
7C

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Proposed Plan for Reviewing Bilingual Certification

Executive Summary: At the February 1, 2005 meeting, staff presented the Commission with a plan to involve stakeholders and to address four policy questions pertaining to bilingual certification. At the request of the Commission, this follow-up agenda item provides a more detailed description of this plan, and provides estimated costs for each of the steps.

Recommended Action: To adopt the action plan outlined in this agenda item to address the four policy questions related to bilingual certification

Presenter: Susan Porter, Consultant,
Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

Proposed Plan for Reviewing Bilingual Certification

Introduction

At the February 1, 2005 meeting, staff presented an agenda item to the Commission that provided a historical background on bilingual education and bilingual certification in California. This agenda item also outlined a plan for involving stakeholders in reviewing the Commission's bilingual certification structure to ensure that the requirements remain aligned with the curriculum models used in California public schools and with the standards for English Language Development adopted by the State Board of Education. The Commission directed staff to prepare a detailed proposal of the plan presented including costs associated with stakeholder involvement and how standards would be developed.

The Four Policy Questions related to Bilingual Certification

With the advice and assistance of experts in the field of bilingual education, Commission staff developed the following four policy questions which must be addressed before bilingual certification routes can be updated:

1. Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers? Currently, the BCLAD Examination offers the only route for credentialed teachers to earn bilingual certification. With the exception of the Spanish BCLAD examination, very few teachers have taken the BCLAD Examination since 1998. Development of a new bilingual certification examination for several languages would be very expensive and would result in prohibitively high testing fees for individual candidates. Education Code Section 44298 requires that candidate test fees be sufficient to cover the full cost of the examination system.
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 within the 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. The Commission approved standards for SB 2042 programs in September of 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 until a new certification structure is in place.

3. Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages? BCLAD Examinations are offered for ten languages and Emphasis programs are offered for twelve languages. However, there are currently over fifty 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 ten 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.
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. New models of instruction may need to be taken into consideration as the Commission proceeds with the development of updated routes to bilingual certification.

Plan for Stakeholder Involvement and Cost Analysis

The plan presented to the Commission at the February 1, 2005 meeting contained three steps for addressing the policy questions: 1) survey data, 2) stakeholder meetings, and 3) an advisory work group. The estimated costs for each of these steps are outlined below, and in Appendix A. At the request of the Commission, staff has also included the costs and scope of work of an advisory panel or supported work group, as an alternative to the volunteer work group outlined in the original proposal.

Survey Data

The use of mailed and electronic surveys would enable staff to collect specific information about the demand for teachers who are authorized to teach in two languages.

In the first step of this plan, staff would design survey instruments, to 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. Copies of the surveys would be mailed to the following groups and representatives: bilingual educator groups, groups representing parents of children in bilingual education programs, institutions of higher education with accredited bilingual teacher preparation programs, teachers' unions, organizations representing school administrators and school boards, directors of teacher induction

programs, and other groups that may be identified during the review process. Additionally, surveys would be posted on the Commission's website, and could be posted on the website of interested stakeholder groups or agencies (public or private).

Estimated costs for mailing 200 surveys with pre-paid return envelopes: \$480

Stakeholder Meetings

A series of open meetings to address the policy questions identified would provide an opportunity for broad stakeholder involvement in the process. The agenda item presented in February 2005 outlined two approaches to stakeholder meetings:

Local Meetings

A series of 5-6 meetings would be held in Sacramento at the Commission offices. Staff would advertise meetings to be held at the Commission offices in Sacramento. All groups and individuals would be encouraged to participate in this series of meetings. Notification of these meetings might be distributed through the Commission website, websites of other advocacy groups (with permission), e-mail list serves, phone calls, and targeted mailings. This method could consist of four meetings, and each meeting would solicit testimony from the public on all four of the bilingual education policy questions. Each meeting would be structured so that Commission staff would provide participants with a brief background on the four policy issues related to bilingual certification. The rest of the meeting would be devoted to public discussion, while staff recorded comments and recommendations. The first meeting would be held in late spring or early summer of 2005, and the final meeting would be held the fall of 2005. The cost of these meetings would be nominal, and would only include overhead costs (for paper and duplication of handouts and notices).

Estimated costs for holding five stakeholder groups at the Commission offices in Sacramento: Typical overhead costs of approximately \$400.

Regional Meetings

Alternatively, stakeholder meetings would be held at five or six locations throughout California. The series of meetings would also be held in late spring or early summer of 2005 and conclude in fall of 2005. Holding stakeholder meetings in various locations around the state would allow participation by groups and individuals that are not able to travel to Sacramento. Estimated costs for these stakeholder meetings are based upon the travel costs for two Commission staff members for five meetings. Costs for meeting rooms were not included in this estimate, since it is assumed that colleges, universities, public schools, or county offices would provide meeting rooms at no cost to the Commission.

Estimated costs for holding five stakeholder groups around the state: \$4,873.

Advisory Work Group

A work group constituted to advise staff on the specific issues identified through the stakeholder surveys and meetings is the third step in the review process and will help ensure that teachers who attain bilingual certification are qualified to help students access the core

curriculum in two languages. Workgroups enable staff to consult with classroom teachers, faculty members, administrators, and other individuals with specific expertise or knowledge to aid in the development of examinations and programs for educator preparation. These groups advise staff that make recommendations to the Commission. Advisory groups have been used historically to advise the staff on teacher credentialing policies, to draft standards for teacher preparation and subject matter programs, and to recommend content specifications for teacher examinations. In recent years, the Commission has moved toward using terms such as “design teams” or work groups instead of the term “panel” to describe this advisory process.

It has been Commission policy to select members of advisory work groups from the stakeholder groups who are experts in the areas of education for which standards and/or examinations are being developed. The Commission has also endeavored to assemble advisory work groups that reflect the geographic, cultural, and linguistic diversity of California’s student population.

Due to budget restrictions faced by the Commission in the past two years, the advisory work groups have been comprised of volunteers who are not reimbursed by the Commission for their travel costs. As with the Accreditation Workgroup, composition is determined relative to the constituents and experts who should be represented and the association represented pays the travel costs of the participant. Depending on the issue and scope to be addressed, work group representatives have typically been drawn from among the following constituencies:

Association of California School Administrators	Association of Independent California Colleges & Universities
California Council on Teacher Education	Credential Counselors & Analysts of California
California County Superintendents of Education	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
California Department of Education Staff*	California Federation of Teachers
California School Boards Association	California State PTA
California State University system	California Teachers Association
Induction program directors	Reading Specialists
Subject Matter Experts	University and District Intern program directors
University of California system	

* CDE staff provides technical assistance and serve as liaisons representing the Department and the State Board of Education

For the review of the bilingual certification, additional criteria for membership in an advisory work group could reflect expertise in specific languages, linguistics experts, parents of English learners, teachers, and may include (but not be limited to) the following representative groups and agencies:

Bilingual Coordinators' Network	Bilingual Teacher Training Programs
BCLAD Emphasis and Intern Program Coordinators	California Association of Bilingual Educators
Language experts for specific languages and language groups	Parents of bilingual education students

At the February 2005 meeting, the Commission discussed two approaches to using an advisory work group:

Volunteer Advisory Work Group

In this step, the Commission would determine which stakeholder groups and experts would comprise the work group and the Executive Director would invite those stakeholder groups to select representatives to participate in a series of meetings to be held at the Commission offices in Sacramento. The Commission may wish to consider inviting representatives from the above list of stakeholder groups to serve on the volunteer advisory group. The Commission may also wish to include individuals representing the State Board of Education and/or California Department of Education to serve as liaisons to the group and provide technical assistance. This work group could convene its first meeting in late spring or early summer of 2005 and meet until late fall of the same year. All meetings would be held in Sacramento at the Commission offices. The volunteer work group would be responsible for reviewing the findings from the surveys and stakeholder group meetings, and assisting Commission staff with recommendations for answering the four policy questions. These recommendations would be brought to the Commission in late fall or winter of 2005. The work group could, with directive from the Commission, continue its work into 2006 to implement the plan to update bilingual certification routes as adopted by the Commission.

Estimated costs for a 12-15 member volunteer advisory work group meeting five or more meetings at the Commission offices in Sacramento: Typical overhead costs of approximately \$415.

Supported Advisory Work Group

In this option, the Commission would determine which stakeholder groups and experts would comprise the work group and the Executive Director would invite those stakeholder groups to nominate individuals to be considered for selection to the work group and to participate in a series of meetings to be held at the Commission offices in Sacramento. The Commission would pay the travel costs for members selected to participate on the work group.

The scope of work of the advisory panel would be to the same as that of the work group, and would adhere to the same timelines as the volunteer work group. The findings of the surveys and stakeholder groups would be considered in light of the four policy question, as the panel assisted staff in developing answers to the policy questions for the Commission's consideration. The advisory panel could continue its work through 2006, if the Commission chose to convene the same group to implement the recommended changes for bilingual certification routes, including standards for certification programs.

The costs for convening a supported advisory work group would be significant. Staff estimate the per member cost for a supported advisory work group to be approximately \$2,233, for a total projected cost of approximately \$26,800. Given the estimated shortfall in the current year of \$300,000 and additional fiscal constraints in the 2005-06 fiscal year, this option would have serious consequences for the Commission's budget. The estimates provided below are based upon the costs of convening a twelve member panel for five two-day sessions, and are based upon the following factors: travel costs for twelve panel members, per diem costs (meals, taxis, incidentals, etc.) and substitute pay for three K-12 educators.

Estimated costs for a 12-15 member supported advisory work group meeting four times at the Commission offices in Sacramento: \$26,800 (based upon a 12 member panel).

**Follow-Up Activities Once the Four Policy Questions are Answered:
Possible Implementation Activities for Updating Bilingual Certification Routes**

After the three steps for stakeholder involvement are concluded, staff will report back to the Commission late in 2005 or early in 2006 with a recommendation for answers to the four policy questions, as well as a proposed plan of action for updating bilingual certification routes for California teachers. The recommendations for answering the four policy questions might require the Commission to direct any or all of the following activities:

1. Release of an RFP for test development for bilingual certification for fewer languages than is currently offered for the current BCLAD examination. Alternatively, new test development might address only one or two of the domains (tests) offered in the current BCLAD examination;
2. Convene of an expert panel, a volunteer work group, or expand the scope of work of the expert panel or volunteer work group assembled for the purposes of addressing the policy questions, to be charged with the work of updating standards and/or guidelines for bilingual education course routes for new teachers, experienced teachers, or both groups;
3. Convene language-specific work groups to consult with the scope of work in either 1) or 2) (above) and to determine whether there are existing language proficiency exams that would fulfill all or some of the requirements of BCLAD Test 6;
4. Request another extension of the current BCLAD contract so that the final administration would be extended to 2007.

The above activities may be only a partial list of a plan that the Commission may wish to implement, depending upon the results of the stakeholder involvement and the recommendations developed in response to the policy questions.

Recommended Action

Staff presents the plan with options for discussion and potential action.

APPENDIX A
Steps for Plan to Involve Stakeholder Involvement
To Update Bilingual Education Pathways

Step	Description	Stakeholders Represented	Scope of Work	Start Date	End Date	Estimated Costs
1	<u>On-line & Mailed Survey</u> , to be posted on CTC website and mailed to targeted groups to gather information from the field and from the public regarding bilingual certification issues.	Any interested parties-- stakeholders, experts, members of the public, etc. from on-line posting. Targeted mailings to: IHE's, bilingual educator groups, district and county office personnel, bilingual educators, teachers' unions	Survey(s) would address current issues in the field related to bilingual education and teacher certification, particular focus on the four policy questions.	March 2005	June 2005	\$480 for mailing
2A	<u>Open Stakeholder Meetings in Sacramento</u> Four or five meetings, to be held at the Commission offices in Sacramento	Any interested individuals or groups: educators, stakeholder groups, members of the public, etc.	Each stakeholder meeting would ask for public comment on all four policy questions related to bilingual certification for California teachers. Information from these meetings would advise Commission staff and the volunteer workgroup or advisory panel.	May 2005	Nov. 2005	\$400
2B	<u>Open Stakeholder Meetings around the State</u> Five or six meetings, to be held in at regional meetings around the state	Any interested individuals or groups: educators, stakeholder groups, members of the public, etc.	Each stakeholder meeting would ask for public comment on all four policy questions to advise Commission staff and the volunteer workgroup	May 2005	Nov. 2005	\$4,873 (Travel costs for 2 staff for 5 meetings)
3A	<u>Volunteer Advisory Workgroup</u> 12 to 15 members	Members selected by certain stakeholder groups to represent the field of education and bilingual education	Would advise and assist staff in drafting answers to policy questions for the Commission to consider. Subject to Commission action, this group could continue work into 2006 to assist with the drafting of standards for bilingual certification	July 2005	Dec. 2005	\$415
3B	<u>Supported Advisory Workgroup</u> 12 to 15 members.	Members nominated to the Commission and approved by the Executive Director selected to represent various language groups, geographic areas, various professional organizations, K-12 and higher education	Would advise and assist staff in drafting answers to policy questions for the Commission to consider. Subject to Commission action, this group could continue work into 2006 to assist with the drafting of standards for bilingual certification	July 2005	Dec. 2005	\$26,796 (for 12 members & 4-2 day meetings)

