1962

A history of the public schools of Stockton, California

Charles Dennis Bloch
University of the Pacific

A HISTORY OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of History

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Charles Dennis Bloch

April 1962

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Department Chairman or Dean:

Malcolm R. Eiselen

Thesis Committee:

Malcolm R. Eiselen, Chairman

R. Cake Wood

J. Mark Jacobson

Dated May 21, 1962

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

APPENDIX PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL STUDY

This study represents a history of the development of the public schools in Stockton, California from the beginnings in 1853 to the present. It seeks to place within a single cover a comprehensive record of public education in Stockton.

Since the first three years following the incorporation of the City of Stockton in 1850 saw no public schools, it was deemed necessary to include an account of the private and religious schools that provided the only opportunity for education in the community until 1853. This is followed by an account of the founding, maintenance, and conditions in the pioneer public schools. A fourth chapter is concerned with the construction of the primary and grammar schools. This is followed by two chapters dealing in the same manner with the secondary schools, and the junior college. Chapters dealing with the curriculum of the elementary, secondary, and college facilities, and the recent expansion of the public school philosophy and program, conclude the study.

Stockton is fortunate in that several attempts have been made to give a general survey of local history, and that one study has treated specifically with the public schools. It is unfortunate that many of the early minutes

of the Common Council of Stockton, and the Stockton Board of Education have been completely lost. This loss is reflected in the writing of the first person attempting to record local school history, Jessie Ryan Hollembeak, in A History of the Public Schools of Stockton, California.[1] The loss of the Common Council minutes is highly significant since the public schools were originally under the jurisdiction of the Common Council. It was important to note the strong and weak points of the Hollembeak record in terms of planning this study's content. Particular strength was found in this earlier research in the area of curriculum development. Hollembeak's study is also fortunate in that it was written at a time when the availability of personal recollections by living persons would throw valuable light on the early history of the schools. While the historical value of this book is outstanding, there is also definite weakness in organization and chronology. In order to be useful to the modern reader, more attention needs to be given to the systematic and complete coverage of one topic at a time. Research revealed that the present study would be of value only if these shortcomings were corrected and incorporated into the context of this paper.

---

[1]Title appearing on cover binding is The Stockton Schools from Pioneer Days. Title page states A History of the Public Schools of Stockton, California. 1909.

The minutes of the board of education of the Stockton Public Schools provided the primary source for this study. These records are stored in the vault of the Stockton Unified School District. Since there is no way to look up subjects topically in these minutes, it was necessary to read all of the minutes. Following the initial reading and notetaking, all information was catalogued chronologically prior to the final topical arrangement.

Certain limitations in the research of this paper must be recognized. Having depended, extensively, on the minutes of the Stockton Board of Education, the writer may have introduced bias. A more extensive presentation would have included use of newspaper reports from the various periods of local school history. Sources of this kind would have given more information concerning the year-by-year activities and changes, and possibly more on curriculum development.

This study should, in a small way, add an important chapter in the total local historical record, and be of particular value to the Stockton Unified School District. It is to be hoped that the following study will give proper credit to the early achievements of the schools, and give a chronology of school progress. This paper also points to the shortcomings and failures of the local schools, since these are also a part of the record.

CHAPTER II

PIONEER SCHOOLS OF STOCKTON AND THE FOUNDING OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Private and Religious Schools, 1850-1853. The county court granted the incorporation of the City of Stockton and authorized the election of municipal officers in July, 1850. At that time, no provision was made by the city authorities for education. It was not until 1853 that free public-supported schools were established in the community. However, this does not mean that education was neglected until that time. During the same year that the city was incorporated, Charles M. Blake landed in Stockton for the purpose of starting a private school. On his arrival, he was referred to Captain Weber as the founder of the city, and a gentleman willing to assist any worthy enterprise. Blake succeeded in gaining Weber's support in the amount of $500 towards the erection of a schoolhouse. Weber took personal charge of the construction and, in addition to providing construction funds, donated the site. This pioneer schoolhouse later became known as the Academy Building. This site is now the present location of the Lafayette School. Blake's school opened for classes on May 4, 1850, but failed due to the small number of children in town. In spite of this initial failure, the era of private and religious schools

in Stockton had begun.[1]

A few months later, on August 30, 1850, the Presbyterians opened a school facing Main Street called the San Joaquin Female Seminary. Since no further information is available concerning this school, it is impossible to speculate on its success or failure.[2]

A third attempt to establish a school in Stockton was definitely a success. This school was founded in the Spring of 1851 by W. P. Hazelton. While the school was advertised as "a free, or public school," financing was from private sources.[3] In April, a group of citizens including Edward Canavan, R. S. Elsworth, Dr. R. P. Ashe, and Dr. Chris Grattan, persuaded Hazelton to take charge of the new school. These men agreed to pay part of the expenses, and it is also on record that Hazelton himself provided some support from his own resources. To find pupils the school advertised as "a free, or public school will be opened in the Academy Building, where all orderly children of proper age (six years) may receive instruction free of charge."[4] While there is no available record, this

---

[1]George H. Tinkham, A History of Stockton (San Francisco: W. M. Hinton and Company, 1880), pp. 281-2.

[2]Ibid., p. 282.

[3]Ibid., p. 281.

[4]Ibid., pp. 281-2.

school probably continued to operate until it was replaced by the public schools in 1853. Apparently Hazelton resigned as teacher in 1852.[5]

Although the founding dates are now vague, two other schools were established in 1851. One was Mrs. Newman's School for lady boarders in the South Methodist Church. The second was called the Stockton Seminary. This was a school for boys emphasizing a classical curriculum. Records indicate that it used the Academy Building, although this was supposed to be housing the school run by Hazelton. In October, 1852, the seminary was moved to a Sutter Street location and admitted girls.[6]

Two more private schools were founded in 1853, the same year that marks the opening of the public schools. On April 4, 1853, a school in the Baptist Church on Center Street was founded as the Mrs. J. B. Saxton School. June 13, 1853, saw the opening of Mrs. Isaac Woods' School as a private school for girls. An interesting fact about this school was that it was located on the site which was

---

[5]According to Tinkham cited previously, Hazelton resigned to become a dentist. Covert Martin, Stockton Album Through the Years, (Stockton, California: Simard Printing Company, 1959) p. 163. Hazelton went to Oregon in 1852, invested successfully in hogs, returned to Stockton and became a money lender and dentist. He donated the public library on Market Street to the city.

[6]Tinkham, op. cit., p. 282.

later to become the location of the Washington School. The Washington School was used, over the years, as a primary, grammar, high school, and administration building. The site is now the location of the Bank of Stockton at San Joaquin and Lindsay Streets.[7]

Rounding out the list of private schools in the pioneer 1850's, was the D. Morris Select School at Henrietta House. Nothing further is known of this school, and there is no record of an opening or closing date. A Seminary of Learning was opened in March or September of 1858, in a brick building on Hunter Street. A Dr. Hunt's Seminary was opened in 1859. Dr. Hunt was an ordained Methodist minister. The name of this school was later changed to Hunt's Female Seminary. This school closed its doors in 1873.[8] Thus Stockton saw the founding of eleven private schools before 1860.

Public Schools Founded. On a statewide basis, the first legislative action passed with an eye toward public education came in October, 1851. That legislature provided that revenue for the support of schools could come from the sale of school lands. But since none were sold, no school fund or revenue occurred. Actually, at this time, few

---

[7]Ibid., p. 283.

[8]Ibid., p. 283.

persons in the state, including legislators, could be convinced that there was any necessity of providing for public schools in spite of the fact that there were 6,000 children living in California. During the session of 1852, however, the School Act of 1851 was repealed, and a new law was passed in January which included a revenue provision calling for five cents to be set aside for the benefit of public schools from the thirty cents being taxed for each one hundred dollars of assessed property valuation. Under the new law, public schools could receive grants of state aid after an operating period of three months.[9]

With an eye toward these available funds, the following October, Valentine Mason Peyton, then a member of the City Council, known as the Common Council, called the attention of that body to the necessity of a public school, and stated that Stockton should take advantage of the state act providing funds. In spite of Peyton's concern, the council moved to postpone the matter for another year because the city treasury was empty.[10] Apparently, at this point, Peyton emphasized that it was not right that San Francisco and Sacramento were receiving all the benefits

---

[9] Ibid., p. 287.

[10] J. M. Guinn, and George H. Tinkham, History of the State of California and Biographical Record of San Joaquin County (Los Angeles: Historic Record Company, 1909) I. pp. 283-88.

of the school fund and placed fifty dollars on the table to start a public fund to found a public school. Each of the other nine aldermen immediately matched this amount to give the schools a starting revenue of five hundred dollars. The aldermen were J. W. Carlisle, Joel Clayton, P. E. Jordan, A. Lester, B. W. Owens, A. Sperry, James Underhill, William M. Vance, and A. Wolf, in addition to Peyton.[11] Following this display of generosity on the part of the aldermen, C. W. Phelps, a married man, appealed to the fathers of the community for donations and a Captain Jordan collected from the bachelors.[12] This raised an additional five hundred dollars and the proposed public school got off to a sound financial start with one thousand dollars in the treasury. Peyton proposed a city ordinance which placed the schools under the direction of the Common Council and the motion was passed unanimously on October 30, 1852. In addition to the money raised through donation, the ordinance provided that a tax of three cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation of property be levied for the support of the school. William G. Canders was appointed as a school census marshal with orders to prepare a report concerning the number of children living in Stockton before November 1.

---

[11]Tinkham, op. cit., pp. 287-8.

[12]No way to prove whether this is Alderman P. E. Jordan.

The city ordinance provided that the council elect a board of education and a city superintendent. Dr. E. G. Bateman was chosen superintendent and the school board consisted of Rev. J. W. Kelley, V. M. Peyton, and Dr. George Shurtleff. At the first meeting of the board held in December, in Peyton's grocery store, Peyton was elected board president and John Herron was elected clerk of the board. The next major business of the board was to appoint teachers. It was apparently decided that there was to be no mixing of boys and girls, since a teacher was hired to run the boys' school, and another to conduct the girls' school. Peyton was able to persuade Dr. Canders to give up his private school and take charge of the boys. Mrs. J. H. Woods consented to teach the girls.[13]

According to Tinkham, the public schools were opened in Stockton on February 23, 1853. Hollembeak indicates there was a delay until March 1, 1853.[14] The boys were first taught in the Stockton Academy, and the girls were housed in a building on Main Street near Sutter Street.[15] The following year, the boys were moved out of the Academy,

---

[13]Ibid., p. 289. (According to Martin and Hollembeak, the first woman teacher was Mrs. Isaac.)

[14]Hollembeak, op. cit., p. 24.

[15]Martin, op. cit., p. 155.

and the girls, numbering 67, were moved in because the Main Street quarters were not large enough. In turn, the boys were moved to two rented rooms in the McNish Building at the corner of Hunter and Channel. Over the years, this building was also used as a lodging house, court, and jail. Eighty-eight boys were enrolled at this time. Several years later, in 1857, the grand jury found this location undesirable because of the distraction of 40 or 50 hogs, chickens, and cows that were fed in pens next to the school building by the owners of the Magnolia House.[16] At the time, the grand jury said, "It is the opinion of the jury that the buildings are a disgrace to any civilized community." This report was made in May, and before the year closed the school found new housing in a new two-story building at the corner of Main and Sutter Streets.[17] However, these quarters were only intended to be temporary since the board was authorized to receive bids for the construction of a two-story brick building on Center Street, September 20.[18]

---

[16]Covert V. Martin, Stockton Album Through the Years, (Stockton, California: Simard Printing Company, 1959) pp. 155-65.

[17]This is according to Tinkham. Martin places the structure at Market and Sutter Streets.

[18]Tinkham, op. cit., p. 293.

The Center Street school site had been donated to the city in 1851 by Captain Weber, and the contract to build the school house was awarded to the Thomas J. Smith Company for a total cost of $5,295. This school was only to house the boys. The girls were still located in the Academy Building.[19] Construction of the Center Street School, later to be named the Franklin School, began in 1858.[20] This school has the distinction of being the first permanent brick school building in Stockton. It was dedicated February 25, 1859.[21] This building was in use up to very recent times, but was finally condemned and demolished during the 1950's. The site on Center between Washington and Lafayette Streets is now standing vacant. As recently as 1939, a Southern Pacific Railroad booklet made the observation that Stockton has not kept many of her old landmarks, but that there were two brick buildings dating from 1852 and 1858, ". . .the latter the attractive two-story Franklin School, built as the first brick schoolhouse in Stockton, and still a haven for studious youth. . . ."[22] The Franklin School is of particular historical significance since it was the only school

---

[19]Hollembeak, op. cit., pp. 30-1.

[20]According to Hollembeak, p. 30, the contract was not awarded until 1859.

[21]Tinkham, op. cit., p. 293.

[22]Hildegarde Hawthorne, Romantic Cities of California, (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939) pp. 337-344.

building constructed by the board of education during the first decade of the public schools in Stockton.

Enrollments during the first decade are interesting to note. In a report dated September 26, 1853, Board President Peyton reported to the council that the average attendance in each school was 35 to 40, making a total average daily attendance for the boys and girls of about 80.[23] However, the county superintendent's report for 1853 showed a total enrollment in the girls' school at 67, and the boys' school at 151.[24] This would indicate some laxity in attendance accounting, or a certain lack of scholarly attitude on the part of students. An enrollment figure from the year 1858 reported that the number of children in the city from 4 to 18 years was 450. Of the 450 children counted in the school-age group, 437 were enrolled as attending school. However, the average daily attendance was 190.[25] Enrollment discrepancies such as this would suggest several potential problems. Foremost at this time, as previously mentioned, would be a general laxity toward attendance on the part of parents and teachers, and poor attendance accounting. There is no record of formal

---

[23]Hollembeak, op. cit., pp. 24-5.

[24]Ibid., p. 25.

[25]Ibid.,pp. 29-30.

attendance accounting in the local schools. Laws affecting truancy were either non-existant or not enforced. Other factors contributing to poor attendance might have been the poor condition of school facilities, shortage of well-qualified teachers, and no definite board policy concerning attendance. In fact, there is something to indicate that the overcrowded conditions of the schools tended to cause the board and city council to ignore failure to attend school as a convenient safety valve. During the 1860's, as will be seen in the next chapter, much was done to improve these conditions, particularly in respect to the quality of teachers and methods of instruction. Strict attendance accounting and truancy laws were not to be enforced, however, until the administration of Superintendent James A. Barr, at the turn of the century.

Before leaving the pioneer schools, two social high points must be noted in the early history of the Stockton schools. The first was the grand picnic held in May, 1855. Two hundred fifty children assembled at the girls' school, and headed by the local Cornet Band, marched down Main Street to Center Street, along Center to Levee Street, and from there to the Court House. At this point, the students were transported by horse-drawn conveyances, furnished by the stage companies and stable keepers, to Bowen's Ranch on the Calaveras River. Miss Mary Buffington was crowned

"Queen of the May," and Miss Annette Parker was named "Lady Hope."[26] The second social event worth noting was the staging of a public entertainment at the close of the November term in 1856. At this time an exhibition was given in the Stockton Theater for the purpose of raising sufficient funds to purchase a piano for the schools. When the entertainment was finished, Board President Peyton explained the object of the show, and immediately a shower of gold and silver was thrown on the stage. More than $1,000[27] was collected and the piano was purchased as the first musical instrument in the records of the local schools.[28]

---

[26]Hollembeak, p. 26, says Annette Parker was Queen of the May, and does not mention Mary Buffington. Tinkham is the source for the information saying the Queen of the May was Mary Buffington.

[27]Ibid., According to Hollembeak, the amount was $1,000, and the piano was still in use in the high school building as late as 1909 when she was writing. Tinkham indicates $600 was collected.

[28]Tinkham, op. cit., pp. 290-2.

CHAPTER III

GROWTH OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Early Buildings, 1860-1899. From 1860 to 1899, 14 elementary schools were constructed and an addition was made to the Franklin School. The new schools were the North, Negro, Weber, Vineyard, Jefferson, Washington, Lafayette, South, Jackson, Fremont, Lincoln, Manual Training, and Fair Oaks.[1] Of these schools, nine were constructed during two decades extending from 1870-1889. An approximate valuation of these schools built prior to 1900 can be determined from statistics presented to the Board of Education in 1893. At that time the Manual Training, Lincoln, and Fair Oaks buildings were not yet constructed and the valuation at that time was estimated at $250,000. The construction of these three schools probably brought the total value of the school properties by 1900 to slightly more than $300,000.[2]

---

[1]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, September 10, 1873 to March 12, 1903, (Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District), also, Andrew P. Hill, Original Costs and Valuations Elementary School Buildings, Stockton, California, (Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, undated single copy in vault)

[2]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, June 27, 1893 (Stockton California: Stockton Unified School District) p. 226.

The significant consideration relative to these figures is that school construction was not keeping pace with population growth. While it seems the local schools have always been faced with too many students and too few classrooms, the problem reached crisis proportions in September, 1895. On September 3, a special board meeting was called to consider the matter of providing accommodations for overfilled classrooms. As a result of this meeting, six recommendations were adopted which illustrate the urgency of the problem: (1) A special bond election for buildings was authorized. (2) Principals were instructed not to admit additional pupils once seats were filled. (3) The district was divided on the basis of population, distances to be walked by pupils, and the number of pupils that could be accommodated in the various school rooms. (4) Investigation of the advisability of renting and equipping an extra room near Lafayette, and equipping a basement room at Jackson. (5) Establishment of an eighth grade at Jackson for all students south of Jackson Street, and (6) authorization for eighth graders to return to Lafayette.[3] (Students had been transferred to

---

[3]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, September 3, 1895, (Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District) p. 125.

one of the eighth grades at Jackson due to overcrowded conditions at Lafayette.[4] The enrollment figures for 1897 show further evidence of overcrowding. The first grade enrollments in that year were as follows: Lincoln, 87 pupils; Weber, 63 pupils; and Franklin, 83 pupils.[5]

A summary of the achievements and problems of the schools at this time was given by H. C. Holman in 1899, upon retiring from office as board president. In reviewing the preceding eight years, Holman indicated that all school lots had been filled in to the proper grade and ornamented with grass and shade trees. Much painting and repairing had taken place in the older schools. He mentioned that in 1897, a movement was inaugurated to decorate the school rooms of the city with pictures, casts, and other art works. Through donations and through entertainments given by the pupils, a number of rooms had been provided with appropriate decorations. He made particular mention of the efforts of Mr. Steinhart, San Joaquin County Fair Director. Among the problems noted were lack of adequate ventilation in most schools, overcrowding, inadequate funds, need for a new high school building, need for

---

[4]Ibid., September 3, 1895, pp. 124-125.

[5]Ibid., September 13, 1897, p. 363.

new grammar schools, and difficulties with out-of-district tuition. The outgoing president also reported that the graduating classes of 1898 and 1899 received their diplomas in their own classrooms in order to do away with the useless expense of hiring a theater and a speaker for graduation night.[6]

Intermediate Construction, 1900-1939. From 1900 to 1939, sixteen elementary buildings were constructed. The first of these schools was the Monroe, completed in 1903. Most of the construction during this period, however, fell during the 15-year period from 1912 to 1927. School construction at this time averaged nearly one building per year for a total of 14 schools completed. The last school to be constructed was the Grant in 1938. Altogether, the Monroe, Lafayette, Wilson, August, Jefferson, New Weber Grammar, El Dorado, Hazelton, Lottie Grunsky, Fair Oaks, McKinley, Roosevelt, Victory, Burbank, Bungalow, and Grant schools were constructed at this time. With the exceptions of the Monroe and Bungalow schools, all of these facilities are still in use. The New Weber is no longer in use as an elementary school, however. This building was converted into the Stockton Unified School District Administration

---

[6]Ibid., September 11, 1899, pp. 363-4.

Center in 1958.[7]

Confusion has resulted, from time to time, in discussion of the names of elementary schools. This is due to three factors: (1) Names have been changed, (2) buildings have been razed but names have been preserved in new construction, and (3) two buildings were allowed to keep the same name at the same time. The following paragraphs will explain this confusing terminology:

The North School, constructed in 1866, was located at the present site of the First Presbyterian Church on North El Dorado Street south of Harding Way. This school was later named the El Dorado because of its location. The site was later sold and the school was reconstructed in 1916 as the present El Dorado located on Pacific Avenue.

The Negro School, built in 1867, was discontinued when the local schools were desegregated February 1, 1879.[8] Colored residents later used the building as a church. The building was removed for the construction of the Monroe School on this site in 1903. Incidentally, this Monroe School is not to be confused with the New Monroe completed and occupied in the Spring of 1962.

---

[7] Ibid., March 12, 1903 to October 21, 1941, also Hill, loc. cit.

[8] Ibid., January 28, 1879, p. 252.

Franklin Elementary, constructed as the first brick schoolhouse, received additions in 1872. This site has been razed, and the name has been continued in the Franklin Senior High School.

Weber, built in 1872, in honor of Captain Charles M. Weber, is still in use as a child day care center, operated by the school district. This building was given a namesake in the New Weber, built just two blocks away in 1915. At the time, Old Weber was called Weber Primary, and New Weber was named Weber Grammar. Ironically enough, the name "Weber" was taken from the new facility when it was converted into the administration center. "Old" Weber is still standing, the voices of children still reach its red brick walls, and the name is unchanged.

Vineyard School, constructed in 1873, was of the one-room type. The frame structure was sold, and the Lincoln School was constructed there in 1895.

The first Jefferson School was built in 1873. While under construction it was called the East Side School. The Jefferson School was renamed the Pre-Vocational School when it ceased to be used as an elementary school, and the building became a part of the secondary program. This name was later changed to High School Annex. As High School Annex, the two-story frame structure was torn down in 1954. The second Jefferson School was completed in 1915.

Washington Elementary was established in 1873 on San Joaquin Street between Miner Avenue and Lindsay Street. The building housed elementary classes, high school classes, and the administration facility. Superintendent James A. Barr hoped to turn it into a junior high school in 1904. Perhaps a little ahead of his time for a 6-3-3 plan, Barr never saw this idea come to a reality. This original site has been sold to the Bank of Stockton, and the name has been reborn in the Washington Elementary completed in 1953.

The original Lafayette, completed in 1880, was sold for $68,000 on April 5, 1911. The present Lafayette was built in 1912 on a different site.

The South School, built in 1883, burned in 1937 and was reconstructed as the Grant School in 1938.

The Fremont School, first occupied in 1891, was given to the City of Stockton in 1956, and razed in 1957. Fremont Junior High School now bears the name.

The Fair Oaks School constructed in 1898, was reconstructed in 1921.[9]

Among the interesting sidelights of school construction during this period was the naming of the Lottie

---

[9]The previous paragraphs dealing with school names are impossible to credit. Information was obtained through intensive searching of the board minutes, reading Tinkham, Hollembeak, and Hill's evaluation study, and a number of interviews with persons connected with the school district.

Grunsky School on Harding Way. This was the second school to be named for a resident of Stockton. The first school named after a local person was in 1915, when the "Southwest" School was named in honor of W. P. Hazelton, pioneer teacher, hog buyer, dentist, money lender, and benefactor responsible for the construction of the public library, recently condemned. Lottie Grunsky was also a public school teacher and a member of the pioneer Grunsky family. The naming of the school in her honor was unique in that Miss Grunsky was still living. On June 24, 1918, the following letter was sent to her:

> Dear Miss Grunsky:
>
> The citizens of the city have for many years held you in high esteem. You have endeared yourself during your long services to the girls and boys and to your co-workers of this community. Recognizing this as a deep and lasting feeling for you, the Board of Education has unanimously decided to name the new school in the northeast part of this district the Lottie Grunsky School.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> Ansel S. Williams, Secretary[10]

Shortly following this letter Miss Grunsky replied:

> To the honorable Board of Education of the City of Stockton:

---

[10]Stockton Board of Education, op. cit., June 24, 1918, p. 131.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Your notification as to naming the prospective new school building in my honor has caused me great satisfaction.

Words fail me in trying to express my appreciation of the distinction accorded me. I can only assure you that with all my heart, I thank you.

Sincerely,
Lottie F. Grunsky[11]

Only on two other occasions has the local school district so honored a local person by naming a school for that person while they were still living and that was in 1935 with the naming of Schneider Vocational High School in honor of Alice Smallfield Schneider, then a member of the Board of Education and a former teacher, and in 1956 with the naming of Amos Alonzo Stagg Senior High School. Certainly, however, it is recognized that Stagg is famous nationally as well as locally. Other persons still living at the time schools were named in their honor were Woodrow Wilson, Theodore Roosevelt, and Herbert Hoover. The dedication of the Hoover School was singular in that Herbert Hoover attended the ceremonies in person. An interesting school name in the intermediate construction period was Victory, so named in 1923, as a reflection of local patriotic feeling following World War I.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 132.

Names were not the only unique characteristic of the schools constructed at this time. During 1920, the board made a decision to call in the firm of Davis-Heller-Pearce Company of San Francisco, supervising architects, to assist with the construction of elementary schools. A communication from the company filed with the board on March 30, 1920, following the official adoption of the contract four days previously indicated that the services of this company included the furnishing of architects and engineers to study plans and specifications of present buildings, and visits to each of the school buildings for the purpose of recommending improvements. The firm agreed to make trips to San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, Fresno, and elsewhere for consultation with school authorities and examination of facilities there. At that time, the company recommended that representatives of the board make such visits also, and that principals, teachers, and janitors engaged in school work get their ideas on school facilities and buildings into definite shape for presentation in informal discussions.[12]

Davis-Heller-Pearce Company was to serve as supervising architects and engineers for all school buildings to

---

[12] Ibid., March 30, 1920, pp. 225-6.

be constructed under a recently passed bond issue. The function of this firm as described by the board is worth noting because it reflects a significant change in educational thinking and school construction. Previously, construction of the schools was handled by local architects and local builders. Under the terms of the agreement with the supervising architects, the board expected the firm to study the school housing problem as a whole, making such preliminary sketches and estimates as were necessary, and recommend a general plan to serve the needs of Stockton. The district was to use the services of this company on all questions of lighting, heating, ventilation, and size and layout of rooms, and the best means of standardizing all school features. Once needs were determined, it was the job of the supervising engineers to survey the market carefully, and recommend materials and the nature of construction, price, availability, and serviceability of material. Davis-Heller-Pearce Company was then to provide an outline to the architects selected to draw plans and specifications that would be required in their particular buildings to conform to the general program. Once plans were completed by the architects selected, these were to be checked to insure expertness in engineering features and conformity to the agreed plan. Once building was to proceed, this group was to cover the matter of material delivery and work

completion of subcontractors. The supervisors were to oversee all work during construction, guarantee correct payments to contractors, and utilize their buying power and equipment available through the architectural firm. Under the terms of the agreement the supervising architects received one and one-half per cent of the total cost of each job.[13] The hiring of supervising architects, judged by present standards, might not appear to have been a particularly noteworthy innovation, since it was obviously an intelligent means to upgrade the quality of the school structures while doing everything possible to spend money wisely. However, for the Stockton schools of this period, it was undoubtedly a major achievement in what was otherwise a conservative era for the Stockton School District's elementary schools.

Some generalization should be made concerning the general plan of construction which characterized the local schools. With the single exception of the single-story Grant School, built in 1938, the plan of construction in the elementary schools was to design four-corner buildings of frame and brick construction, utilizing two stories. Each school contained inside corridors, and an assembly hall. Following 1900, an attempt was made to add covered

---

[13] Ibid., March 26, 1920, pp. 221-3.

play space to the schools, which was in part a reflection of the educational thinking of Superintendent Ansel S. Williams. Cafeteria facilities and electric lights were not provided until the 1940's, although some schools had PTA-sponsored cafeteria and lunch programs. Prior to 1900, little attention was given to landscaping and playground design and maintenance. Following 1900, there was an upgrading in these two areas. Playgrounds were brought up to good standards with ample turf and blacktop areas, but observation will show that, generally speaking, landscaping has not been an outstanding feature in the local schools constructed prior to 1940. That statement might be enlarged further to say that landscaping has never been a strong point in the local schools. Problems of heating, ventilation, and sanitation--real difficulties prior to 1900--were brought up to good standards during the close of James A. Barr's superintendency and have not been significant shortcomings in the public schools since that time.

It is an interesting fact that basic construction plans were not used in the Stockton School District until the construction of the Van Buren School in 1943. Prior to that time, schools were individually planned. Outwardly, many of the schools constructed prior to that time, and especially during the period 1912 to 1925, are striking in similarity, but it would be a false assumption to conclude

that the same plans were being used from one school to another. Uniformity was obtained in exterior design through the use of brick, but interior designs reveal that each school is entirely different.[14]

Modern Expansion, 1940-1962. From 1940 to 1962, a total of 15 elementary schools were constructed. Actually these schools were built in a period of only 15 years since construction of elementary schools did not start until 1948. During this time, Garfield, Elmwood, Madison, Harrison, Washington, Cleveland, Hoover, Van Buren, Adams, Tyler, Taft, Fillmore, Taylor, New Monroe, and the new August were constructed.

Basic plans were followed in building eleven of these schools. Garfield, Elmwood, Madison, and Harrison are the schools that do not follow the basic plan. All of the exceptions were constructed prior to 1953, when the basic plan was adopted with the construction of Van Buren. Garfield might be described as a hodge-podge, architecturally, since it was built under four different contracts. A portion of the school was built in the basic plan. Outside walls are of frame and stucco. Elmwood and Madison were both constructed in 1949. Both schools contain audi-

---

[14]Statement by Loren Peterson, personal interview, April 2, 1962.

toriums. These buildings were the last elementary plants to contain such a feature. Both schools are built with concrete walls and inside corridors. Harrison is a frame and stucco building. All four of these structures utilize inside corridors. A note of particular interest concerning the Madison School is that it was designed to serve as the observation school for the teacher education program in the school of education at the University of the Pacific. A special observation room was constructed in the school which makes it possible for observers to look in on classroom activities unnoticed.[15]

Since 1953, basic plans were developed for the elementary schools. Repetition of these plans has saved the school district more than $300,000 in architect fees. This basic plan calls for (1) three wings of five classrooms each, (2) one wing of two kindergarten rooms, (3) multi-purpose room with kitchen facilities, (4) administrative wing, and (5) two toilet buildings. Since the original basic design was put into use, the administrative wing has been slightly modified to include more storage, a faculty workroom, and a special education classroom. Multi-purpose rooms are used for assemblies, play in poor weather, and cafeteria eating space. Each is provided with

---

[15] Ibid.

a stage, dressing room, and kitchen. All buildings in the basic plan are of conventional single story, four-corner design with frame and stucco siding. The schools use outside corridors, thus taking advantage of the comparatively lower cost of land to construction expense, and Stockton's long periods of mild weather.[16]

Landscaping plans have been developed for all new schools built since 1951, and for most of the other existing schools of the district. These have been prepared by a landscape architect assisted by the district's landscape committee. School grounds are fenced, all have some blacktopped play areas, and lawns. Plants and trees have been selected which will thrive in this climate, which require a minimum of care, and which will give the grounds the best year-round appearance.[17]

It is an interesting fact that the cost of one elementary school constructed in 1954--Adams--was $382,415.93. The total valuation of the district in 1900 was estimated earlier in this chapter at $300,000. More striking is the fact that the present total valuation of the elementary

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

schools is $5,587,348.90.[18] The present (1962) enrollment in these schools is 17,000.[19]

---

[18]Stockton Unified School District, Ten Year Report, (Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, (1962), "School Building Program", in rough draft, n.p.

[19]Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The Washington Building. High school classes were first established in Stockton around 1870. The first official mention of high school classes in the minutes of the Board of Education is dated January 20, 1870.[1] At that time there was an enrollment of 28 students. Classes were held in the Washington Building which also served as an elementary school and the office of the superintendent of schools. Apparently the district was conducting secondary level classes since 1866 or 1867 because the board minutes record a graduating class in the spring of 1870. Up until 1886, no effort was made to record the names of graduates of Stockton High School. The 1886 board cleared this matter, however, by recording names from 1886, back to the class of 1870. C. Ewald Grunsky, Lottie F. Grunsky, and Alice Mills were the first graduates of the local high school program. Gradually, the number of students enrolled in the secondary school began to grow, and by 1886, there were twenty graduates.[2]

High school classes continued to be taught at this

---

[1]Martin, op. cit., p. 157.

[2]Stockton Board of Education, op. cit., p.263.

location until a special election was held at the close of 1900, in which the community voted in favor of establishing a special high school district separated from the primary and grammar schools. The organization of trustees under the new district was to remain the same, but the board was required to discuss high school matters and elementary school matters in separate sessions. The primary reason for the change seems to have been taxation revenue. Under the new organization, it was possible to spread the school tax over a larger area including what had previously been out-of-district units governed under the various county rural school district boards. Throughout the pre-1900 history of the district, the collection of tuition rates from these outside districts for students attending the local schools was a major problem to the Board of Education in Stockton.[3]

Apparently, the campaign to form a high school district was carefully planned. Prior to requesting a special election to decide on the issue, a group of citizens circulated a petition in the community requesting the establishment of such a district. When completed, the petition was bound and presented to the Board of Education. This petition has been preserved, and is on file in the

---

[3] Ibid., November 1, 1900, p. 275.

vault of the Stockton Unified School District. On November 1, 1900, the Board of Education filed this petition with the County Superintendent of Schools, to call an election in the Stockton School District for the determination of the question of the establishment and maintenance of a high school. At this time the signatures were filed with the county.[4]

Stockton High School. The formation of the high school district was approved. It is important to preface all treatment of the high school by indicating that the community placed great importance in the success of this high school. This is a matter that is difficult to measure, but board minutes show overwhelming interest in site selection, support of successive bond issues to construct and enlarge the high school, and in the curriculum.

Seventeen sites were offered for the location of the high school before the one on Vine Street was chosen. This site was an orchard at the extreme northern end of the city owned by the Rossi family. The southwest corner of this otherwise four-block square location has always been held by this family since their home was located on this plot. The structure is still intact and in excellent

---

[4]Ibid., p. 275.

repair, and is probably just as representative of local history as the high school itself. At the time of the site selection, the board of trustees was criticized for its selection because it favored the wealthy people's children, and forced too long a trip each day on the poor children living on the south side. In 1901, the board voted to hold a bond election for $150,000 to build twenty rooms to accommodate 500 pupils. The election was held April 29, 1901. At that time a total of 1,509 votes were cast. The yes votes totaled 1,444 against a no tally of 65.[5]

The site cost to the district was $24,000 and the first building constructed on Vine Street--which is still used as an administration and classroom building--cost $100,000. The building was designed by architect, George Rushforth. He received five per cent of the total cost as his fee.[6]

The cornerstone was placed on April 18, 1903, under the auspices of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons. Orrin S. Henderson, Grand Master of the State of California, and a graduate of local schools, officiated. Charles L. Neumiller, a graduate of 1896, and considered to be an excellent orator in his time, accepted the

---

[5]Ibid., May 6, 1901, pp. 24-26.

[6]Martin, op. cit., p. 157.

building for the community.[7] The school was constructed of grey sandstone at a final cost of $154,989, and was occupied in September, 1904.[8]

Along with the high school plans for building construction, the Board of Education decided to adopt a landscape plan for the new school. Community landscape gardeners were invited to submit plans. The gardener submitting the best plan was to be appointed gardener for the high school at $90 per month. The board instructed competing landscapers to observe the following rules: (1) Preserve the oak trees on grounds. (2) Preserve the North Street natural water course insofar as drainage would permit. (3) Submit a scheme of improvement providing that the entire grounds may be cared for by one competent gardener. (4) Provide grounds, insofar as possible, for football, track, basketball, baseball, tennis, and handball. (5) Provide a plot for the cultivation of plants to be studied by the classes in botany in the high school.[9] William Vortriede was the winning gardener.[10]

Four expenditure items are interesting to note in

---

[7]Board of Education. op. cit., April 2, 1903, p. 183, which contains the program for April 18, 1903.

[8]Martin, loc. cit.

[9]Board of Education, op. cit., October 1, 1903, p. 221.

[10]Ibid., May 19, 1904, p. 279.

tracing the development of the high school. These included the purchase of a power lawn mower in 1915, a motion picture machine in 1915, a $150 budget item in 1916 for rental of films for "illustrated pictures", and a mimeograph machine in 1915.[11]

Rather than install tennis courts, as called for in the original plan for the high school, the board decided to rent tennis courts opposite the high school grounds on California Street and owned by the Stockton Tennis Club. These courts were located on the State Hospital grounds. Under the terms of the lease, $25 was to be paid to the Tennis Club until $900 was paid out, and at that time the courts would become the property of the high school. Half of this sum was paid in rent by the board and half was provided by the high school student body.[12]

By 1913, it was evident that additional construction would be needed in order to accommodate expanding enrollments at the high school. In April, the board voted to hold a $98,000 bond election to build one or more high school buildings, make alterations or additions to the original facility, supply furniture and apparatus, improve

---

[11] Ibid., May 19, 1915, p. 364; October 21, 1915, p. 412; June 13, 1916, p. 458; November 3, 1915, p. 418.

[12] Ibid., January 3, 1917, p.2.

grounds, and liquidate any indebtedness already incurred for this purpose.[13] The election was held on June 5, 1913.[14] The results saw a passage of the bonds with a yes vote of 2,378, against a no vote of 475.[15] As a result of this election a science building was constructed at a cost of $47,900, a manual training building and gymnasium building contract was awarded for $29,700, the swimming pool was enclosed at an additional cost of $2,825 over the original gymnasium contract, an industrial shop bid was awarded at $8,354, and the high school bungalow for domestic science classes was built at an undetermined cost.[16] An additional $325,000 high school bond was passed on February 28, 1920, which made possible the construction of the auditorium under an original construction contract for $81,875,[17] but additional costs on record as of 1945, show that the ultimate cost was $178,585;[18] a girls' gym for

---

[13] Ibid., April 21, 1913, pp. 198-212.

[14] Ibid., pp. 198-212.

[15] Ibid., June 12, 1913, pp. 218-19.

[16] Ibid., Records of construction under this bond revenue are found as follows: October 10, 1913; p. 249; January 20, 1914, p. 263; December 2, 1914, p. 325; July 1, 1918, p. 1, and January 7, 1920, p. 120.

[17] Ibid., May 22, 1922, p. 354.

[18] Ibid., March 10, 1945, p. 9.

$22,914;[19] additions to the machine shop for $3,925;[20] and a new classroom building in 1928 which was constructed at a total cost of $40,555.[21] This final classroom building marked the completion of the high school facilities. No additional construction took place on this site until the gymnasium was torn down, and a new one was built in 1954 at a cost of $590,211.42.[22]

Vocational High Schools. In addition to the regular high school program, the district also offered vocational training at the old Jefferson School renamed the Prevocational School. This was later called the Junior Trade School. This name, in turn, was changed to High School Annex. The building retained this name up to 1954 when it was demolished. There is no record of when this former elementary school was converted to a vocational school, but it was probably around 1915, when the new Jefferson School was completed. In 1931, a new vocational school was built on Channel Street and was named the Part-time High School. This was later changed to

---

[19] Ibid., July 24, 1922, pp. 381-2.

[20] Ibid., pp. 381-2.

[21] Ibid., March 28, 1928, p. 143.

[22] Stockton Unified School District, Ten Year Report, op. cit. "School Building Program", n.p.

Continuation High School. Finally, on December 10, 1935, the school was named Schneider Vocational, in honor of Mrs. Alice Smallfield Schneider, a former teacher and, at the time, a member of the Board of Education.[23]

Edison High School. Stockton High School, Schneider Vocational, and the High School Annex continued to serve as the only secondary school facilities in the community until the spring of 1942, when the new Edison High School first opened its doors. This school opened with the present classroom-administrative building facing Center Street, and the industrial shops facing Charter Way.[24] The need for a second comprehensive high school in Stockton was at this time more than evident, due to enrollment pressure at Stockton High School. However, a more difficult time to build a new school could not have been chosen. Due to World War II, materials were scarce, and construction proceeded at a slow pace. An important consideration is that Edison High School was never completed to the original specifications and plans. Several factors caused this: (1) As already pointed out, Edison was constructed initially during World War II and the scarcity

---

[23]Statement by John Adamson, administrative assistant in charge of publications, Stockton Unified School District, personal interview, April 4, 1962.

[24]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., December 20, 1941, pp. 11-12.

of materials slowed building. (2) The Stockton Unified School District was short of funds following the war years. (3) Local schools were completely behind in building due to no construction other than a single elementary school during a twenty-year period. (4) Transformation to 6-4-4 and the operation of Edison as a junior high school. Since the inception of 6-3-3-2, and the reorganization of Edison as a senior high school, construction has been resumed and the plant is presently nearing completion under its original plans with the opening of bids in April, 1962, for a speech arts building.[25]

The first major organizational change in the local high schools came in 1948, when the Board of Education adopted the K-6-4-4 plan of organization. At this time, the junior and senior year students at Stockton High School and Edison High School were moved to the 43-acre junior college site adjacent to the College of the Pacific. Under this change, Stockton and Edison High Schools became junior high schools.[26]

Franklin High School. Franklin High School originally was constructed as a junior high school and occupied in 1950. Franklin was first built at a cost of $2,500,000. Then on

---

[25]Peterson, op. cit., April 4, 1962.

[26]Adamson, op. cit., April 2, 1962.

January 18, 1954, the Board of Education adopted the 6-3-3-2 plan of organization, and Franklin became a senior high school. Since that time, nearly $300,000 has been spent on classrooms, swimming pool, and science rooms to bring the plant in line with senior high school needs.[27]

Webster Junior High School. Webster was started in 1954, after the Committee on School Organization had recommended a change to the 6-3-3-2 plan of organization. The school was started as a junior high school with grades seven through nine, as an entirely new unit in the school system. Following the official Board of Education decision to make a complete change to the 6-3-3-2 plan of organization, many of the innovations tried at Webster Junior High School were adopted as district policy and the Junior High School Curriculum Guide was produced and became effective in 1956.[28]

Fremont Junior High School. Fremont Junior High School was ready for students in the spring of 1957.[29]

Marshall Junior High School. Marshall Junior High

---

[27]Elwyn G. Gallagher, principal of Franklin High School from the date of its founding, personal interview, April 6, 1962.

[28]Stockton Board of Education, Ten Year Report. op. cit., "Junior High School Program", n.p.

[29]Ibid., March 28, 1928, p. 143.

School was also occupied by students in the spring of 1957. Both Fremont and Marshall were formed in the fall of 1956, to enable a smooth transition of the students and faculty to the new sites.[30]

Hamilton Junior High School. The most recent addition to the junior high school facilities, was Hamilton Junior High School which opened its doors to students in the spring of 1962. This school was also formed in the previous fall semester in order to provide an easy transition. The student body of Hamilton was previously enrolled at Stockton Junior High School. Hamilton has relieved enrollment pressure on this site, and placed a junior high school facility closer to the students that must attend. The student body sources for Fremont and Marshall were Edison and Franklin High Schools when these plants were converted to senior high schools.[31]

Following the change of Stockton High School to a junior high school plant, there was a proposal, in 1947, to sell the school site for $1,200,000. Superintendent of Schools Andrew P. Hill, at the time, pointed out that it was possible to secure a 30-acre site on West Lane south of the Jackson residential area for $40,000, and that this was a

---

[30]Ibid., March 28, 1928, p. 143.

[31]Adamson, op. cit.

chance to get modern school facilities for Stockton. The board, however, ascertained that the money from the sale of the site would only provide for construction of 30 classrooms, and the board questioned the advisability of giving up 97 rooms at Stockton High School for 30 classrooms.[32] From there, the entire matter was referred to a citizens' advisory committee. The recommendation of this committee was opposed to the sale. According to Hill, opposition to the sale was based on more than the issue of exchanging 97 classrooms for 30 classrooms. He believes that three additional factors were important in this decision: (1) The opinion that West Lane was not the proper location for the school, (2) opposition from business interests since it was assumed the site would ultimately be used for commercial purposes, and (3) tradition.[33]

Stagg Senior High School. Stagg Senior High School was formed into a student body in the spring of 1956. At that time its administrative authority was synonymous with the Stockton College administration. The school was organized under its own administration and separate teaching staff in the fall of 1956, but the school remained housed on the junior college campus. In the spring of 1959, the

---

[32] Minutes of the Board, op. cit., February 25, 1947, p. 439.

[33] Andrew P.Hill, personal interview, February 23, 1962.

student body and faculty was moved to its present campus located on Brookside Road adjacent to the Calaveras River. This school was constructed at a total cost of $2,633,673.16. The naming of the school for a famous living American resulted from the request of a group of citizens in 1956. The board was unanimous in its approval. Mr. Stagg had made several appearances before the student body, especially prior to recent health difficulties in 1960, and he has had tremendous impact on the morale of the students.[34] Three other persons known locally have been so honored. These have been W. P. Hazelton, Lottie Grunsky, and Alice Schneider.

---

[34]Arthur Becker, first principal of Stagg from 1956 to 1960, personal interview, April 7, 1962.

CHAPTER V

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Early Attempts to Establish a Junior College. The first move to establish a junior college in Stockton came on March 13, 1917, when the high school board carried a motion to consider the advisability of forming a junior college in connection with the Stockton High School during the next school term.[1] On June 6, 1918, the matter was continued, and at that time it was estimated that the cost of such a program would be $5,000. It was decided to go ahead with the junior college plan if enough students applied for admission.[2] Opportunity was given for the high school students to sign for the course, but the superintendent failed to promote an adequate enrollment, and the proposal was dropped.[3]

Three years later, Superintendent of Schools Ansel S. Williams presented a new resolution on the establishment of a junior college calling for the Board of Education to

---

[1]Stockton School District, Record of the High School Board, (Stockton, California: Stockton School District) March 13, 1917, p. 17.

[2]Ibid., June 6, 1918, p. 130.

[3]Ibid., June 29, 1918, p. 148.

declare itself heartily in accord with such a policy.[4] The board considered this resolution for one month, and then declared in favor "of a law permitting the establishment of a junior college in any community having an average daily attendance of 400 pupils."[5] This seemed to be a rather vague type of endorsement, not particularly inclined toward the actual promotion of a junior college. The board approved of such an educational facility, but did nothing in the way of providing funds, or further attempting to set the idea in motion. These early attempts of Superintendent Ansel S. Williams to establish a junior college ended at this point in 1921.

Stockton Junior College and the College of the Pacific. The junior college was a dead issue until it was revived successfully in 1935. Officially, there is no record of the forces that finally set the board in motion toward founding a junior college. Fortunately, a study by Louis Sandine, Jr., under the guidance of Dr. G. A. Werner in 1937, at the College of the Pacific, outlines the steps which led to the establishment of the Stockton Junior College. In the school year of 1933-34, the Coordinating Committee of the College of the Pacific, consisting of the

---

[4]Ibid., February 2, 1921, p. 356.

[5]Ibid., March 2, 1921, p. 229.

president, dean of the college of liberal arts, dean of the conservatory, dean of the school of education, the registrar, the comptroller, and the five major department heads, became enthusiastic over the idea of starting a junior college division within the college. In the meeting of the committee on February 7, 1934, it was decided to establish a junior college division at Pacific. A month later Assistant Professor Dwayne Orton, head of the department of speech, was made the administrator of the junior college. The junior college was made an official part of the 1934-35 bulletin of the college. According to this first bulletin issued in June 1934, the junior college of the College of the Pacific was organized in response to a long-felt need for a general liberal education unit to provide a broad intellectual training and an appreciative view of modern life under the auspices and influence of a Christian college. The course of study was to be of the survey-appreciation type. Then in the summer of 1935, agitation for a local public junior college crystallized as a result of reports that nearly $30,000 in local funds was being spent annually on tuition of local students in junior colleges outside of the county.[6]

---

[6]Louis Sandine, Jr., The Development of Stockton Junior College. September 9, 1937. unpublished.

It was at this time that Orton and Knoles presented the idea of renting junior college facilities to the Board of Education. After a great deal of discussion, the board began to swing in favor of the idea, but had reservations concerning the fact that the plan as conceived by Orton and Knoles involved leasing or renting junior college facilities on the campus of the College of the Pacific, which was presumably associated with the Methodist Church. This involved the issue of a public school and public funds being associated with a religious affiliation. This prompted a meeting of local school officials with State Superintendent Kersey to discuss the legality of such a move. This meeting was held on January 9, 1935.[7] According to Carter, Dwayne Orton, Tully Knoles, Ansel Williams, and he met with Kersey in San Jose, and discussed the matter at lunch. Kersey then referred the matter to the state attorney general.[8]

Throughout the first few months of 1935, the general plan began to gain popularity. Then on July 1, 1935, Carter read a "Pacific Junior College" plan submitted by President Tully C. Knoles, whereby Stockton pupils who were enrolled in Modesto, Sacramento, and San Mateo junior colleges, and

---

[7] Ibid., January 8, 1935, p. 258.

[8] Statement by Ralph Carter, personal interview, April 6, 1962. (See Appendix for text of the decision of State Attorney General U. S. Webb.)

whose out-of-district tuition was being paid by San Joaquin County, could be given the same education at the College of the Pacific. At this time the board tabled the plan in order to give it future consideration.[9] Eight days later the board asked the state board of education to approve the prescribing of junior college courses of study in the Stockton High School District.[10] In August it was decided that the junior college would start with only a freshman, or 13th year class, and that first year pupils would have the option of attending public junior college classes anywhere in California.[11] The following October, the board entered into an agreement with the College of the Pacific. First year housing of classes did not present a rental or salary problem for the school district since Pacific was providing the trial year with a no-cost charge under a five dollar token fee.[12] By the middle of that month, the board had received official state approval of the arrangement.[13] Dwayne Orton, who had previously been given the title of Dean of the Junior College was given a new title of

---

[9]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the High School Board, op. cit., July 1, 1935, p. 269.

[10]Ibid., July 9, 1935, p. 274.

[11]Ibid., August 23, 1935, pp. 277-8.

[12]Ibid., October 3, 1935, pp. 282-3.

[13]Ibid., October 15, 1935, p. 289.

Principal of the Stockton Junior College.[14] Thus in the fall of 1935, the junior college was an official reality and probably one of the most unusual educational arrangements in the United States, owing to the alliance with the College of the Pacific.

At the end of the first year of operation, the board met in the summer of 1936, to establish permanent policies concerning entrance, curriculum, graduation requirements, integration of the junior college budget with the proposed Stockton Unified School District budget, and a junior college salary schedule.[15]

Admission Requirements. Admission as put into practice the previous fall, was open to residents of the Stockton High School District. This practice apparently was to continue without change, although the board never touched directly on this subject in formal rulings. A problem did arise, at this time, over the admission of students not residing in the local high school district. For purposes of discussion, the board divided these non-resident cases into four classifications: (1) Students residing in a high school district maintaining a junior college course, (2) students residing in a junior college district, (3) students

---

[14] Ibid., June 30, 1936, p. 335.

[15] Ibid., July 7, 1936, pp. 338-342.

not residing in the Stockton High School District who do not come under either of the first two classifications, and (4) students not residing in the state of California. It was recommended and the board approved, that all four classes of students be permitted to attend the Stockton Junior College. At the time the board made this decision it was presumed that class one would be primarily filled by a few cases of sophomore students who took their freshman year at Pacific and who might want to take their sophomore year in Stockton Junior College, and class two with students seeking out Pacific's superior facilities in music, drama, athletics, as well as the possibility of a four-year curriculum.[16]

Organization of Curriculum. In carrying out the curriculum of the junior college, the administration of the faculty, course of study, and personnel service was placed under the authority of the administrative head, or principal, of the college. Courses were in conformity with the California State School Code. Curriculum was organized into three divisions: (1) Natural Sciences, (2) Social Sciences, and (3) Arts and Letters.[17]

---

[16] Ibid., July 7, 1936, pp. 338-342.

[17] Ibid.

The division of Natural Sciences included the study of astronomy, botany, chemistry, engineering, geology, mathematics, physics, and zoology.[18]

Social Sciences covered courses in business administration, economics, sociology, education, health, physical education, history, political science, orientation, philosophy, and psychology.[19]

The Division of Arts and Letters encompassed ancient languages, English, graphic arts, modern languages, music, and speech.[20]

Graduation Requirements. The board specified the total of 62 units required for graduation, or completion of the junior college course of study, but five general requirements were spelled out. These requirements covered work in a specified field of study, health and physical education, Constitution of the United States including the study of American institutions and ideals, oral or written communications, and orientation during the freshman year. An alternate graduation plan was also offered by the junior college for students planning to transfer to a regular four-year college following completion of the freshman and

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

sophomore year. This plan allowed the acceptance of the lower division requirements of any college or university where upper division work was to be continued, provided these lower division requirements fulfilled the requirements of the general pattern.[21]

A Unified School District. At this time, the junior college and Stockton High School budgets and administrative organizations were integrated with the elementary school program to form a unified school district.[22] The first major overhaul that came as a result of the formation of the district was in the accounting department. Ralph Carter, who was then president of the Board of Education, recalls that prior to changes in accounting that were brought about at this time, the accounting system was "pitiful and haphazard." The Board of Education could in no way attempt to estimate the amount of money being spent, or on hand, at any one time during the school year. At this time, a public accountant was called in to devise a system suitable to the needs of the school district. The accountant visited other school districts to obtain ideas on successful school district accountancy procedures, and

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

then established a system for Stockton which has continued to function creditably to the present time. From that time on, Carter added, the Board of Education and the taxpayers have known exactly what was being spent, and how much money was left to be spent.[23] Perhaps an indication of the accounting weakness can be see in the fact that the board made no official record of rent payments to the College of the Pacific for the 1936-37 school year. The first record of a rent payment in the board minutes is for the 1937-38 school year when payment amounted to $40,320.80. At this same time the board decided to use this amount as a basic figure for future rents, and determined to pay further increases in average daily attendance according to the following schedule: (1) With each increase of 25 students A.D.A., the increase would be $500, (2) with an increase of 50 students A.D.A., the increase would be $1,000, (3) with an increase of 100 students A.D.A., the increase would be $2,000. In short, starting with the basic $40,320.80, the board agreed to an increase at intervals of 25 students, that would amount to $20 per additional student attending the junior college. The rental of facilities included buildings, grounds, and necessary equipment or apparatus that would be needed to accommodate the Stockton Junior

---

[23]Statement by Ralph Carter, personal interview, April 6, 1962.

College.[24]

The Conflict Over Rental Payment. Over the years, a conflict developed over the amount of rental payment owed by the Board of Education to the College of the Pacific. Critics of this arrangement charged that the rental payments, running as high as $180,000 a year, were excessive. They complained that junior college students were not always being offered the same opportunities in use of facilities as the College of the Pacific students. Defenders of the plan pointed out that Stockton was thereby relieved of the responsibility of immediate construction of a junior college campus and the subsequent high cost of construction, the community was able to make an easy and gradual progression into junior college development, and the community was able to offer a superior junior college facility from inception due to its being a lower division to a four-year college.[25]

The rental issue was first aired in 1939, when

---

[24]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., May 10, 1938, p. 67.

[25]These conclusions have been made only after careful and extensive investigation. Opinions were gathered both from persons convinced the school district was being overcharged and from those who feel the payments were fair and that the alliance with Pacific should have been allowed to go beyond the approximate date of the break in 1950.

Dr. Knoles reported that the 1939-40 rent would be on the basis of $65 per pupil in average daily attendance. This would raise the rent from $50,000 paid the previous term, to approximately $59,150. This figure was derived from the estimated enrollment of 910 students that were attending the junior college by the end of June 1939.[26] At this time the board expressed dissatisfaction over the proposed rental contract, and after an exchange of thoughts with Dr. Knoles, ordered Dwayne Orton, principal of the junior college, W. Fred Ellis, principal of Stockton High School, and Ansel Williams, superintendent of schools, to make a study of the possibility of accommodating the junior college at Stockton High School. The board ordered the committee to study the feasibility of dividing the school day between the junior college and the high school, the effect upon the length of the school day, the effect upon the size of the junior college faculty needed, and the possibilities of the platoon system.[27] Interestingly, there is no record of the official outcome of this meeting, the findings of the committee, or the agreement whereby the board settled its differences with the College of the Pacific. The matter must have been

---

[26]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., March 21, 1939.

[27]Ibid.

settled to some satisfaction, however, since the junior college opened that fall on the campus of the College of the Pacific, as usual.

Dwayne Orton Administration. Dwayne Orton was the first principal of Stockton Junior College. In this capacity, he was the man held most responsible for its promotion and inception. Prior to that time in 1935, he was the head of the speech department at the College of the Pacific. In addition to the initial promotion of the junior college, Orton's primary achievement was the building of a quality academic faculty, and a superior general education program. Orton resigned in the spring of 1942, and is presently employed by International Business Machines Corporation as editor of "Think" magazine. He is considered an excellent speaker, and in addition to his duties as editor of this magazine, represents IBM in a public relations capacity. His position involves travel throughout the world.[28]

Arthur T. Bawden Administration. Following the resignation of Orton, a science instructor holding a Ph. D. in chemistry and employed at the junior college, was moved into the top junior college administrative job. That man was Arthur T. Bawden whom former superintendent Andrew P.

---

[28] Ibid.

Hill described as being a scientist-turned-administrator with a thorough understanding of the job of junior college principal. "Dr. Bawden had an excellent understanding of what he was expected to do and in spite of his academic training was able to develop a superior shop program," Hill explained. Bawden can also be credited with the success of the Civil Aeronautics Administration program under which the junior college trained 1,000 pilots at Carson City and Minden, Nevada.[29] This program proved the ability of the college to adapt to changing needs as the United States entered World War II. Previous to the war the college had conducted a pilot training program in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Administration. After Pearl Harbor this program was moved to Carson City and Minden, Nevada.[30] Bawden administered this program single-handed. According to Hill, he personally drove to Nevada once every two weeks.[31] Also under Bawden's administration, a program of radio servicing training was carried out in Stockton for the Army Signal Corps. In July, 1943, the junior college entered into a contract with the College of

---

[29]Statement by Andrew P. Hill, personal interview, March 16, 1962.

[30]Statement by Arthur T. Bawden, personal interview.

[31]Statement by Andrew P. Hill, personal interview, March, 1962.

the Pacific to offer lower division instruction for the College of the Pacific Navy V-12 program. During the two years of the V-12 program, the college operated on a three semester per year basis. In 1944, Dr. Bawden assisted in launching an intensive planning program to prepare a plot plan for the just-purchased 43-acre site adjoining the southwest half of the College of the Pacific campus. Under him, construction started on the new south campus with sixteen classrooms in "temporary" steel buildings donated by the federal government. These were occupied in 1948.[32] Bawden resigned from the administrative post in 1948, in order to return to teaching. He is still employed at the junior college as an instructor in the science department. Since then he has authored text and workbooks in the field of chemistry in addition to teaching.[33]

Junior College District Coterminous with the Stockton Unified School District. In December of 1943, the State Department of Education informed the Board of Education that it would be possible to form a junior college district and receive an appropriation of $90 per pupil in

---

[32]Stockton Unified School District, Stockton College General Catalogue, (Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1948) pp. 6-7.

[33]Statement by Arthur T. Bawden, personal interview, February 28, 1962.

A.D.A.[34] This organization was not to involve any administrative changes. Under the proposal the junior college district would be coterminous with the Stockton Unified School District. A junior college district would make possible an additional $10 A.D.A.[35] Such a district received voter approval in 1945.[36]

Athletic Relations Between Stockton Junior College and the College of the Pacific. Rumblings of discontent between the junior college and the College of the Pacific were heard again in 1946, when a member of the board expressed concern that allowing junior college boys to play with the College of the Pacific teams would ruin the chances of the junior college in attracting athletes. Superintendent Hill explained that during the war when the junior college had very few men, the junior college men had been allowed to play with the College of the Pacific, but that starting with the coming year, a sports program for the junior college would be resumed.[37]

---

[34]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., December 14, 1943, p. 255.

[35]Ibid., June 9, 1945, p. 385.

[36]Stockton Unified School District, Stockton College General Catalogue, op. cit., p. 7.

[37]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., p. 214.

Nine months later, a special meeting of the Board of Education was called to clarify the athletic situation between the two schools. The immediate problem was the use of junior college freshmen on the College of the Pacific football team. Several members of the board had understood that no freshmen were to be allowed to play on the Pacific team that fall. It was further believed that all junior college students playing for Pacific were to receive a statement setting forth eligibility requirements and the effect participation on the College of the Pacific team would have on their athletic careers, if they later transferred to another college or university. Superintendent Hill reviewed the "Proposed 6-4-4 Sports Program," passed on February 26, 1946. During the discussion, James Corson, vice-principal of the junior college, brought out the fact that all the teams were operated by the Pacific Student Association, a combined student body organization for the two schools. He explained that no freshman was playing on the College of the Pacific team excepting some who were solicited by the College of the Pacific, and receiving scholarships. Corson said that the statement concerning eligibility requirements was given out on the first day of school. He also noted that the College of the Pacific had offered about 13 scholarships for freshmen playing football, two in track and four in baseball. Corson further explained that during the war years freshmen

were allowed to play on their varsity teams, but that the fall of 1946 was to be the last time that the practice would be continued for football.[38]

Following Corson's presentation, Superintendent Hill was instructed to send the following letter to Dr. Tully Knoles:

> Dr. Tully Knoles, September 23, 1946
> President, College of the Pacific
> Stockton, California
>
> Dear Dr. Knoles:
>
> On February 26, 1946, the Board of Education of the Stockton Unified School District met with Dr. Bawden, coordinator James Corson, and Superintendent Hill, and after discussing the athletic situation between the College of the Pacific and the public schools, adopted the enclosed principles dealing with the local athletic situation. For some reason or reasons, this information does not seem to have reached the proper College of the Pacific authorities, or if it has, it has not been acted upon in the cooperative spirit the board had intended.
>
> The agreement as adopted, was a compromise between those who wanted a bona fide junior college team for all junior college sports, and those willing to settle for a freshman team so that the College of the Pacific might have the benefit of enrollment of such 14 year boys as desired to play with the College of the Pacific. Although Mr. Corson explained that the College of the Pacific could, under the rules of the league they were to participate in, solicit and use freshmen for this season, some members of our board did not understand that this would be done, and no member of the school board presumed that College of the Pacific would undertake to look over all of our freshmen, pick out what they wanted, and leave the residue for us to build a freshmen team out of. All of the board members understood that a printed statement

---

[38] Ibid., September 23, 1946, pp. 348-352.

would be placed in the hands of all junior college boys entering a sports program, and that any boy eligible to participate on College of the Pacific teams would do so with the full knowledge of the consequences with respect to his future participation in other colleges, and without any pressure being put upon him. In other words, he was to be left entirely free to choose.

In principle, the school board is not in favor of placing freshmen boys of normal age on College of the Pacific varsity teams. We do not like the publicity recently carried in the local press in which it has been openly stated that sixteen year old boys will be used by Mr. Stagg on his team and where the statement has also been made that after the college has picked them over, the junior college would get what was left to build a junior college freshmen football team with. If we compromise on a junior college freshmen team it is our intention that it be a representative team. In the emergency that now exists, and under the pressures that have been built up, this board desires that coordinator Corson be immediately given the authority to assign those men solicited in the field by College of the Pacific for their football team, and promised board, room, and any additional remuneration, to College of the Pacific and announce that the balance of the junior college men are expected to play with the junior college.

We further ask that Mr. Stagnaro, our coach, be completely divorced from any domination or direction by Mr. Stagg or any members of his staff, and that he be free to develop his team without any pilfering by the College of the Pacific coaching staff after this date.

The board desires, also, to state that it is apparent that the College of the Pacific has undertaken to call junior college boys to practice without complying with the requirements of this board, that they have placed in their hands a written statement describing their collegiate participation rights. While it is possible for the College of the Pacific to claim that no harm has been done, and that the athlete will eventually get the statement, the practice does not appear to us to be one that is open and fair and in keeping with the purpose of our request. We suggest, therefore, that if the required statement is not in the hands of all junior college men participating or intending to participate in College of the Pacific athletics, that it be placed in their hands at once.

Some of the boys who have been engaging in football practice report that no statement has been put into their hands. To properly preserve our future relationships we believe that your office should notify your coaching staff, that from now on, all junior college men going out for athletic teams must first come to Mr. Corson, read and sign the statement regarding eligibility, and be accepted by Mr. Stagg and his associates only when certified to them by Mr. Corson, acting as coordinator. The College of the Pacific coaching staff should be able to produce such a certificate for every junior college man practicing with their squads.

Unless these requests are met in all fairness to the junior college, this board will be forced to reconsider the entire situation, and possibly effect a complete divorce in athletic relations. We desire to stress the fact that our previous action was:

1. A compromise, and

2. An honest attempt to cooperate with College of Pacific.

We trust that you will recognize this and take immediate steps to rectify the present situation.

Board of Education
Stockton Unified School District

s/ Andrew P. Hill[39]

Following the authorization of this letter, Corson was authorized to prepare a letter to parents of junior college men who participate in athletics for the College of the Pacific, and ask them to sign a statement of release absolving the Board of Education of any liability for any injuries incurred while playing for the College of the

---

[39] Ibid.

Pacific. As the meeting concluded, Avery Kizer, the newspaperman present, was given the board's side of the situation, and told to stress cooperation between the two schools. The board was also of the opinion that the Stockton Record had not handled the College of the Pacific-Junior College situation diplomatically.[40]

The issue was far from closed, however, since Tully Knoles had some views of his own on the situation, especially with respect to the letter sent him by the Board of Education. The following excerpts are quoted from Dr. Knoles' reply to the Board of Education:

> Board of Education
> Stockton Unified School District
>
> Dear Sirs:
>
> For the purpose of the record it seems necessary to answer, categorically, the letter from your body under the personal signature of Mr. Hill, Secretary of the Board.
>
> Certainly this letter indicates very sharp misunderstanding of the factual situation that exists upon the campus of the College of the Pacific and its athletic relations with the Stockton Junior College.
>
> At the invitation of Principal Bawden and myself, Mr. W. H. Orion, chief of the division of physical education and recreation of the State Department of Education, was invited to come to the campus and discuss the athletic situation. . . .
>
> . . .San Diego State, San Jose State, and Fresno State all have incorporated Junior College classes

---

[40] Ibid.

> within their set-ups . . . . However, by the vote of the student bodies, taken separately, the student bodies of the Stockton Junior College and the College of the Pacific have been unified and are operating under a constitution adopted by the student body, the greater majority of which is registered in the Junior College . . . .In San Diego, Fresno, and San Jose State Colleges the majority of the members of the athletic teams are enrolled in the Junior College. During 1946 season freshmen would be used on varsity teams in the PCC and the California State Conference, not to be permitted the following season . . . this was understood . . . .
>
> The only resentment that I as an individual, or the College of the Pacific has with respect to the letter of September 23 is in the use of the word "pilfering". The word "pilfering" in the Standard dictionary is simply to steal, and I am quite sure that Mr. Stagg is not a man who would stoop to pilfer anything--up to and including a human being.
>
> . . . .
>
> Tully C. Knoles
> President
> College of the Pacific[41]

Following this exchange of letters, a definite attempt was made by the disputing parties to restore friendly relations and preserve the Stockton Junior College-College of the Pacific educational ties. Superintendent Hill reviewed the policy of the Board of Education with regard to the cooperative relationships between the two schools, so that the board would have some background of what had transpired in the past to forge such a union of colleges. The superintendent pointed out the way in which

---

[41] Ibid., October 8, 1946, pp. 355-357.

the College of the Pacific, a purely liberal arts college, had changed and broadened since being in contact with the Stockton Junior College, and how the Stockton Junior College had benefited in turn. Hill stressed that the district had an unparalleled opportunity to build a seven-year institution on the two adjoining campuses that would be outstanding in the United States, if the two were willing to work together. (At this time 6-4-4 was in the formation stage and Hill was referring to this in reference to a seven-year school. There would be two years each of high school, junior college, senior college, and one year of graduate study.) Following Hill, the coordinator between the two colleges, James Corson, explained the workings of the joint student body organizations. In concluding his report to the board, Hill said that the use of freshmen on teams other than for the Stockton Junior College would not be a problem again, since rules that were relaxed during the war would be in force starting the following year. He also declared that emphasis should be placed on physical education and the health program, as a regular part of the curriculum, rather than on sports, which is an extra-curricular activity.[42]

---

[42] Ibid., October 22, 1946, pp. 369-370.

The result of all this was that in December a detailed plan described as "Recommendations Respecting the Relationship of the Stockton Junior College and the College of the Pacific", was worked out between the officials of both schools.[43] The text of the adopted plan was such that it was evident both sides had taken a long look at the issues that had just transpired and were hopeful that the wrangling could come to an end.

K-6-4-4 Plan. It is possible that the origin of the K-6-4-4 plan can be indirectly traced to the Sears study of 1938 which recommended the eventual transition to K-6-3-3-2 plan.[44] At the time this study was made by Dr. Jesse B. Sears of Stanford University, the local schools were regarded by some persons to be among the poorest in the state.[45] The study did much to awaken the community to the condition of the schools and pave the way for the improvement that followed in the 1940's onward, starting with the administration of Andrew P.Hill as superintendent of schools.[46]

---

[43] Ibid., December 10, 1946, pp. 391-394.

[44] Jesse B. Sears, Stockton School Survey, (Stockton California: Board of Education, 1938)

[45] Hill, op. cit.

[46] Carter, op. cit.

While K-6-4-4 was not the K-6-3-3-2 suggested by Sears, it was a plan that would serve to relieve the pressures of enrollment on the high school plants by providing housing for the last two years of high school on the junior college campus, provide grading breaking points by schools in better conformity with popular educational thinking, and make it possible to concentrate expensive shops and laboratories on one campus, thus providing for maximum utilization and no needless expense of duplication of these facilities in several plants. At that time, K-6-4-4 was working in several districts in California. Prior to coming to Stockton, Hill served as administrator in a four-year junior college in Santa Maria, and with his hiring in 1941, Stockton was paving the way for such a change. Hill became superintendent in 1943, following the retirement of Ansel Williams, and in 1944, the district first began to make concrete moves for the inception of K-6-4-4 with the purchase of a 43-acre site adjoining the southwest half of the College of the Pacific.[47] The following year, Stockton overwhelmingly approved a $2,500,000 bond issue which made it possible to begin construction on the new junior college campus. By the fall of 1948, the site was ready for the first wave of the new plan with 36 general classrooms,

---

[47]Hill, op. cit.

buildings for art, biology, physical science, and home economics laboratories, student union and cafeteria, library, administrative offices, gymnasium, and three permanent shops. With the exception of the shops, all buildings were considered "temporary".[48]

In the spring of 1948, construction of permanent dressing rooms was started. That same spring the voters of Stockton passed a special twenty-cent three-year building tax and a bond issue for $5,250,000. This tax and bond issue, together with future special taxes were to provide a permanent home economics building, library-agriculture building, art building, and gymnasium. Due to pressing building needs elsewhere in the rapidly expanding Stockton Unified School District, and modifications in the general educational plan of the junior college, certain alterations were made in the construction schedule of this building program.[49]

The home economics building, originally to be completed in 1951, was not occupied until the winter of 1955, and was transformed into a general classroom building. The library was completed on schedule as a facility apart from agriculture, and the agriculture building was also

---

[48]Stockton Unified School District, Stockton College General Catalogue, op. cit., p. 7.

[49]Statement by Arthur Bawden, personal interview.

completed on schedule in 1953. The art building was completed two years behind schedule with modified plans in 1961-62, and is known as the Speech-Arts Building. There are no plans in sight for completion of the gymnasium which was originally scheduled to be constructed after 1960.[50]

According to former Superintendent Andrew P. Hill, the original campus plan called for a home economics building, general classroom-administration-speech arts building, library, science building, shops, locker and shower building, swimming pool, and gymnasium.[51] The ultimate capacity of the proposed buildings was estimated at 6,273 with two-story construction. These estimates were for a four-year campus. Hill's long-term proposal for Stockton would have called for a continuation of the K-6-4-4 and the construction of a second four-year junior college.[52]

Stockton College Officially Named. The name, "Stockton Junior College", which had emerged spontaneously through usage was dropped as the description for the junior college in 1948, with the name "Stockton College". Other proposed names were "Stockton City College", and "Stockton

---

[50]Stockton Unified School District, Stockton College General Catalogue, op. cit., p. 7.

[51]Hill, loc. cit.

[52]Ibid.

Community College". This latter was the name proposed by the faculty of the college.[53]

Leon Minear as Stockton College President. Following the resignation of Arthur Bawden as principal of the junior college, Leon Minear became the principal. His term as chief administrator began officially in the late spring of 1949, and he resigned in the spring of 1952. Minear was the first junior college principal to be renamed "President" in the official job title.[54] Dr. Minear was described by former superintendent Hill as "bright academically, and held a good concept of school administration."[55] He came to Stockton from the University of Colorado where he had been administering a junior college for the University.[56] Perhaps the most significant event that took place during his administration was the resurrection of a number of old issues which had always placed pressure on Stockton College-College of the Pacific relations, and the introduction of certain new issues which ultimately terminated the relationship between the two

---

[53]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., pp. 357-8

[54]Hill, op. cit.

[55]Hill, op. cit.

[56]Ibid.

schools. However, according to Mrs. Ruth Isaacson, who was president of the board at the time of the break with Pacific, Minear was in no way instrumental in this break. According to the person who was then board president, his connection with the break was only that it occurred during his administration. The issues raised, and the resulting action which led to the decline of the relationship between the two colleges were conducted at the level of the Board of Education.[57]

However, Dr. Minear has slightly differing observations on the matter. He regards the major accomplishments of his administration as (1) the physical development of the junior college campus, including the planning of many buildings which were completed after he left Stockton, (2) the attempted integration of the four-year community college under 6-4-4 into one student body and the withdrawal of Stockton College from the domination of the College of the Pacific, and (3) adjustment of certain questionable fiscal practices to accord with state procedures and statutes. Minear points out that when he was employed as the president of Stockton College he had a mandate from the Board of Education to develop a separate school in spirit and organization. In addition to problems that rose from these professional problems, Minear notes that having three

---

[57]Statement by Ruth Isaacson, personal interview, April 7, 1962.

football teams on the same campus was not acceptable to anyone. The community became exceedingly unhappy because the following for the eleventh and twelfth grade team dropped to a low point. Some of the old timers who felt they should protect the old Stockton High School "Tarzan" teams were exceedingly unhappy. The athletic community would not accept this structure, although it apparently began to produce an athletic machine that should have proved unbeatable.[58]

The End of a Unique Experiment. In retrospect, it is clear that the breaking point in Stockton College-College of the Pacific relations came in the spring of 1951. While this is clear, what is not evident is the immediate final causes of this break. The reason for this confusion lies in the fact that an imformal meeting was held at that time between the Stockton Unified School District Board of Education and the Trustees of the College of the Pacific. Minutes were not recorded at that meeting, but evidently there was open and free discussion of the old issue of rental payment, athletics, student body budget accounting procedures, and the secondary position of Stockton College in the eyes of some faculty members.[59] One set of facts

---

[58]Leon P. Minear, personal interview, April 5, 1962.

[59]Ibid.

does seem to be clear, however. It was now evident that the junior college felt that its needs as a junior college were not properly being carried out under the existing relationship. Clearly, however, the Stockton Board of Education was not the only group conducting an evaluation of needs. According to President Burns of the College of the Pacific, who was also college president at that time, Pacific was also beginning to see a definite need to reinstate its lower division. Three factors seemed to motivate this: (1) It was evident that Stockton College was moving toward its own entity. (2) Transfers from the junior college, an important source of enrollment for Pacific, were dropping and no longer filling the facilities which indicated a need to provide a more stable enrollment through a lower division, and (3) while the alliance between Stockton College and the College of the Pacific was opportunistic for both schools during the depression years, the failure of Pacific to maintain a lower division was not building the college. Dr. Burns regards this last motive as the most important in causing Pacific to form a lower division in the fall of 1951.[60]

Ellen Deering, registrar for the College of the

---

[60]Statement by Robert Burns, personal interview, April 8, 1962.

Pacific, adds a fourth point leading to the separation of the needs of the two schools in the formation of 6-4-4, and the inclusion of the junior and senior years of high school in the junior college program. It was apparent that such a program would not be suitable to the development of the College of the Pacific.[61]

Julio Bortolazzo as Stockton College President. Following the resignation of Dr. Minear in the spring of 1952, Dr. Julio Bortolazzo was appointed president of Stockton College. His major accomplishment was to boost the junior college into community-wide importance following the break with College of the Pacific. Under Bortolazzo, there was a general uplifting of morale, increasing evidence that the program of the community-college function had been incorporated into the curriculum, completion of the library, classroom building, and planning of the science building. Bortolazzo resigned in the spring of 1956, to accept a similar position in San Mateo.[62]

Dr. Burke Bradley Becomes President. Dr. Burke Bradley was elected President of Stockton College by the

---

[61]Statement by Ellen Deering, personal interview, April 8, 1962.

[62]Hill, op. cit.

Board of Education following the resignation of Dr. Bortolazzo. Prior to that time, he was a member of the administrative staff of the college and had been serving as vice-president. His administration has brought with it a long-term perspective of the problems of the junior college. Under Dr. Bradley, the college has seen the completion of the science building and the speech-arts building, the inception of the 6-3-3-2 plan and the final abandonment of a high school campus on the junior college site with the completion of Stagg High School in the spring of 1958, and the promotion of a county-wide proposal for an area junior college district.[63] At this writing, the area junior college is still in the discussion stage.

---

[63]Stockton Unified School District, Ten Year Report, op. cit. "Stockton College", n.p.

CHAPTER VI

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Pioneer Curriculum. The pioneer curriculum was based, rather haphazardly, around the fundamentals of reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, grammar, geography, and whatever else a particular teacher's preparation allowed. There was no standardized use of textbooks. Teaching methods followed a pattern of assignment, recitation, and some individual help for non-English speaking students. (Hollembeak indicates that twenty-two out of a total of thirty Mexican children residing in the city, were enrolled in the schools around 1853.) The school year was divided into four terms, or quarters. The spring term began in February, closing in June. The summer term opened in July and ended in August. From August 21 to October 31, the fall term was held, and the winter term extended from November to January. In order to help determine promotion, and serve as a check on the competency of the public school system, semi-annual public examinations were held during which the pupils were expected to answer all questions asked of them by teachers, members of the Board of Education, and persons invited to take part in the examinations. Promotions were made on the results of this examination. Grading of the schools was not possible as we know it today. Up to 1861, the Stockton schools were typical of most ungraded

county schools. The first division of the schools was merely into classes in the boys' and girls' departments on a segregated basis. As attendance increased, a further separation into primary and grammar schools was made necessary. Distinction between the two was based as much on age and size, or teacher judgment or prejudice, as on attainments.[1]

Reform of the 1860's. A period of reform is characteristic of the curriculum, and local schools generally, in the 1860's. This reform started in 1861, under I. S. Locke, superintendent of schools. At that time the Board of Education resolved to create a school "system". The Boston schools were taken as a model to work toward. The first reform drive came in the area of attendance and punctuality. For the first time, strict attendance accounting was called for, and written excuses for absence were required. The second reform was aimed at the teaching staff. There were on record complaints concerning teachers declaring holidays at will and early dismissals. The district now demanded an improvement in methods of instruction and discipline. This local reform move concerning teachers was further strengthened in 1866, when the state

---

[1]Hollembeak, op. cit., pp. 32-34.

legislature gave boards of education full power in all school matters, prohibited the employment of any teacher who did not hold a certificate, and boards were given full power to set the standard of qualification, and examine applicants. A uniform system of textbooks was adopted, and the lines between classes were more strictly defined. Co-education replaced segregated classes. The first printed manual for the schools was published in 1864, which gave the list of adopted textbooks by three grades. This grading consisted of primary, intermediate, and grammar schools. References in the manual describing teaching textbooks and resource material indicate that calisthenics and instruction in morals and manners had been added to the curriculum. At this same time, the school year was changed into a division of three terms. The first term lasted from January 8 to April 30, second term from May 20 to August 31, and the third term extended from September 15 through December 15.[2]

Superintendent Ladd, in 1869, suggested a curriculum change that would call for a more practical course of study. His suggestions were acted upon to the extent of reorganizing the department into six grades covering a period of ten years. The two highest grades--first and second--constituted the grammar school, while the remaining four formed the

---

[2]Ibid., pp. 34-37.

primary schools. The first, second, third, and sixth grades were each divided into two classes of one year each, thus providing for ten grades. The system was peculiar to Stockton and required one more year than most school districts. Arithmetic was the foundation, and throughout the ten years of their school life, pupils continued through the round of reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, grammar, and geography.[3]

Two years prior to the change in grading, a percentage system had been introduced. Under this system students were graded on a basis of 100 in daily recitations. These grades, as well as the monthly examinations and the yearly examinations determined promotion. The percentage, in each subject required for passing, and the subjects to be learned were carefully included in the manual. Students were expected to gain proficiency in written and mental arithmetic, reading, grammar, geography, spelling, writing, physiology, history of the United States, bookkeeping, and general exercises in composition and declamation.[4]

Examination System Abolished. The examination system was criticised in a report given by Superintendent George

---

[3] Ibid., p. 38.

[4] Ibid., p. 39.

S. Ladd, on December 29, 1874. The superintendent felt that the examinations were overdone by many teachers. According to Ladd, some teachers were spending all their time preparing and asking questions that would appear on the yearly examination while neglecting other important areas of education. According to the report, reading and spelling were being neglected.[5] The matter of examination questions was allowed to slide along without board action of any kind until 1881. At that time the board was informed by the superintendent that the term was ending and the examination schedule would extend over Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of the final week. One member of the board questioned the use of the examinations during the final week at levels below the high school.[6] There was no formal discussion beyond this for another nine years. Then a resolution was passed by the board which abolished the examination system in the lower grades. At that time, the board ruled that teachers were to make and record, each month, estimates of the "fidelity and success with which pupils have performed assigned work in the several studies, without daily marking and without stated examinations."[7] Pupils with approved

---

[5]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., December 29, 1874, pp. 73-76.

[6]Ibid., May 25, 1881, p. 8.

[7]Ibid., October 28, 1890,pp. 363-64.

average standings for the year of "8" or higher were to be promoted without examination. (Grade estimates were made on a scale of 10 as follows: 10, excellent; 9, good; 8, fair; 7, poor; and 6, very poor.) Pupils of high and grammar grades whose average standing was less than 8, could be submitted to a written examination to determine fitness for promotion. It was specifically stated by the board, however, that no written examination for promotion was to be permitted below the third grade except on complaint of the parent or guardian interested.[8]

Report Cards. Along with abolishing the examination system, the board also provided that teachers were to send a statement upon blanks furnished by the Board of Education showing the standing of each pupil during the month to the parent or guardian of each pupil. These report cards were to be sent at the close of each month.[9]

The Reformation Period Under James A. Barr. Starting in 1891 with the appointment of James A. Barr as superintendent of schools, Stockton schools entered what Hollembeak has described as the reformation period. According to this writer, every innovation in the schools was criticised by

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

the parents and the public. The newspapers devoted their columns to communications from critics of every degree who set themselves against the reconstruction policy of the schools. Scarcely a day passed that some one of the city papers did not contain some notice of the public schools either derogatory to their new methods or, contradictorily, praising their standing. When nature study was introduced into the schools there immediately arose an outcry from the public who failed entirely to understand either the import or method of the work. According to Hollembeak, the daily papers gave the subject so much attention that no less than ten articles concerned with the teaching of entomology appeared during a period of one month. Nature study was associated with "bugs", and one paper declared that the schools were "getting so buggy that one could almost hitch a horse to them and go out driving."[10]

During the years 1894, 1895, and 1896, gradual changes took place in the curriculum. Nature study, manual training, a new system of drawing, and the study of history and literature in all grades was added to the curriculum. In order to organize the course of study and insure balance and continuity between the grades, a Committee of Twenty, consisting of special teachers, principals, and grade

---

[10]Hollembeak, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

teachers who had special training and had been successful in teaching, was appointed. The chief work of this group was to consider the subject matter and teaching methods of a graded eight-year course of study. The committee then broke into sub-committees with the following titles which give insight into the primary and grammar curriculum of the time:

> Reading, Writing and Word Study (including Phonics, Spelling, Word Analysis, Dictionary Work, etc.)
>
> Language (including Language Lessons, Grammar, Composition and Rhetoric).
>
> Mathematics (including Number Work, Arithmetic, Form Study, Geometry, Algebra, Bookkeeping, and Business Forms).
>
> History (including Literature and History proper).
>
> Natural Science
>
> Geography
>
> Music, Physical Culture and Ethics
>
> Drawing, Manual Training and Domestic Economy
>
> Night School[11]

By 1900 the efforts of this group were complete and the curriculum had been tried in the classrooms of the Stockton schools. Following the necessary revisions the work was presented in permanent form.

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

Outline of Studies.[12] An Outline of Studies was published in 1900 which represented the first curriculum guide in the Stockton schools. In 1903, the Board of Education was informed that the outline of studies for the primary and grammar schools was a "pronounced success". It was pointed out that the entire edition was circulated throughout the United States within three months, and that an additional 2,500 copies had since been requested. The course was being used as a text in the practical work of training teachers in various normal schools and universities. Requests for the course had come from England, Canada, France, and Germany. The president of the board reported that "Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools in London sent a most appreciative letter in acknowledging receipt of a copy he had asked for". He also added that books on method, many educational journals, and school courses have quoted at length from the Stockton course.[13]

It is interesting to note that from this point on there is little mention of curriculum change in the

---

[12]Unfortunately a copy of this outline could not be found in the vault, superintendent's office, or scrapbooks of old pictures. Also, boxes of letters revealed no clue in a record storeroom, and employees of the district searched through the old corporation yard storage file unsuccessfully.

[13]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., pp. 39-40.

elementary schools. The board minutes do touch on changes in such areas as Drawing, Manual Training, and Homemaking which are treated in this study under "Special Education", but general curriculum is never discussed.

Development of Curriculum Guides in 1956. Available evidence indicates that nothing significant was done in the area of curriculum development until 1953, when the school district started laying groundwork for a major curriculum overhaul. In 1954, a curriculum council was formed, and out of this came a series of vertical committees organized by subject fields extending from kindergarten through the fourteenth year. The present set of curriculum guides was issued in the spring of 1956. Since that time, the vertical committees have continued to study curriculum in the district, and these groups serve as a permanent curriculum council with an eye toward needed revision and improvement in the district's course of study. With the exception of certain subject areas that do not apply to the elementary schools, such as business education, these vertical committees consist of eleven persons: two each from the primary, intermediate, junior high school, senior high school, and junior college, and one consultant from the central administrative staff. At the present time, curriculum revision is taking place in the Social Studies, English,

Mathematics, and Science programs in the district.[14]

High School Curriculum. The first session of the high school is dated at January 10, 1870, by Hollembeak. As near as can be determined, this first high school curriculum was an extension of the tenth year. The first year's work was somewhat experimental according to Hollembeak. The course of study included Physics, Chemistry, Rhetoric, Mental Philosophy, Algebra, Geometry, Geology, and Latin. The first graduates, previously cited as being Lottie F. Grunsky, Alice M. Mills, and Ewald Grunsky were presented with first grade county teaching certificates.[15]

In 1873, a member of the Board of Education gained favorable response to a motion to incorporate Latin and Greek as a definite part of the high school curriculum in order to fulfill the requirements of the University of California.[16]

First Night School. That same year the board approved the establishment of a night school to be taught by the teachers of the high school and the principals of

---

[14]Statement by Harlan Reyburn, personal interview, April 7, 1962.

[15]Hollembeak, op. cit., p. 77.

[16]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., September 27, 1873, p. 10.

the elementary schools.[17] Apparently this night school was to offer both elementary and high school studies.

Grading the High School. By 1878, the high school had evolved to a point where it was necessary to divide the normal course into graded classes. At that time the classes were defined as Junior, Middle, and Senior years.[18]

Revision of the High School Curriculum, 1881. A major revision of the high school curriculum was adopted in May of 1881. The curriculum was divided into five divisions: (1) Business, (2) Normal, (3) Literary, (4) Classical, and (5) Scientific. In addition, a fourth post-graduate year was offered in Science, Classical, and Literary. In all of the above courses there was a common core of classes. The specialized divisions simply meant that a student would elect to take one or more courses in certain years which gave emphasis to one of the five divisions.[19]

University of California Approval. During February of 1885, a committee of the faculty of the University of California visited the city for the purpose of examining the

---

[17] Ibid., December 5, 1873

[18] Ibid., August 19, 1878, p. 230.

[19] Ibid., May 4, 1881, p. 3-5.

high school curriculum. After two days of examination the committee unanimously reported in favor of allowing the graduates to enter the University without examination. At that time, this privilege had been extended to three other high school programs: San Francisco, Oakland, and Berkeley. A certain note of pride can be observed in the board minutes at that time over this achievement.[20]

Revision of 1889. In order to lessen the work of the Junior and Middle classes, and provide a more practical range of courses in the Senior year, the Board of Education removed the study of English Literature as a compulsory course and made it optional, and included a review of Arithmetic, Grammar, Physiology, and Bookkeeping in place of the English class. At the time of this revision, six divisions were adopted in the high school course. The emphasis possible for a student to select as a major field were: (1) Classical, (2) Literary, (3) Scientific, (4) Modern Language, (5) General, (6) Commercial.[21]

Revision of 1892. In 1892, the board simplified the formal structure of the high school course of study by dropping the differentiation of five areas of major emphasis.

---

[20] Ibid., June 24, 1885, pp. 219-221.

[21] Ibid., December 31, 1889, p. 340.

English and Mathematics were required for all Junior and Middle year students, with two electives each year in Latin, French, German, Science, History, and in the Middle year, Greek. Seniors were required to take English and Civil Government with three electives in a choice of Greek, Latin, French, German, Science, History, and Mathematics.[22]

Four-Year High School Adopted. The high school course was changed to a four-year course by transferring the Lafayette and Fremont ninth-year grades to the high school, and organizing these grades as the first year in the high school program in 1894. The four years were described as: Ninth, Junior, Middle, and Senior classes. The requirements for graduation stated that each student must select four subjects each year. The commercial course offering was enlarged to extend to the ninth year.[23]

An Emerging Commercial Course. Under the previous revision, the commercial course offering extended over a period of two years. Then in 1900, this subject sequence was enlarged to a four-year offering including Shorthand, Typing, Economics, Commercial Geography, and Commercial

---

[22]Ibid., August 30, 1892, p. 136.

[23]Ibid., August 20, 1894, pp. 362-365.

arithmetic.[24] These classes were offered in addition to bookkeeping and commercial law which were included in the 1889 curriculum change.[25]

Vocational Course Recognized. There was a gradual development of vocational training following 1900, and this is treated in the section on special education in this chapter, but four years of vocational training was not recognized as worthy of a regular Stockton High School diploma of graduation until 1924. The first graduates under this program were Kenneth Stribley, Victor Nelson, Harvey Zinck, and Fred Rentz of the class of 1924.[26]

Academic, Commercial, and Vocational Revision of 1926. Three courses of study were established at Stockton High School in 1926. This program set up three major divisions of course sequence in the high school: Academic, Commercial, and Vocational.[27]

For graduation from the academic course, students were required to complete sixteen units which included a major of three years of English, and an additional major of

---

[24]Ibid., June 7, 1900, pp. 214-16.

[25]Ibid., December 31, 1889, p. 340.

[26]Ibid., February 20, 1924, p. 102.

[27]Ibid., October 6, 1926, p. 37.

three years chosen from the departments of Language, Social Science, Mathematics, or Natural Science. The program for these students included one unit each in United States History and Civics, World History, Natural Science, Physical Education, and for girls, Home Economics. Two minors of two years each chosen from any department in the school, and electives were to make up the required sixteen unit total. These students were not allowed to take classes in the vocational division.[28]

The commercial course also required sixteen units for graduation. Courses were selected in two majors of English and Social Science. The Social Science major was composed of Economic Geography, American History, and Civics, and one unit from Economics, Salesmaship and Advertising, and Commercial Law. These students were required to take a laboratory science, and the girls would take a year of Home Economics. In addition, all students were enrolled for two years of Bookkeeping, Penmanship, and Typing. The secretarial course included two years of Shorthand and Office Training, and accounting required Bookkeeping for two years and one year of an accounting class. All students were given four years of Physical Education.[29]

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

Vocational classes were conducted under the Smith-Hughes Act, and included courses in Machine Shop, Auto Mechanics, Carpentry, Cabinet Making, and Printing. This course consisted of three hours of shop work and three hours of related subjects each day.[30]

This plan of course organization was continued until the inception of the K-6-3-3-2 pattern of classes in 1954 and the adoption of the comprehensive high school curriculum organization. At that time, a complete revision of the secondary school program was carried out through the various vertical committees on curriculum.[31]

Stockton Junior College. The junior college was founded as an academic institution in 1935, and for all practical purposes its program continued with this emphasis until 1948. Certain exceptions in this program are to be found during World War II years, but most of the changes were brought about due to the war needs of the community and the Navy V-12 program being carried out under the College of the Pacific contract with the government. In 1948, with the inception of the 6-4-4 program and the completion of shops, there was an emerging feeling that the college should function more properly as a community

---

[30] Ibid.

[31] Reyburn, op. cit.

college and not simply cater to the needs of college transfer students. At this time, vocational and business education were introduced at the college under the Stockton High School organization of Academic, Commercial, and Vocational divisions. Since that time the college program has been enlarged within the community college concept. Much of the progress in this direction took place under the leadership of Julio Bortolazzo as college president from 1952 to 1956.[32]

Special Education. Certain courses not generally considered a regular part of the public school curriculum have had special emphasis in the Stockton schools. Some of these courses were an attempt to enrich the school program, while others were designed to fit the particular needs of the community.

Hollembeak refers to a number of these programs. Writing, or penmanship was given special emphasis as early as 1873, Music in 1861, Physical Culture in 1893, Drawing in 1890, and Manual Training and Sewing in 1894.[33]

Vocational education was given community-wide attention when a citizens' committee on industrial education was formed to investigate the entire field of industrial work

---

[32]Hill, op. cit.

[33]Hollembeak, op. cit., pp. 60-74.

for the primary, grammar, and high schools of Stockton and submit recommendations to the Board of Education.[34] Apparently nothing substantial came from this committee, or the Board of Education was not prepared to spend additional funds to enlarge the manual training program, until 1919 when Smith-Hughes Vocational work was established in the high school.[35]

The first attempt on record to organize classes for overaged and sub-normal pupils came in 1919. At that time the superintendent was given the power to investigate the matter and take action if it was within the power of the district.[36]

Education for the handicapped was first provided in 1930, when Margaret Meredith was given work in speech correction in addition to her regular class work. Three hundred dollars per year was allotted for this work. At this time the superintendent was authorized to provide a teacher for crippled children in their homes if as many as eight children needed the schooling.[37] A program for spastics was started with the employment of Margaret Waybur

---

[34]Stockton Board of Education, Record of the Minutes, op. cit., December 7, 1910, p. 68.

[35]Ibid., March 26, 1919, p. 56.

[36]Ibid., September 3, 1919, p. 159.

[37]Ibid., June 24, 1930, p. 319.

under a contract for $1,440. Her salary was provided by the Rotary Club.[38]

Operation of a child care center was authorized in 1943, in accord with the school code of the State of California.[39]

A released time for religious education program was started in 1944, but apparently was stopped in 1949.[40]

Since 1950, the Stockton Unified School District has instituted a program for the gifted, a school for the handicapped, and organized a pupil personnel services department which administers child care centers, welfare and attendance, clinical services, health services, special education for the retarded, and student employment services.[41]

---

[38] Ibid., February 14, 1939, p. 173.

[39] Ibid., June 25, 1943, p. 171.

[40] Ibid., December 12, 1944, p. 380, and August 24, 1948, p. 429.

[41] Stockton Unified School District, Ten Year Report, op. cit., n. p.

CHAPTER VII

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES AND THE EXPANSION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

The preceding pages have attempted to trace the development of the Stockton Public Schools from their inception to the present. The findings of this research project should give insight to the problems faced in building a school system, and a better understanding of recent problems in building a modern system on a sometimes weak foundation.

It was seen that the first schools in Stockton were not public, but rather private schools of both secular and non-secular backing. From the start, the local schools were seen as overcrowded and lax in the matter of enforcing standards and attendance.

As a school system emerged, the elementary schools went through three major periods of growth. The bulk of school construction at the elementary level had taken place from 1866 to 1898, 1912 to 1927, and 1948 to the present. The high school progressed gradually from 1870 to 1900, developing its curriculum along academic lines in the old Washington School Building. Then in 1900, community attention was focused on the development of the Stockton High School. There was evident civic pride in connection with this school as its buildings rose and the facility was

regarded as the flowering point of Stockton's educational system.

One of the most interesting and unique phases of local school history came in the development of a junior college. This junior college is singular in that its 1935 inception saw it in alliance with a private four-year liberal arts institution of higher learning, the College of the Pacific. This alliance resulted in the junior college serving as the lower division to the College of the Pacific. This alliance came to an end in 1951, when the junior college and the College of the Pacific felt that their individual needs were not being best fulfilled by the arrangement. The Stockton Junior College, then renamed Stockton College, wanted to depart from the academic emphasis to include the broad offerings of a community college. The College of the Pacific realized that it must develop its own lower division if it was to build its academic stature.

Curriculum development was traced in its haphazard beginnings and first period of reform. The elementary curriculum was severely criticised for rapid change in the 1890's, but the schools were still able to make a needed series of moves toward a complete revision of the curriculum which resulted in a published outline in 1900 which was given national recognition. From there the development of curriculum seemed to remain untouched until the complete

overhaul of the present period starting in 1954.

The high school curriculum saw a more systematic and gradual progression of development. From an emphasis on meeting the entrance requirements of the University of California to a gradual change in philosophy to include the needs of business and vocational education, the secondary school seems to have never been satisfied with its program and was constantly searching for means to improve it. Finally there was a treatment of special phases of the curriculum which show that very early in local school history, educational needs were seen to go beyond the conventional classroom pattern of learning.

In very recent times, since 1940, the local schools have seen three organizational changes in grade patterns: (1) K-8-4-2, (2) K-6-4-4, and (3) K-6-3-3-2. There has been a population growth in Stockton, partly the result of World War II, which caught the community completely unprepared educationally.

Modernization of the school district was a critical need at the administrative and board level as well as in construction of schools and curriculum development.

School finance has seen the need for higher taxes, bond issues, need for state aid, and the utilization of available federal aid.

In the meantime, educational services have expanded

in the areas of supervision, coordination, audio visual, curriculum development, and special services which include guidance and counseling, special education, child care, child welfare and attendance, clinical services, and cafeterias.

Increasing size of staff has made necessary the creation of a personnel department. The need for competent teachers has forced the adoption of a recruitment program, realistic salary schedules, and the development of an induction program.

Professional growth has been encouraged through administrative pre-school conferences, in-service training of teachers, continuous revision and production of curriculum materials, in-district committees working in areas other than curriculum to evaluate district needs outside of the classroom, consultant services, citizen advisory committees, and various school district publications.

Throughout the district it is evident that a quality educational system is emerging. The lesson of history should be clear, however, that quality comes with growth that is constant, self-appraising, and ambitious. A program that is discontinuous, afraid of criticism, and complacent will only play havoc on some future generation that will desire quality. It is to be hoped that the present generation will go far beyond a structural rebuilding of previous shortcomings and

offer new and higher foundations of its own, for it is only in this that real progress is possible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Collected Documents

San Joaquin County. Petition for the Formation of a High School District. Stockton, California, San Joaquin County, November 1, 1900, contains the wording of the original petition and signatures.

Stockton Board of Education. Record of the Minutes. Stockton, California: Stockton Public Schools, 5 vols. September 10, 1873-March 12, 1903.

_____ Record of the Elementary Minutes. Stockton, California: Stockton Public Schools, 13 vols. April 2, 1903-April 29, 1947.

_____ Record of the High School Minutes. Stockton, California: Stockton Public Schools, 9 vols. December 18, 1900-March 2, 1945.

_____ Record of the Stockton Unified School District Board Minutes. Stockton, California: Stockton Public Schools, 5 vols. January 3, 1949-Present.

2. Diaries, Letters, and Narratives

Taylor, Clotilde Grunsky (ed.). "Dear Family; the Story of the Lives of Charles and Clotilde Grunsky, 1823-1891, As Revealed in Diaries and in Their Letters to Their Respective Families." 1944.

B. BOOKS

Guinn, J. M. History of the State of California and Biographical Record of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Chicago: The Chapman Publishing Company, 1905.

Guinn, J. M., and Tinkham, George H. History of the State of California and Historical Record of San Joaquin County. Los Angeles: Historical Record Company, 1909.

_____. History of the State of California and Biographical Record of San Joaquin County. Los Angeles: Historical Record Company, 1909.

Hawthorne, Hildegarde. Romantic Cities of California. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939.

Hollembeak, Jessie Ryan. A History of the Public Schools of Stockton, California. 1909. Place of publication is not mentioned in book. Cover title is: The Stockton Schools From Pioneer Days.

Martin, V. Covert. Stockton Album Through the Years. R. Coke Wood, and Leon Bush, collaborators in writing the manuscript. Stockton, California: Simard Printing Company. 1959.

Santa Fe Railroad. The San Joaquin Valley of the State of California. Los Angeles: Out West Company, 1902.

Tinkham, George H. History of San Joaquin County. Los Angeles: Historic Record Company, 1923.

_____. A History of Stockton. San Francisco: W. M. Hinton and Company, 1880.

Anonymous. An Illustrated History of San Joaquin County, California. Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1890.

B. BOOKS: PARTS OF SERIES

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. History of the North Mexican States. The Works Vol. XV. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Company, Publishers. 1884.

_____. History of California. The Works Vols. XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft and Company, Publishers. 1884-86.

_____. History of California. The Works Vols. XXII, XXIII, XXIV. San Francisco: The History Company, Publishers, 1886-90.

_____. California Pastoral. The Works Vol. XXXIV. San Francisco: The History Company, Publishers, 1888.

_____. California Inter Pocula. The Works Vol. XXXV. San Francisco: The History Company, Publishers, 1888.

_____. Retrospection. New York: The Bancroft Company, 1912.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Stockton City Council. Charter and Ordinances of the City of Stockton. Stockton, California: Stockton Mail, Printers and Bookbinders, 1908.

Sears, Jesse B. Stockton School Survey. Stockton, California: Board of Education, 1938.

Stockton Unified School District. A Report From Stockton Schools. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1956.

_____. Annual Report, 1944-1945. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1945.

_____. Annual Report, 1951-1952. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1952.

_____. Annual Report, 1952-1953. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1953.

_____. Annual Report, 1954-1955. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1955.

_____. Statistics for 1861-1910. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, compiled during the administration of Andrew P. Hill.

_____. Statistical Report, 1953-1959. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1959.

_____. Ten Year Report. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, to be printed in 1962.

Stockton Public Schools, By-Laws of the Board of Education and Rules and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Stockton. Stockton, California: Independent Book and Job Print, 1881.

_____. Report of the City Superintendent of Schools of Stockton, California. Stockton, California: Herald Book and Job Printing Department Printing, 1884.

_____. Rules of the Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Stockton. Stockton, California: Printed at the Independent Book and Job Office, 1864.

_____. The Stockton Schools, 1892-93. Stockton, California: Stockton Daily Independent Printing, 1893.

Works Projects Administration of Northern California, Charter of the City of Stockton, Stockton, California: Printer not listed, 1941.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Love, Bertha E. (ed.). Original Costs and Valuations Elementary School Buildings. Stockton, California: Stockton Public Schools, approx. 1947.

Love, Bertha E. and Delucchi, Erma J. (ed.). The Hazelton School Medal Fund, 1892-1944. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1944.

Stockton Unified School District, Report of Three Study Committees to the Board of Education. Stockton, California: Stockton Unified School District, 1953. Concerns issue of transformation of K-6-4-4 to K-6-3-3-2.

E. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Adamson, John W., Administrative Assistant-Publications, Stockton Unified School District, April 4, 1962.

Bawden, Arthur T., Science Instructor, Stockton College, March 1962.

Becker, Arthur, Coordinator, Guidance Services, Stockton Unified School District, April 7, 1962.

Burns, Robert, President, University of the Pacfic, April 8, 1962.

Carter, Ralph, former President of the Board of Education, April 6, 1962.

Deering, Ellen, Registrar, University of the Pacific, April 8, 1962.

Gallagher, Elwyn G., Principal, Franklin Senior High School, from the date of its founding, April 6, 1962.

Hill, Andrew P., former Superintendent of Schools, February 23, 1962.

Isaacson, Ruth, former President of the Board of Education, May 7, 1962.

Minear, Leon F., former President of Stockton College, personal letter, April 5, 1962.

Peterson, Loren D., Director, Building Construction, Stockton Unified School District, April 2, 1962.

Reyburn, Harlan, Coordinator, Curriculum, Stockton Unified School District, April 7, 1962.

APPENDIX

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROPERTY OWNED BY THE STOCKTON SCHOOL DISTRICT SINCE 1853 INCLUDING DATE OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY BY CLASSES

Name of School	Date
Academy Building San Joaquin and Market	1853
Franklin School Center and Washington	1859
North School El Dorado and Vine	1866
Negro School Monroe and Washington	1867
Weber Commerce and Flora	1872
Vineyard Ophir and Market	1873
Jefferson Sierra Nevada and Lindsay	1873
Washington San Joaquin and Lindsay	1873
Lafayette San Joaquin and Market	1880
South School Sutter and Fourth	1883
Jackson Jackson between San Joaquin and Sutter	1888
Fremont Fremont and Aurora	1891
Manual Training School San Joaquin and Lindsay	1895
Lincoln Ophir and Market	1895

Fair Oaks 1898
Lafayette and C

Monroe 1903
Monroe and Washington

Lafayette 1912
American and Church

Wilson 1912
Mariposa and Hunter

August 1912
Waterloo Road and Sutro

Jefferson 1915
Sierra Nevada and Lindsay

New Weber 1915
Park and Madison

El Dorado 1916
Pacific Avenue and Harding Way

Hazelton 1916
Lincoln and Jefferson

Lottie Grunsky 1919
Harding Way and Funston

Fair Oaks 1921
Lafayette and C

McKinley 1922
McKinley and Moss

Roosevelt 1923
Fair Oaks and Garden
Main and Broadway (present address)

Victory 1923
Buena Vista and Mt. Diablo

Burbank 1925
Pilgrim and Jefferson

Bungalow 1927
Fresno and Sonora

Grant 1938
Sutter and Fourth

Garfield 1948
Sixth between Fair and Anne

Elmwood 1949
Cardinal and Main

Madison 1949
Mission and Mendocino

Harrison 1950
Alpine and Sanguinetti Lane

Washington 1953
Sonora and Los Angeles

Cleveland 1953
Fulton and Commerce

Hoover 1953
Kirk and Michigan

Van Buren 1953
Tenth and Beighle

Adams 1954
Inglewood and Glendora

Tyler 1954
Webster and Del Rio

Taft 1955
Downing near Mourfield

Fillmore 1956
Poplar and Golden Gate

Taylor 1958
Lever and Hawaii

New Monroe 1962
Ash and Pock

August 1962
Sutro near Waterloo

HIGH SCHOOL AND JUNIOR COLLEGE PROPERTY OWNED BY THE STOCKTON SCHOOL DISTRICT SINCE 1853 INCLUDING DATE OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY BY CLASSES

Name of School	Date
Stockton High School Vine and California	1904
Schneider Vocational Channel and Pilgrim	1931
Edison High School Center and Charter Way	1942
Stockton College Kensington and Mendocino	1948*
Franklin High School Gertrude between Miner and Farm	1950
Webster Junior High School Michigan and Warren	1954
Fremont Junior High School Flora between Wizard and Sanguinetti Lane	1957
Marshall Junior High School Lever and Hawaii	1957
Stagg Senior High School Brookside west of Pershing	1959
Hamilton Junior High School Eleventh between Ash and Pock	1962

*From its inception in 1935, the Stockton Junior College rented facilities from the College of the Pacfic. Until the Stockton Unified School District started development of the Stockton College campus in 1948, junior college classes were conducted exclusively on the Pacific campus.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE STOCKTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Name	Dates
E. B. Bateman	1852-53
J. M. Buffington	1854
J. W. Ellis	1855-56
W. T. A. Gibson	1857-59
B. W. Owens	1860
I. S. Locke	1861-62
Rev. R. Happersett	1862-65
L. M. Hickman	1865-67
Rev. E. Birdsall	1867
N. M. Orr	1867-68
George S. Ladd	1868-79
Dr. S. P. Crawford	1880-84
J. E. Richardson	1884
W. R. Leadbetter	1884-86
Frank Laning	1886-88
W. R. Leadbetter	1888-91
James A. Barr	1891-1911
Ansel S. Williams	1911-43
Andrew P. Hill	1943-51
Nolan D. Pulliam	1951-Present

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Legal Department

San Francisco, May 9, 1936

Honorable Vierling Kersey
Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Dear Sir:

I acknowledge receipt of your communication in which you refer to an arrangement that has been made between the governing board of the Stockton City High School District and the College of the Pacific, a private institution of learning located within the boundaries of the Stockton City High School District.

It appears that in the early part of the current school year 1935-36 the State Board of Education, acting under School Code Sections 3.350-3.355, authorized the governing board of the Stockton City High School District to establish junior college courses. Such junior college courses are the courses given in the first and second academic years, in other words, the freshman and sophomore years in a college or university. After securing such authorization, the governing board of the Stockton City High School District entered into an agreement with the authorities of the College of the Pacific under which the College of the Pacific agreed to provide housing for the junior college for the remainder of the current school year at a nominal rental of $5.00.

At or about the same time the governing board of the Stockton City High School District entered into a contract with certain members of the faculty of the College of the Pacific duly certificated to teach in the public schools of this state, employing them as members of the junior college faculty at the nominal salary of $2.50 per month for the current school year, with certain deductions as required by the Teacher's Retirement Salary Act of this state.

Said rentals and said salaries were fixed at a nominal sum because the high school district would not receive any funds from the State on account of the main-

tenance of such junior college until the school year 1936-37. (See School Code Sections 4.870 to 4.888.) Also for the further reason that the high school district would not receive any funds for the tuition of pupils not residing in the high school district until the school year 1936-37. (See School Code Sections 4.270 to 4.278 and 3.300 to 3.309.)

A junior college when maintained by a high school district is, except where the law otherwise specifically provides, considered as a part of the high school of the district in connection with which it is maintained, and the pupils attending such junior college are considered as high school pupils. (See Opinion No. 8051, rendered by this office under date of May 4, 1932, to the Honorable James C. Hollingsworth, District Attorney of Ventura County.)

It is contemplated by the district and the College of the Pacific that the rental will be increased to a more appropriate figure for the school year 1936-37, when additional funds permitting an increase in said rental become available to the high school district. It is further contemplated that the salaries paid these members of the faculty of the College of the Pacific who are employed as teachers in the junior college will be increased to a more appropriate figure for the school year 1936-37, as additional funds become available.

At the present time pupils enrolled in the junior college and pupils enrolled in the College of the Pacific are being instructed in the same courses in the same room at the same time by the same instructor. However, so far as any possible objection to this procedure is concerned, it is proposed that if the present arrangement is continued, there will, beginning with the next school year 1936-37, be a complete segregation of junior college pupils and College of the Pacific pupils. By this I understand that the teachers who teach the junior college pupils will not teach the College of the Pacific pupils.

Further it is proposed that if the arrangement is continued, the College of the Pacific will discontinue its freshman and sophomore years, permitting these classes to be replaced by the junior college which offers what is, in effect, college freshman and sophomore work.

From your communication I understand that there will be no sectarian or denominational instruction of any kind given in this junior college, either directly or indirectly. As a matter of fact, you state that the College of the Pacific is not a sectarian or denominational institution in the sense that it is controlled by a religious body. Its status is that of a private, non-profit institution of higher learning.

In our opinion No. 4331, rendered under date of December 21, 1921, to the Honorable Will C. Wood, Superintendent of Public Instruction, we advised that an arrangement entered into between the Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church, in whose diocese was situated St. Vincent's Home near San Rafael in Marin County, and the school trustees of the Dixie School District, in which St. Vincent's home was situated, was a lawful arrangement.

The Dixie School District was a small district enrolling in its one-room school only six or eight pupils. The School house was too small to accommodate the boys from St. Vincent's Home. The Archbishop requested the district to provide school facilities for about three hundred and fifty boys in the home. The only building in the district capable of accommodating the boys was a wing of the main building of St. Vincent's home, which home was a sectarian institution. The Archbishop leased to the school trustees of the Dixie School District the wing of the building above referred to, giving the trustees full control thereof. The plan discussed was for the board of trustees to employ a sufficient number of teachers to instruct the boys in the said quarters located in said home. Our understanding was that the school trustees would have full control of the education of these children and that no sectarian or denominational doctrines would be taught. We advised that there was nothing in the arrangement violative of either section 30 of Article IV or Section 8 of Article LX of the State Constitution.

I am of the view that under the facts as stated by you, neither or these sections nor Section 3.52 of the School Code nor any other provision of law would be violated by the proposed arrangement. The contract would amount simply to an arrangement such as is suggested by Section 6.41 of the School Code. Said section reads as follows:

"When the school enrollment of any school is such as to cause overcrowded schoolrooms, then boards of school trustees and city boards of education shall have power to make arrangements for the location of schools in temporary quarters.

"These quarters may be procured for a consideration, or at a rental, or by the construction of temporary buildings on school property."

Certainly the general spirit and intent of the school law of this State would encourage the education of these students by the Stockton City High School District in the College of the Pacific, so long as none of the above-mentioned prohibitions in our school law and in the State Constitution are ignored.

Very truly yours,

U. S. Webb, Attorney-General

By (Frank English)
Deputy

LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF WILLIAM P. HAZELTON, Deceased

Recorded July 27, 1891, White Plains, N. Y.

"Item 5. Remembering the time when I was a child, and appreciating the value which children attach to the marks of approbation bestowed upon them by their elders, and believing that such rewards of merit stimulate the youthful mind to greater activity in the acquisition of useful knowledge, it is my wish, as one of the pioneer teachers of the city of Stockton, State of California, that there shall be an annual award of prizes to the most deserving of the schollars attending the public schools of said city. To secure, therefore, the object sought, I give and bequeath to said city of Stockton the sum of one thousand ($1,000) dollars in trust, to be invested and held as a fund in perpetuity, the income from which shall be for the providing of silver prize medals to be awarded to the most deserving of the schollars attending the public schools of said city. The first prize awarded in each school to be for general good behavior, said medals to be stamped with appropriate devices and designated the Hazelton School medal."

Hazelton awards were first given on June 26, 1896. The winners were Elsie Kroeck, Lois Mayhew, and Hilda Simon from the Washington Primary School, and Hugh Berry, Eddie Trask, Bessie Yardley, and Lottie Ziegler from the Lafayette Grammar School.

When interest on the principal was no longer adequate to perpetuate the prize, the award was discontinued in 1903. However, since that time the fund has been increased through interest earned. At present the fund totals $8, 812.62. With the present increased size of the endowment, awarding of the prizes will be resumed at the end of the current school year of 1961-62. Awards will be limited to junior high school, and senior high school students.