own district, and then Santa Clara pulled out to form their own. Santa Clara pulled out of the MAEP portion, the academic, and kept the vocational. Because the vocational center, I believe, is owned by all the districts, so if somebody drops out they lose their [portion]. I think there's something in the contract where they might lose a part of that voc center. If they ever dissolve it, I guess they could just [divide the assets].

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

ATTEBERY: Just to go back and review the governance of what used to be called the Metropolitan Adult Education Program--and it still is, however it's a smaller unit than it used to be--since its conception, and when it was at full strength. Milpitas has pulled out in the academic portion, and also Santa Clara, so both those have pulled out in the academic. And Los Gatos was never part of the academic. And since I retired in 1985, East Side [Union] High School District has also pulled out of the academic, which is a big part of the program. So, at the present time in the academic, San Jose and [Campbell] still remain there as far as the academic [MAEP], and then the other four districts [Milpitas, Santa Clara, East Side, Los Gatos] are just all [part of the vocational] at this time.

I did want to mention one other thing back here in the sixties regarding. . . . We set up a training program for instructional aides, or teachers' aides. So the chief of the bureau at that time said, "Would you mind writing an article on this?" and I said sure, and so I tried

to check on other people who had been offering programs for instructional aides and I couldn't find anybody in the state who had offered programs. And we had started programs in instructional aides and we had special . . . like instructional aides for the Head Start, instructional aides for ABE, instructional aides for the high school academic, and we had all these specialized areas that we offered for instructional aides.

And we wrote an article on how to train instructional aides for the official publication of the California State Department of Education, and I believe it was June 1966 that the article was published. The state used to put out a monthly publication and they would tell about new and innovative things that were happening in education, and it just so happened that we were in the final issue of that publication. As a result of this, I received inquiries from throughout the state on how to train instructional aides. It's strange how this publication eventually moved to other states. The first thing you know, I was getting [requests] from Oregon, Washington, pretty soon

back in Texas, and even as recently as the late 1980s a person from the East Side District, of which I was working with their adult ed, said, "Roland, I found an article on instructional aides that you wrote," and that was twenty years later. [Chuckling] So it's funny how long it takes these publications to circulate throughout the United States and people asking you how to do it. Of course, we were very new in the field ourselves, and that's what we indicated to them, but we'd send our outlines and so forth to tell them how we had done it.

But the instructional aide was a new thing and when they were first being used you had to be very careful. I'll never forget an error I made at a board meeting when I said, "Sometimes it's hard to tell the teacher from the instructional aide." And then the board member said, "Gee, maybe we don't need to pay the teachers as much," you know, if you couldn't tell the difference. [Chuckling] So that was one of the more interesting things.

So, as the years went by, when people used instructional aides, all the direction had to come from the teacher when they were working with

the aides, but it's a nice training ground for people who eventually become instructors. So that's the background on the teachers' aides. Of course, since then, you know, instructional aides have been a very important part of adult education programs and day school programs. However, when we first began to use them, teachers were a little hesitant about using instructional aides because they really didn't know how to plan to use them and they felt that they were a threat in their classroom. But when some of the teachers that refused to have instructional aides in their classrooms when we first began, before the year was over they were wanting to know if they could have an instructional aide because they had found that other teachers were using them in ways in which they really assisted them with their instruction. So I believe instructional aides are here to stay and are really a big asset to the teaching program.

We had mentioned the Community Action Program. I was trying to remember some of the things regarding that program. They made a lot of important decisions and they were operating

throughout the state of California. They operated, I know, in an advisory capacity, but it seems that they had a little more strength than that at the time. And I can't remember the guidelines regarding Community Action, but they'd review a lot of things that were being offered within the community and give their support to them. And I believe their support was important at the time in getting approval of a lot of important financial aid to communities.

WEST: On the issue of community support for adult ed, what were some of the things that you did to generate interest in the community so that the community would financially and in other ways support the program?

ATTEBERY: We were involved in going out to a lot of organizations and clubs and things like the Welfare Department. I remember we used to. . . . the Welfare Department was very. . . . I worked very closely with [them] and what they called their social workers at the time. They'd have a meeting where every social worker in the county would be present and we'd go out and put on a program for them. And, oh, the Elmwood County Jail was another facility where I would go out

and present programs to the officers and also the rehabilitation people at the county jails.

An interesting sideline regarding this was that the enforcement division, which usually are the ones that made the decision, so a lot of times when you would be making presentations and the audience was so supportive, you'd think, oh, wow, you've really sold this. But unless the enforcement people were still there listening, you hadn't sold much, because, of course, the rehabilitation people were there to support. Enforcement people often thought the prisoners were there to be punished rather than to rehabilitate.

So eventually, though, what we did in MAEP, we started classes to assist the enforcement people in understanding where the inmates were coming from. And so that tended to be rather successful for a time in our program. And we had attendance from the law enforcement people in the classes. We thought perhaps if we could have more of an understanding perhaps it might help our programs that were being offered at these facilities. We offered programs in the county

jails and also city jails or wherever they might be needed.

And then we would go out to, like I say, to many of the other organizations in town, whether it be the Welfare Department, EDD, into the community, as far as clubs. In fact, our brochures used to have a wide distribution. You would get a list of all the clubs in the city and send your publications out to them, certain classes that they might be interested in, and offer to come out and talk to them if they should desire.

But it's so important when you form this base that you have the support of not only your citizens but of your local government. Because one agency talking you down can actually hurt your program. As far as community support, I think that's pretty much what we did.

WEST: Let's talk a little bit about the California Council for Adult Ed. You were president of CCAE and then you've been active at the state and the section level. Tell me about CCAE.

ATTEBERY: CCAE, I joined it back in the sixties. Somebody called me and said, "Well, we would like to have you join CCAE." And I said, "Gee, I just don't

need another organization." They said, "Well, we'd sure like to have you join." And I said, "Well, I'll tell you what, I'll send you some money and then I'll attend your meetings." So I attended CCAE, and at that time I found they had a lot of good leadership in the community. I think I mentioned earlier an Ed Stanley who was in legislation at that time, and he worked both through CCAE and the other adult organizations, and I found that they were a strong force. And so I joined CCAE and I became the central section president eventually.

At that time, that's when we were growing so rapidly in the organization, and then I was in the process of becoming state president then when I left the San Joaquin Valley. And during my term as president, we found we needed more money to operate on. The dues were \$4 a year at that time, and so we went through a very hard process of trying to get these raised because people didn't want to raise the dues. I remember when we had the board meetings. Before that we'd hold them in a small room and never worry about having an overflow. And when we started talking dues increase, I remember we had the real large room

where you had people down the hallway listening to this discussion. And the discussions went from raising it. . . . I think we only wanted to go to \$10 or something like this, and we had to have a counteroffer of a dues structure based on work time. And so we finally settled for that, but at least we got the dues structure on the move. We went from \$4, I think, to a structure where part-time teachers paid this amount, and then if you worked a little more you paid this amount, a little more you paid this amount.

So it was approved and we knew we needed this in order to move in legislation. Because we were discovering that sometimes you need money to help your legislative people go to the state meetings and so forth, because their local districts didn't always support the people leaving the districts to go up and work on legislation. So this assisted us in putting out more publications, keeping our membership informed, and also sending our legislative . . . well, you can call them lobbyists up to Sacramento to talk to the legislators and to keep some communication going.

Well, I moved to the Bay Area where I became the Bay Area section president also. I think that was just before I became the state president, or after I became the state president. So I stayed active in the CCAE, and it has been a driving force in the state. Ever since then, I have seen it becoming more powerful and the organization being one that can effect legislation.

In fact, this most recent legislation that occurred in the year . . . I guess it was 1991-92--the legislation goes in effect in '93--they had a large part in seeing that that legislation was passed. And it has grown to. . . . It's a very effective organization at this time; it was back then, but not as effective. It was more of a group where people would come and talk about curriculum and a little bit about legislation.

WEST: Tell me about the membership of CCAE. Who can belong?

ATTEBERY: Membership in that organization is one of the few that we have teachers and administrators, and as I know at this time, it is the only organization that involves both teachers and administrators [and] that is for adult education only.

WEST: And classified as well, right?

ATTEBERY: And classified as well. That's long been the cry that we support only adult education and anybody can be a member that's involved in adult education. They've had conferences throughout the state here. Oh, I remember here in our MAEP, we held a conference at one time. Well, we did it locally here but we had CCAE's help on it, too. We had over 700 people attend a curriculum workshop where we had over fifty different workshops offered, and very big, and I think it was probably one of the biggest ones we had where your main interest is on curriculum. But we held it here locally with CCAE's support.

WEST: One of the things I remember about CCAE is after Prop. 13, CCAE led the fight to restore funding for adult education.

ATTEBERY: I remember some things about 13. One of the major areas after 13 was being sure that the handicapped were still being served. And that still is in the code right now that [the 1979-80 a.d.a. times 1.02 times the current revenue limit is the amount that must be spent on the handicapped in a district.] And there was a major thrust at that time to separate the older

adult and the handicapped because we had. . . . The terminology was a little fuzzy at that time and therefore we had some that may have been older adult classes and some may have been handicapped. So, since the handicapped had to remain at a certain level, they tried to separate the courses out: older adults and handicapped. So, in looking at programs throughout the state, when I ran into programs that may be a little short on the handicapped, we'd go back and review the program to see whether some of those that were labeled as handicapped in '69 and '70 were truly older adults and was being offered in the older adult program. But it was quite a change. The other ones, of course, you didn't have any of this limitation like you do on the handicapped. But they do want to be sure that the handicapped are still be served.

WEST: The year that you were president of CCAE, what were the important issues at that time? What was CCAE working for, do you remember?

ATTEBERY: Well, of course, the major issue was obtaining more dues in the program. That was a major issue, but isn't really truly our purpose in education. The reason for the dues was so that

we could work more on legislation, and we did have a lot of important legislative committees. I was trying to remember what the legislation was going on at that time that we would have been working on.

WEST: Was that the time of the Master Plan for Higher Ed[ucation] and the interests of the delineation of functions with the community colleges and so forth?

ATTEBERY: You're really striking a memory chord in me right now. The delineation of functions, I might just mention what has happened over the years on that one. When I came into adult ed, which is, I guess, probably '62 or '63, they were talking about the delineation of functions between the junior college and adult ed. And through the years we are constantly making this effort to delineate the functions between them. And I don't know that we have ever got a clean description of what this should be, but every so often there would be a threat, and we would work on our legislators. They'd say, "Well, gee, we think all this should come under the head of the junior colleges." And of course adult ed said, "Yes, we know, but as you cut back on. . . . If

you ever have a cutback in junior colleges, the first one that would be delineated from the offerings in junior college would be the ones that are the adult ed classes." Therefore, we always felt like there was a need for adult education for people who were not at the college level. And once in awhile we do serve people beyond the college level, too, in special courses, but we felt like there was a need to have these classes offered at the adult level to ensure that they would continue to be offered for these adult people that sometimes aren't able to even speak up for themselves.

So over the years we've worked on this delineation of functions from the sixties right on up to the nineties, and we're still talking about it, but I don't hear it being discussed as much as it was during the seventies there because we were afraid. . . . Because we had legislators speaking very strongly that it should all be at the junior college level. So it's been a constant effort to keep this separate from the junior college. And junior colleges at the time, of course, had moved into . . . started to move into the basic ESL courses, and far below what we

thought was college curriculum. We thought maybe they should work at the college level and we could work at more or less the high school level in the main, plus these few other courses that served adults who are high school graduates.

WEST: One of the things I think that has influenced it, you said it's not discussed so much now with the influx of refugees and other immigrants into the state, just finding enough service providers has been a problem for California.

ATTEBERY: I might mention what happened to us here. I'll never forget the first morning they were to enroll here and I thought, well, I'll get down there early. We were going to register at . . . I guess at nine o'clock. I thought, well, I'll go down at seven o'clock and be there when we open up. And when I went down there at 7:00, there must have been 1,000 people surrounding our building.

WEST: What year was that, or about what time?

ATTEBERY: Oh, it was somewhere, I believe, in the . . . it seemed like it would have been in the early eighties or prior to that, somewhere around the eighties, 1980.

WEST: What were the groups that were there? They were registering for ESL, were they?

ATTEBERY: From Vietnam, Koreans. . . . Those were the main groups that were there. A couple of incidents that occurred there, I couldn't even get them to line up because we were there and we were. . . . Usually we put up ropes, and we couldn't even get the ropes established. And so we tried to drain them off, even drifting some through the back door. But as soon as you had somebody drifting in, they'd come to the door and. . . . So my secretary had called the newspaper at the time and told them to come out to see. So I was at the front door trying to keep them . . . get the door closed, and here I was holding the door. [Chuckling] And they said, "These people can't get in to get an education." They ran it in the paper, you know, on the front page, so it was kind of interesting.

So we did get a lot of support at that time, but we still could not enroll all the students. And at one of my centers where the main thrust was ESL, we had 500 people on the waiting list and we kept trying to serve them. And we used to give priority if they had been enrolled the prior

year. We'd try and enroll them first. And so it left some people out there who kept trying to get in.

A couple little stories that I remember along the way, like I had one gentleman who said, "Gee, my uncle died." He said, "I wonder if I could come in and take his place in the program."

WEST: Oh, my goodness! [Chuckling]

ATTEBERY: So he'd have priority, but not necessarily. And we'd say, "Well, gee. . . ." Sometimes the day programs in the afternoon didn't have full enrollment, so we'd say, "Well, if you come to our day school afternoon class, you'll have priority for coming in the morning and evening classes," where we had full classes usually. So we had a lot of these little incidents almost on a nightly basis, people wanting to come into classes, you know. The waiting list has never ended here. I think they still have waiting lists in the MAEP on the East Side for programs. I know they do on the East Side; I haven't talked to MAEP lately.

But I guess in the United States there were two main places that they did go, and of course California being one of those, and then there

were two central places for them in the state of California: one was Orange County and one was San Jose. And the one area in San Jose that they primarily went to happened to be in East Side, so we probably caught the influx of most of these refugees.

WEST: And these were the Indochinese refugees?

ATTEBERY: The Indochinese. And it's strange what happened. These people were very hard workers and they'd be at school almost daily. And when they came to enroll, of course it was first come, first served, and they'd tend to be there at five o'clock in the morning to enroll. After that first morning, of course, we set up ropes and we tried to steer them into a line and maybe even have an interpreter there that could assist us, although we didn't speak all those languages. But we'd have somebody there that could help us and we would enroll them. But we found that the Orientals tended to have most of the enrollment places in the classes, and I had people from other ethnic groups come and approach me and say, "You know, it looks like the Orientals are getting most of the places in class. And we think you ought to hold certain ones for certain

ethnic groups." And I said, "Gee, I think I'd have a harder time defending that than I would my position that the first ones come in, the first served."

So this was acceptable, but I believe it established another type of climate in all the ethnic groups, in that we set up attendance regulations, where if they missed three or four days [without an excuse] they couldn't come back to [were dropped from] class. And therefore, all the ethnic groups started coming on a consistent basis and we had better attendance and we were able to teach a much better program, rather than when we used to. . . . We'd have somebody drop in one week and then [it would be] two weeks before they'd come back. And we did have classes where people could attend only twice a week, and that would be a twice-a-week class. They wouldn't enroll in the five-day-a-week class, which, as you know, we have all levels. You do want to have a little continuity in there.

So they entered our classes and we did have a little problem in our city. We were all concerned because certain ethnic groups were afraid that the Orientals that came to town were

getting some of the breaks and they weren't. So what we attempted to do through adult education, and where we were able to offer special programs for the Oriental groups that were coming in, we tried through other funds to offer those same things to the other people, which cut down a lot of the conflict between the groups. And I think the whole city of San Jose has worked to do that in order to keep that friction down. Because there was some. You could see there was some friction developing when [they arrived] here. And there's still a feeling. You still feel it now and then, but not as strong since they've done [some things] to keep down the friction. Of course, that really affected our ESL program here. We've always worked a little under cap, which has been a little difficult. I'm not sure where we go from here, but . . .

WEST: Well, this concludes the questions that I have. Is there any other thing that you would like to add or any concluding statement that you'd like to make?

ATTEBERY: I guess, as far as adult education in the state of California, we've had our ups and downs over the years. You know, as you go back over the

history of adult ed prior to the sixties, there were times when adult ed was very strong for awhile; and then when any part of the educational structure had to be cut back, it was always the adult portion. But we have survived this one this time--you know, the cutbacks--and I'm hoping that this is a new era for adult ed, where we receive the same priorities that other levels do.

And I think. . . . Well, I'd really like to see somebody do a master's or perhaps a doctorate on what happens to the children of adults who have been dropouts and returned to education, what happens to their children. Most educators, adult educators, I think realize that when the adult who has dropped out returns and gets his diploma, quite often their youngsters return and graduate. And if we could show that this actually occurs in a high percentage of times--whereas the dropout who doesn't come back to school, his children do not come back--we could show that the percentage is so great for the adult [student], I believe there would never be another question regarding the offering of adult ed. Because many of the legislators, when you say, "Well, this assists the youth," they are

really supportive. So, if we can tie this back to where anything we do for adult education and our adults assists the children in staying in school, I think it's a real good selling point. And I hope this is the era we're entering in. If somebody does a study, it would show this, I'm sure.

WEST: Thank you, Roland. This interview was done as a part of the California Adult Education Oral History Project.

INDEX

Adult Basic Education Act, 2, 3, 12,
 Adult education reform bills (1992), 43
 American Indian students, 7, 16-17
 Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), 24
 Babitz, Milton, 5
 Black students, 7
 Bradshaw, Juson P. (Jud), 23
 California Association of Adult Education Administrators, 23
 California Council for Adult Education, 23, 56-60
 Campbell High School District, 34-37, 50
 Concurrent students, 41-43
 DeGabriele, Eugene M. , 5, 46
 Deliniation of functions (adult schools & community colleges), 62
 East Side High School District, 34-37, 50, 66
 Elementary & Secondary Education Act, 2, 3
 Gonzales, Eugene, 45
 Hanford Joint Union High School District, 2, 45
 Indochinese refugee students, 64-69
Kings County Community Action Organization, 27, 53-54
 Kings County, 10
 Koehler, Lawrence E., 5
 Los Gatos, 35, 50
 Manpower Development & Training Act (MDTA), 1-4
 Metropolitan Adult Education Program, 31-37, 49-50, 66
 Mexican American students, 7
 Milpitas Unified School District, 34-37, 50
 Nursing education, 2,3,9, 11, 17
 Proposition 13, effects of, 36-40, 49, 60
 Rafferty, Max, 33, 45
 Regional Occupational Program (ROP), 47-49
 Riles, Wilson, 5
 San Joaquin Valley, 26-27, 57
 San Jose Unified School District, 30-37
 San Jose Unified School District, 34-37, 49, 50,
 Santa Clara County Regional Occupational Agency, 48-49
 Santa Clara Unified School District, 34-37, 49-50
 Simms, Joe L. , 5
 Smith, Wesley P., 4
 Stanley, Ed, 23
 Steeves, Roy W., 46

Stone, Roy, 23

Sworder, Stanley E. , 5, 21

Ten-cent tax, 19-21, 40

Vocational Education Act, 3

Work Incentive Program (WIN, Title V), 5, 24-25

ROLAND K. ATTEBERY

PAID TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

| <u>From</u> | <u>To</u> | <u>Occupation and Description of Duties Performed</u> | <u>Employer's Name and Address</u> |
|-------------|-----------|---|--|
| 02/88 | Present | CA State Department of Education Coordinated Compliance Review Team Member | State Dept. of Education, Sacramento, CA |
| 07/69 | 08/85 | Adult School Principal | San Jose Unified School District and Central Santa Clara County Regional Occupational Agency San Jose, CA |
| 09/60 | 06/69 | Vice-Principal, Dean of Students, Adult School Principal*, Summer School Principal, Driver Training Department Chairman, Federal Projects Coordinator, Math, P.E. and Driver Training Instructor. (Administrative duties began in 1962) | Hanford Joint Union High School District Hanford, CA |
| 11/68 | 06/72 | Adult Education Principles and Adult Education Methods and Materials Instructor | Fresno State College Fresno, CA |
| 02/66 | 06/69 | Adult Education Principles and Adult Education Methods and Materials Instructor | University of CA Extension Santa Barbara, CA |
| 07/67 | 12/67 | Bureau of Adult Education Consultant (Specialized in elementary education for adults and workshops for instructors of elementary subjects.) | CA State Dept. of Education Sacramento, CA |
| 09/52 | 06/60 | Mathematics, Physical Education, Science and Driver Training Instructor | Corona Unified School District Corona, CA |

* The Adult School Principal's job included the development and administering of an elementary education program in addition to secondary, post secondary and vocational programs.

SUMMER AND CHRISTMAS EMPLOYMENT

Corona Recreation Department - Recreation Supervisor
Corona Post Office - Postal Carrier
Corona Lemon Exchange - Material Control Man
Tillotson's in Corona - Construction Worker
Owens Illinois Glass Co. in Corona - Sand Pit Operator's Assistant
Douglas Aircraft in Long Beach - File Clerk
Foothill Lemon Co. in Corona - Sprayer and Truck Driver

CREDENTIALS AND LIFE DIPLOMAS

Held By

Roland Keith Attebery

| <u>Credential</u> | <u>Serial Number</u> | <u>Date of Issuance</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| General Administrative Life Diploma | 33LD 137 | 03/04/68 |
| General Elementary Life Diploma | 8LD 75172 | 03/04/68 |
| Secondary School Administration Life Diploma | 34LD 96 | 03/04/68 |
| General Secondary Life Diploma | 3LD 27921 | 10/09/61 |
| Junior High School Life Diploma | 5LD 2760 | 07/27/59 |
| Special Secondary Life Diploma in P.E. | 29LD 9931 | 07/27/59 |
| Special Secondary Life Diploma in Public Safety and Accident Prevention, Including Driver Education and Driver Training | 29LD 9932 | 07/27/59 |

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ATTENDED

| <u>Name of Institution</u> | <u>Location</u> | <u>Dates of Attendance</u> | | <u>Degree</u> | <u>Major/Minor</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | | <u>From</u> | <u>To</u> | | |
| Chaffey Junior College | Ontario, CA | 9/47 | 6/49 | A.A. | Math/Science |
| San Diego State College | San Diego, CA | 9/49 | 5/52 | B.A. | P.E./Life Science |
| Long Beach State College | Long Beach, CA | 2/54 | 2/57 | | |
| CA State Polytechnic College | San Luis Obispo, CA | 8/57 | 8/58 | | |
| University of CA Extension | Riverside, CA | 6/60 | 7/60 | | |
| George Pepperdine College | Los Angeles, CA | 9/58 | 4/65 | M.A. | Education Administration |
| Fresno State College | Fresno, CA | 2/61 | 1/66 | | |