
7C

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Proposed Plan for Reviewing Bilingual Certification

Executive Summary: At the October 1, 2004 Commission meeting, staff presented an information item that addressed policy questions for the Commission to consider relevant to updating bilingual certification. In response to the Commission's direction, this item provides an expanded discussion of the policy questions, along a proposed action plan for addressing these policy questions and for updating the bilingual certification routes for California teachers.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission approve the proposed plan described in this agenda item to gather information from stakeholders in order to respond to the four policy questions.

Presenters: Susan Porter, Consultant; Mark McLean, Assistant Consultant; Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates.

Proposed Plan for Reviewing Bilingual Certification

Introduction

At the October 1, 2004 Commission meeting, staff presented an information item that addressed the need to update the requirements for authorizations for teaching English learners. That agenda item included policy questions for the Commission to consider relevant to bilingual certification. The Commission directed staff to present a plan at the February 1, 2005 meeting that includes an expanded discussion of the policy questions submitted in October, along with a proposed action plan for addressing these policy questions and for updating the bilingual certification routes for California teachers.

Background

The passage of Proposition 227 in 1998 required that English learners be taught in English unless their parents requested an alternative (bilingual) method of instruction. As a result of this legislation, structured English immersion is now the model for teaching English learners. This law also places a one-year time limit (with certain exceptions) for a student to be in a self-contained classroom for English language development. Under Proposition 227 (California Education Code Section 310), parents of English learners can request that their children be enrolled in bilingual education programs and waive the English immersion program option. In order to do this, the parents must go to their child's schools of attendance and submit their request for a bilingual waiver program in writing. Prior to the passage of Proposition 227, the percentage of English learners in all K-12 bilingual education programs in California was 28 percent. Data from the California Department of Education California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) for the 2003-2004 school year show that eight percent of English learners are currently enrolled in bilingual education programs.

On the other hand, enrollment in dual immersion programs has increased significantly in the past 10 years in California. Dual immersion (or two-way immersion programs) are bilingual education models that serve both English learners and native English speakers. Instruction is conducted in English and in a target language (often the English learners' primary language).

While there are many types of two-way immersion programs nationwide, most programs in California are of two types:

- a 50/50 model, where English and the target language are each taught half of the time during the length of the program, and
- the 90/10 model.

In the latter model, English is spoken at least 10 percent of the time in kindergarten, then increased gradually until English and the target language are used equally for classroom instruction. Students are typically enrolled in two-way immersion programs from kindergarten or first grade through sixth grade. Some school districts in California have extended their two-way immersion programs to include secondary grades as well.

History of Bilingual Teacher Certification in California - As a result of the enactment of the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act in 1976, the Commission developed the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC) pursuant to California Education Code Sections 44253.5 and 44253.6. The BCC authorized instruction for English language development (ELD), specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), instruction for primary-language development, and content instruction in the primary language. An examination for the BCC was available for Spanish only and included bilingual and bicultural teaching methodology, culture, and language components. Alternative assessments were available for eight other languages through Commission-approved assessor agencies. The BCC was replaced by the Bilingual Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development certification in 1994.

In 1992, with the redefinition of bilingual education, Assembly Bill 2987 (Statutes of 1992, Chapter 1050) established a new structure for bilingual teacher certification in California Education Code Sections 44253.1-44253.6 in which the Commission developed certification for instruction of English learners at two levels. The first level, called Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certification, authorizes instruction for ELD and SDAIE. The second level, which replaced the BCC, is called Bilingual Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) certification. This certification authorizes instruction in ELD and SDAIE as well as instruction for primary-language development, and content instruction in the primary language. Multiple routes are available to earn CLAD and BCLAD certification.

Individuals who already possess a valid California teaching credential (e.g., Multiple or Single Subjects, Education Specialist, etc.), may earn a CLAD or BCLAD Certificate by passing examinations. The (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations consist of the following six examinations:

- Test 1: Language Structure and First- and Second-Language Development;
- Test 2: Methodology of Bilingual Instruction, English Language Development and Content Instruction;
- Test 3: Culture and Cultural Diversity;
- Test 4: Methodology for Primary-Language Instruction;
- Test 5: The Culture of Emphasis; and
- Test 6: The Language of Emphasis (listening, reading, speaking, and writing)

BCLAD Examinations were developed for nine languages (Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese). These examinations were first administered in 1995. Examinations for BCLAD authorizations in Punjabi were added

in 1997. Additionally, an alternative assessment for Portuguese is available through the Merced County Office of Education.

Teachers may earn the CLAD Certificate by passing Tests 1 through 3 or by completing 12 semester units of appropriate coursework. Candidates may earn the BCLAD Certificate by passing Tests 1-6 or by completing coursework for the CLAD and passing Tests 4 through 6.

CLAD or BCLAD certification can also be earned through Emphasis program routes. Emphasis programs incorporate standards for teaching ELD and SDAIE in Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential programs. In addition, BCLAD Emphasis programs prepare candidates to teach English learners in a second language. Programs are currently offered for the following languages (as indicated by the institutions): Armenian, Chinese, Cantonese, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Korean, Khmer, Laotian, Mandarin, Pilipino, Spanish, Tagalog, and Vietnamese. An experimental program for American Sign Language is also available through the University of California, San Diego.

CLAD Emphasis programs are being phased out because the content is now addressed in the Multiple Subjects and Single Subject credential programs. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1059 (Statutes of 1999, Chapter 711) California Education Code Section 44259.5, provided that all California Ryan Multiple and Single Subject Credential teacher preparation programs were required to satisfy a new standard established by the Commission for the preparation of teachers to serve English learners. These AB 1059 coursework requirements, which result in an authorization to teach English learners, are also now embedded in SB 2042 teacher preparation programs that have received approval from the Commission.

For credential holders who did not take AB 1059 approved coursework, or who have not yet earned an equivalent authorization to teach English learners, the CLAD Examination and course routes and the BCLAD Examination route are available. Pursuant to AB 1059, Commission staff is currently working with a testing contractor and an expert panel to review and update the current CLAD examination and program routes for experienced teachers who have not earned a prior authorization to teach English learners in English. The new examination and certification will be called the California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) Examination/Certificate. The first administration of the examination is planned for the fall of 2005.

Education Code Section 44265 provides for issuance of the Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Crosscultural Education. This credential provides the same teaching authorization as the BCLAD documents. Candidates for the Specialist Instruction Credential must hold a basic teaching credential and complete a program of coursework through a Commission-approved institution. This program includes more intensive preparation that would be appropriate for teachers who may serve as a bilingual program coordinator or curriculum developer. Very few of these credentials are issued and only one program currently exists.

Appendix A provides a summary of the applicable Education Code sections, available languages, and options for earning each type of certification currently available for teaching in two languages.

Work in Preparation for Policy Considerations - The current contract with National Evaluation Systems for administration of the BCLAD examinations expires in 2006. As part of the planning process for reviewing bilingual certification, Commission staff developed background information by researching relevant data, evaluating available examinations, and gathering comments from stakeholders.

Staff compiled data on the number of BCLAD Certificates and Emphasis credentials issued (by language) from 1997 to 2003 compared to the languages most commonly spoken by K-12 students. These data are provided in Appendix B and show that, while BCLAD Examinations are available for the most common languages, extremely low numbers of individuals are taking exams for nearly all of those languages.

To determine whether existing examinations might meet California's bilingual certification needs, staff and two California experts in the area of instruction of English learners conducted independent reviews of test specifications for bilingual teacher examinations for New York and Texas. The results of both informal reviews documented that those exams are not aligned with the BCLAD knowledge and skill areas.

Staff also received some preliminary information from stakeholders regarding bilingual certification needs through a survey conducted at the March 2004 meeting of the Bilingual Coordinators' Network (BCN), and an informal discussion with representatives of Californians Together, California Association of Bilingual Educators (CABE), California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language (CATESOL), institutions that provide bilingual teaching training programs, and the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE) in November 2004. The comments from these discussions helped to provide insight into potential options for bilingual certification. Additionally, these groups indicated their willingness to work with the Commission to gather information from stakeholders in a more formal manner for this review of bilingual certification.

Four Policy Questions for the Commission to Consider

The following four policy questions were presented to the Commission at the October 1, 2004 meeting:

- 1. Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?** Currently, the BCLAD Examinations are the only route for credentialed teachers to earn bilingual certification. As shown in Appendix B, there have been very few credentialed teachers taking the BCLAD Examinations in recent years. The reduction of bilingual education brought about by Proposition 227 may be a factor in the low number of teachers pursuing bilingual certification through Emphasis and examination routes. Development of a new examination for each language would be very expensive and could result in prohibitively high fees for individual candidates. Education

Code Section 44298 requires that candidate test fees be sufficient to cover the full cost of the examination system. To address this policy question, the Commission might wish to explore the possibility of coursework options and consider alternative assessments of language proficiency to augment or replace the examination route for experienced teachers.

Should the Commission decide to continue examination routes for experienced teachers, the Commission would need to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) and select a contractor to develop and administer the examination(s). The scope of work for the examination would require the contractor to conduct a job analysis, test specifications development, validity study, test development, standards setting study, and test administration. As part of this work, the contractor could assist in developing standards for programs of coursework for only the language(s) for which an examination(s) is developed. This work could be funded by means of a no-cost contract in which the development of examinations and program standards would be paid for through examinee fees. Development of examination and program standards would take an estimated 12-18 months following award of a contract.

- 2. How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?** Standards for BCLAD Emphasis programs require institutions to incorporate competencies and assessments for bilingual teaching within Multiple/Single Subject Teaching Credential programs while staying within the statutory maximum number of units for the program (i.e., a “unit cap”). Institutions have found it challenging to develop high quality BCLAD Emphasis programs while maintaining the unit cap. When the Commission approved standards for SB 2042 programs in September 2001, the intent was to return to the development of standards for bilingual teacher preparation the following year; however, budgetary constraints prevented this activity. As a temporary measure, institutions were given permission to continue offering BCLAD Emphasis programs within the context of SB 2042 standards until a new certification structure was in place. There may be other structures or pathways that could be developed for teacher candidates to earn an authorization for bilingual instruction while working to complete their preliminary credentials.

Should the Commission wish to continue the coursework option for new teachers and should it wish to add a coursework option for experienced teachers, program standards would need to be developed. Advice from a stakeholder group would be needed to guide Commission staff on the development of program standards for these course routes.

- 3. Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?** Currently, BCLAD Examinations are offered for ten languages and Emphasis programs are offered for eleven languages. However, there are over 50 languages spoken by English learners in California classrooms. Statewide, the numbers of bilingual teachers needed for less frequently spoken languages remains relatively low, yet local and regional needs for teachers certified to teach in these low-incidence languages have increased significantly in the past 10 years. Informal surveys and information gathered from the field have shown that there is much interest in creating pathways to bilingual certification that allow for inclusion of more low-incidence languages. To address more languages than BCLAD Examinations currently

accommodate, the Commission might wish to consider alternative language assessments in order to fulfill the language proficiency requirements necessary for bilingual certification. For example, the Commission has recently established the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) that meet subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials for languages other than English (to teach classes for foreign language credit). These tests assess listening, speaking, written language, and reading proficiencies for each of nine languages. The Commission may wish to consider the possibility of using these tests as a way to meet the language proficiency component of bilingual certification. Other language assessments that may be considered for meeting portions of the language proficiency requirement include the Defense Language Proficiency Tests and American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Interview. Because these examinations are used to verify proficiency for teaching a second language, it would be necessary to establish their suitability for verifying language proficiency for teaching native speakers of the languages.

- 4. How should newer models of instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?** Experts have observed that two-way or dual immersion bilingual programs require teachers to have high oral and written language proficiency levels in English and in the target language. Besides requiring high degrees of biliteracy, the research also shows that teachers in two-way immersion classrooms need special skills in the following areas: student grouping and cooperative learning, promoting positive crosscultural attitudes between language minority and language majority students, designing curriculum to be taught in two languages, program planning and team teaching strategies. For these reasons, two-way immersion models may need to be taken into consideration as the Commission proceeds with the development of updated routes to bilingual certification. Stakeholder recommendations would assist staff in terms of how to incorporate the teacher knowledge, skills and abilities for these models of instruction into the updated bilingual routes.

Addressing the Policy Questions

It is important to involve stakeholders in framing and addressing the above policy questions. In the past year staff has had informal discussions with experts in the area of bilingual education who have generously volunteered their time, provided suggestions, and have expressed a strong willingness to continue supporting Commission activities that will result in updates and improvements to the current bilingual certification routes. Staff recommends that the Commission continue this collaboration and broaden stakeholder participation in order to help in addressing the policy questions and updating bilingual certification pathways before the BCLAD Examinations contract expires in 2006. Consultation with experts and stakeholders would enable the Commission to develop meaningful and equitable bilingual certification routes that prepare highly qualified and competent teachers of English learners.

In the discussions with bilingual education experts, a number of ways for including stakeholder participation in this process were examined. The methods discussed included mailed surveys, open stakeholder meetings at the Commission offices, regional stakeholder meetings, a volunteer workgroup, and an advisory panel. Based upon the ideas presented and

the potential costs in implementation, and subject to available resources, staff is proposing the following plan for Commission consideration:

Survey

Staff would design survey instruments that would be posted on the Commission website and mailed to representatives of various stakeholder groups. If necessary, different survey instruments would be developed for various stakeholder groups. These surveys would ask specific questions regarding bilingual education needs in schools, including, but not limited to: the need for certificated bilingual educators in the schools, districts, and geographic areas of the respondents; knowledge and skills needed for current bilingual education models and bilingual educator roles; and the specific language needs of the district or community of the respondents. Mailed copies of this survey would be sent to representatives of teacher education programs, bilingual educators' associations, K-12 educators, and relevant parent groups. Surveys could be developed during the spring of this year to help inform the Commission, staff, and stakeholder groups on the needs of the field. The only expense would be for postage and it would be minimal.

Stakeholder Meetings

In addition, staff would advertise and hold one to four open stakeholder meetings at the Commission offices in Sacramento. All groups and individuals would be invited to participate in this meeting or series of meetings. Notification of meetings would be distributed on the Commission website, websites of other advocacy groups (with permission), e-mail list serves, phone calls, and targeted mailings. If one meeting were held, it would take place in the late spring of 2005 and would focus on all four policy questions outlined in this agenda item. If four meetings were held, they would take place from spring through summer of 2005 with each meeting focusing on one of the four policy questions. Individual meetings would be structured so that Commission staff would provide participants with a description of the policy issue(s) related to bilingual certification, facilitate a discussion of each issue, and record comments and recommendations. The costs would be nominal and would only affect standard operating costs (staff time, paper and photocopying, etc.).

The cost of travel to attend these meetings may restrict individuals from around the state from participating, which may limit the representation of geographic areas, languages, and stakeholder groups. If resources are available in the Commission's budget, the stakeholder meetings could be held in different regions of the state from spring through the summer of 2005. These regional meetings would provide the advantage of increased representation from stakeholders in more diverse geographic areas in California. Depending upon the number and location of stakeholder meetings, this would also ensure representation of large urban areas as well as rural areas. These meetings would only be held if Commission staff is able to reserve meeting spaces at universities or county offices of education at no cost. The costs for conducting the regional meetings would be for one to two staff members to travel to the location.

Volunteer Workgroup

Finally, staff would also invite stakeholder groups to select representatives to participate in a volunteer workgroup for a series of meetings to be held at the Commission offices in

Sacramento during the spring and summer. This group would work with staff to develop recommendations related to the four policy questions. The stakeholder groups participating in this activity would cover their own travel costs. In selecting these representatives, the goal would be to achieve a balanced representation of bilingual educators from different organizations, language groups, and geographic areas. Representatives should include individuals from parent groups, school administrators, the California Department of Education, and teacher educators from the CSU System, UC System, and private universities. Costs would be nominal, since sponsoring groups would support travel costs for their representatives.

Recommended Action

The strategies outlined above provide opportunities for stakeholders to participate in discussions about the future of bilingual certification in California. The involvement and consultation with experts in the field of bilingual education will better inform the discussion when the Commission takes up the issue again this fall.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the proposed plan to gather information from stakeholders in order to respond to the four policy questions. Staff would report back to the Commission at the November-December 2005 meeting and present recommendations for updating routes to bilingual certification. That report would specify procedures and timelines for implementing the recommendations, which may include development of new examinations and/or program standards for bilingual certification.

Appendix A: Bilingual Certification Currently Issued by the Commission

AUTHORIZATION	LEGAL & EDUCATION CODE REFERENCE	LANGUAGES ¹	CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONS)
Bilingual Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (BCLAD) Certificate	AB 2987 (Campbell,1992); AB 2505 (Richter, 1994) EC §44253.1, 44253.2, §44253.4, §44253.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Armenian • Cantonese • Filipino • Hmong • Khmer • Korean • Mandarin • Portuguese • Punjabi • Spanish • Vietnamese 	CLAD/AB 1059 (or equivalent) certification/ authorization and Passage of BCLAD Exams 4, 5, & 6 OR passage of tests 1-6
Multiple or Single Subject Credential with Bilingual Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (BCLAD) Emphasis	AB 2987 (Campbell,1992); AB 2505 (Richter, 1994) EC §44253.4, §44253.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Sign Language (experimental program) • Armenian • Cantonese • Cambodian • Chinese • Filipino • Hmong • Khmer • Korean • Laotian • Mandarin • Pilipino • Spanish • Tagalog • Vietnamese 	Commission-approved Multiple or Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis program
Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Crosscultural Education	EC §44265	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish 	Commission-approved preparation program

¹ The BCLAD Emphasis languages displayed represent the language names indicated by the institutions offering the program.

APPENDIX B: COMPARISON OF BCLAD CERTIFICATES AND EMPHASIS CREDENTIALS WITH FREQUENCY OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH CURRENTLY SPOKEN IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

Table A: BCLAD Certificate Numbers 1997-98 through 2002-03 (available through exam route only)

	Spanish	Hmong	Cantonese	Korean	Vietnamese	Armenian	Mandarin	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Chinese	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Portuguese
1997-98	586	1	9	7	3	8	4	4	4		1	3
1998-99	375		7	11	1	3	9	2	1			
1999-00	346	1	8	3	4	7	1		1	1	1	
2000-01	255		5	5	2		1					
2001-02	280		8	4	2	4	6		1			1
2002-03	361	1	2	5	2	3	4	1	7	1	1	
TOTAL	2,203	3	39	35	14	25	25	7	14	2	3	4

Table B: BCLAD Emphasis Credential Numbers 1997-98 through 2002-03

	Spanish	Hmong	Cantonese	Korean	Vietnamese	Armenian	Mandarin	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Chinese	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Laotian
1997-98		23	15	4			3	11		2	2	2
1998-99		12	16	5	2			1	1	2		
1999-00	1,052	12	16	5	8				1	1		
2000-01	1,116	26	9	3	4					2		
2001-02	1,460	30	11	6	6		2	1		1		1
2002-03	1,227	22	5	3	5	1	1	2	1			
TOTAL	6,907	125	72	26	25	1	6	15	3	8	2	3

Table C: Total BCLAD Authorizations Issued 1997-98 through 2002-03 (Certificate and Emphasis Credentials Combined)

	Spanish	Hmong	Cantonese	Korean	Vietnamese	Armenian	Mandarin	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Chinese	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Portuguese	Laotian
1997-2003	9,110	128	111	61	39	26	31	22	17	10	5	4	3

Table D: Most Frequently Occurring Languages of English Learners in California Schools (ranked by numbers of students)

	Spanish	Vietnamese	Hmong	Cantonese	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Korean	Mandarin	Armenian	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Russian	Arabic
2002-203	10,348,934	36,574	25,199	24,004	20,650	17,627	12,105	11,727	11,360	8,751	7,980	7,751

