
4E

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Report on Bilingual Certification Review

Executive Summary: At the June 1, 2005 meeting, the Commission approved a three-part plan that would involve stakeholders in the consideration of four policy questions relative to bilingual certification for California teachers. This agenda item describes the process for implementing the plan to involve stakeholder feedback, including an online survey and a series of stakeholder meetings held around the state. The responses to the four policy questions that were developed by the expert Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group and based upon stakeholder involvement are presented for the Commission's consideration.

Recommended Action: That the Commission considers the responses to the four policy questions developed by the Bilingual Certification Work Group (BCAWG) and provide staff direction in creating a plan to revalidate bilingual certification routes.

Presenters: Susan Porter, Consultant
Marilynn Fairgood, Consultant

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

Report on Bilingual Certification Review

Background

Information Regarding the Demographics and Bilingual Instructional Settings of English Learners in California

The most recent data gathered by the California Department of Education (CDE) shows that there are just over 1.5 million English learners in California classrooms. This number comprises approximately 25% of the total K-12 student population in this state. Much research has been done to advance the field's knowledge regarding specialized pedagogy and instruction to facilitate English language development and literacy for students who have not yet mastered English.

From 1978 until passage of Proposition 227 in 1998, many school districts provided instruction for English learners in their primary language. Since the passage of Proposition 227 (Education Code Sections 300-340), districts have been required to deliver instruction to English learners primarily in English. Proposition 227 also requires that the parent of an English learner who wishes to have their child enrolled in an alternative program, including a bilingual education program, request a waiver in writing.

Just prior to the passage of Proposition 227, approximately 30% of English learners in California received bilingual instructional services. The most recent data collected by CDE showed that, for the 2004-2005 school year, 111,920 English learners received English Language Development (ELD) instruction and at least two periods of academic instruction in their primary language. During this same time period, another 337,031 students received ELD instruction with primary language support.

Despite a reduction in the numbers of children receiving bilingual services since 1998, the demand for bilingually certified teachers has actually increased. The U. S. Department of Education (2002) found that there were critical shortages of bilingually certified teachers, particularly in states with high numbers of English learners. In California, these regional shortages are so acute that incentives such as financial aid have been provided to prospective teachers wishing to pursue bilingual certification (California Student Aid Commission, 2005). Many districts with high percentages of English learners offer stipends to teacher who hold or are in the process of earning bilingual certification. Site and district administrators report that bilingually certified teachers are needed in bilingual and English immersion programs to coordinate services and assessments and to maintain home/school communication.

Currently, the Commission issues three authorizations for bilingual instructional services: the Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Certificate, the BCLAD Emphasis credential, and the Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Crosscultural Education.

The BCLAD Certificate can be earned by passing Tests 1 – 6 of the CLAD/BCLAD Examination. Tests 1, 2, and 3 (formerly known as CLAD) were recently revalidated and are now called the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Examination. These first three tests address the following knowledge, skills, and abilities: language structure and first- and second-language development; approaches and methods for English language development and specially-designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE); and culture and cultural diversity. SB 2042 Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs have the competencies for CTEL/BCLAD Tests 1 through 3 embedded in their coursework; therefore, teachers who hold this preliminary credential have also earned this equivalent English learner authorization. Prior authorizations issued by the Commission that are equivalent to CTEL/CLAD Tests 1 through 3 include the Multiple or Single Subject CLAD Emphasis credential and Language Development Specialist certification.

Tests 4 through 6 of the BCLAD Examination address the following three domains: methodology for primary language instruction, the culture of emphasis, and the language of emphasis—listening reading, speaking, and writing. The BCLAD Examinations (Tests 4 through 6) were developed for ten languages: Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese. BCLAD 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.

For experienced teachers, passing the BCLAD Examination is the only way to earn a BCLAD authorization. New teachers, on the other hand, can meet these competencies by earning a BCLAD Emphasis Credential or passing the BCLAD Examination. BCLAD Emphasis programs address all six domains of the CTEL and BCLAD Examination in their teacher preparation coursework. Emphasis credentials were originally issued under the Ryan credential standards. Bilingual certification is available in the following fourteen language authorizations via BCLAD Emphasis program routes: Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Punjabi, Portuguese, Laotian, and American Sign Language (ASL).

Appendix A provides a comparison of the numbers of BCLAD documents issued for each language to the ten highest numbers of K-12 students by language. Table A1 shows the number of English learners for the twelve most frequently spoken languages in the K-12 public schools, with “all other” signifying the numbers of English learners speaking other languages not listed in the chart. This is based upon data taken from the California Department of Education website for the 2004-2005 school year. Table A2 shows the total number of BCLAD Certificates and Emphasis Credentials issued, by language, between 1997 and 2004. Table A3 shows the number of BCLAD Certificates earned through examination routes, by language, for these years. Table

A4 shows the total number of BCLAD Emphasis Credentials (course route) issued, by language, from 1997-98 through 2003-04.

A Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Crosscultural Education is also available as an advanced authorization for teachers who already hold, or are in the process of earning, a bilingual credential or authorization. This authorization allows a teacher to teach course content in two languages in any K-12 settings. Therefore, it is a broader authorization than BCLAD certification. Currently, two institutions in the state have approved coursework for this specialist credential. The number of teachers who applied for the Specialist Instruction Credential has been less than five per year. The number of specialist instruction credential holders who renewed their credentials in 2005 totaled 127.

The Need to Update Bilingual Certification Routes

Test specifications for the Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD[®]) Examinations had not been updated since 1994, and BCLAD Emphasis program standards had not been updated since 1998. With the implementation of new teacher preparation standards under Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998), the Commission has continued to issue Multiple and Single Subjects BCLAD Emphasis credentials, pending the development of new standards and guidelines for new teachers who wish to pursue bilingual certification at the same time as their preliminary credential.

Commission staff completed a series of research activities to gather background information and to prepare to revalidate the bilingual certification requirements and BCLAD Examination. In the process of preparing for this update, Commission staff found that recent developments in legislation, credentialing requirements, and bilingual education program models in California could have considerable impact on bilingual teacher certification. Some of these developments included:

- SB 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) made significant changes to teacher credentialing pathways for California teachers. This legislation required teacher preparation programs and induction programs to respond to new standards developed by an expert panel appointed by the Commission. Standards for SB 2042 programs were approved by the Commission in September 2001. However, the panel did not develop standards for teaching in two languages, as this task was beyond their expertise.
- When the Commission adopted the SB 2042 teacher preparation standards, no provision was made for emphasis programs, including bilingual emphasis programs. There was intent to return to the development of standards for bilingual teacher preparation the following year. However, budgetary constraints prevented this activity. As a temporary measure, BCLAD Emphasis programs were required to respond to the SB 2042 standards by indicating any changes that were made to the program pursuant to the new program pursuant to SB 2042. Their responses were reviewed and approved by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Under the previous standards for BCLAD Emphasis program requirements, institutions had to incorporate competencies and assessments for bilingual teaching within Multiple/Single

Subject Teaching Credential programs while maintaining the statutory unit cap for a teacher preparation program. This requirement does not allow a program of coursework for the preliminary Single Subject or Multiple Subjects credentials to exceed the equivalent of a full time year of professional preparation. It has been challenging for institutions to develop high quality BCLAD Emphasis programs while maintaining the unit cap requirement.

- Alternatives to traditional bilingual instruction models are being implemented in greater frequency in California's public schools. For example, the number of two-way immersion programs has shown an 18% increase from 2003 to 2005 and 289% increase in the last 10 years, according to CDE data. Two-way or dual immersion programs require high academic language proficiency levels for bilingual teachers in both English and the target language. This trend may have created a need for proficiencies and skill levels not anticipated by the previous BCLAD standards. It is estimated that of those English learners who are currently receiving primary language instruction, 15,261 of these student are enrolled in two-way immersion programs. Another 13,121 native English speakers are also enrolled in two-way immersion programs statewide.
- The passage of Proposition 227, which specified that structured English immersion was to be the default model of instruction for English learners, which may have caused a reduction in the number of teachers pursuing bilingual certification since 1998.
- BCLAD Examinations are offered for ten languages. There are currently over fifty languages spoken in California classrooms. Additionally, regional needs for teachers to teach in lower incidence languages have increased. The Commission has received requests over the years to increase the number of languages for which bilingual certification is offered in order to accommodate these local needs.

Since spring 2003, Commission staff undertook several activities to determine the most feasible routes for bilingual teacher certification given the policies, legal and budgetary factors that have affected bilingual education and bilingual certification.

The first activity undertaken was to determine whether a test developed for another state might be aligned with BCLAD requirements for California teachers. By using a test already developed in another state, this would result in cost savings for the Commission and for California teachers pursuing bilingual certification via examination routes. The review of bilingual certification examinations developed by other states, conducted by volunteers with expertise in bilingual education, showed that the other states' exams and the BCLAD knowledge and skill areas were not aligned.

Additionally, an open pre-bidders teleconference was conducted to gain input from potential contractors regarding the availability of suitable exams. The teleconference did not yield any new alternatives or recommendations regarding existing exams for teachers of English learners in California.

In fall of 2003, staff met with educators from three institutions that offer BCLAD Emphasis programs and a county Bilingual Teacher Training Program Director to discuss the feasibility of

establishing a bilingual teacher certificate program option. The representatives were enthusiastic about the potential of such programs to provide appropriate training for bilingual teachers and to meet regional needs for employment of bilingual teachers. The group stated that standards for bilingual certification need to focus on strengthening language proficiency, including academic language proficiency, and that this could best be done by providing training and assessment through programs.

From January through March 2004, Commission staff met informally with stakeholders and experts in the field of bilingual education and certification to solicit feedback on the direction of bilingual teacher certification and to determine the most appropriate options for updating bilingual teacher certification.

Staff also attended the Bilingual Coordinators' Network (BCN) meeting conference in March of 2004 to update bilingual educators on policy issues pertaining to certification for teaching English learners. Staff conducted an informal survey with BCN members to gather input about bilingual certification and employment needs. This group of educators strongly supported program routes for bilingual teacher certification to meet local language and cultural needs.

Development of a Plan to Involve Stakeholders

At the October 1, 2004 Commission meeting, staff presented an information item that reported on the findings from the above staff activities. This agenda item articulated four policy questions for the Commission to consider relevant to bilingual certification, based upon the research and expert information received by staff:

1. Should the Commission explore alternatives to current routes to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?
2. How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?
3. Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?
4. How should newer models of instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?

The Commission directed staff to return to the February 1, 2005 meeting with a plan for answering the policy questions that outlined a process for including stakeholder participation.

At the February 1, 2005 Commission meeting, staff presented several options for gathering stakeholder participation and for addressing the four policy questions related to bilingual certification. The tentative plan included the convening of an expert work group to assimilate stakeholder feedback from a statewide survey and from stakeholder meetings. This work group would then develop recommendations to the four policy questions for Commission consideration. No action was taken on the February, 2005 agenda item, and a decision was

deferred until the March 10, 2005 meeting. The Commission directed staff to bring additional information to the March meeting on the procedure for recruiting and selecting members of the expert work group.

A March 10, 2005 agenda item was deferred until the April 14, 2005 meeting. At the April 2005 meeting, the Commission tentatively agreed to proceed with a plan for answering the four policy questions with the stipulation that staff provide more details on the options for seeking stakeholder input, including estimated costs for each option.

At the June 1, 2005 Commission meeting, staff presented a more detailed plan with several options for addressing the four policy questions related to bilingual certification routes. The Commission elected to proceed with a three-part plan for addressing the four policy questions related to bilingual certification:

1. A statewide survey, to be mailed to interested stakeholders and posted on the Commission website, which would solicit feedback from K-12 educators, teacher preparation programs, and the public regarding bilingual certification issues;
2. Five regional stakeholder meetings, to be held in various locations around the state to gather public comments and suggestions related to bilingual certification; and
3. A supported work group, consisting of 12-15 experts in the field, that would meet for four two day meetings to discuss recommendations for the Commission to consider on how to answer the four policy questions.

Stakeholder Involvement Plan Implementation

Selection of the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group Members

At the 2005 May-June Commission meeting, the Commission approved the establishment of a fifteen member Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group and adopted a modified selection process for the appointment of individuals to the work group. Under the supervision of the Executive Director, the staff was directed to solicit nominations from appropriate organizations, institutions, agencies, individuals and members of the public and to develop a list of applicants who fulfill specific requirements for expertise and diversity.

In the process of selecting nominees for recommendation for consideration for the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group (BCAWG), the nominee review committee used the following two documents as guides:

1. The CCTC Panel Policy and Procedures Guide, adopted by the Commission in November of 2002.
2. Agenda Item 6D of the May 31 – June 1, 2005 Commission meeting, “Bilingual Certification Review Plan” that outlined procedures for panel selection and review.

The committee reviewed 46 nomination/applications for the BCAWG that were submitted.

Three meetings were held to review applications on July 14th, July 28th, and July 29th 2005, as follows:

- *July 14th through July 27th*
 - Task 1: Orientation of Committee Members
 - Task 2: First Individual Review of Nominations/Applications
 - Task 3: Second Individual Review of Nominations/Applications

- *July 28th*
 - Task 4: Group Review and Discussion of Applications and Comparison of Independent Reviews

- *July 29th*
 - Task 5: Balancing the Recommended Work Group List
 - Task 6: Final Recommendations Determined by the Review Committee

The final list of recommendations was sent to the Executive Director on August 9, 2005. Commissioners had until September 2nd to comment on the list of recommended members. Following consideration by the Commissioners, a notification of appointment was mailed to work group members in early September, 2005. Appendix B includes the names and affiliations of the work group members selected by the Executive Director.

Online Bilingual Certification Survey

In advance of the newly-appointed BCAWG, the Commission posted a survey to solicit responses from the public. The Bilingual Certification Survey was posted on the Commission web page on August 29, 2005 and closed on September 26, 2005. The survey contained questions regarding the four policy questions being considered by members of the BCAWG. There were twenty survey questions with responses on a four point Likert scale (0= 'don't know' 1 = 'strongly disagree' 2 = 'disagree' 3 = 'agree' and 4 = 'strongly agree'). Three open-ended questions were also included for gathering additional information. Demographic information for each respondent (gender, ethnicity, primary language, region, and role in bilingual education) was also included in the survey. For ease of use, the survey was designed so that stakeholders could respond either on line or by downloading a PDF file and faxing or mailing responses to the Commission.

A total of 350 surveys were completed. Demographic information on survey respondents is provided in Appendix C. For each question survey results show how many of the 350 respondents chose a response other than "I don't know." Appendix C also provides the average of the responses and the standard deviation of the responses.

Summary of findings of the on line survey

Although there were some differences of opinion across the various constituent groups about the most pressing needs in bilingual education, three points were strongly expressed by those completing the survey:

1. There is a need for personnel with bilingual certification authorizations.
2. There should be multiple pathways and certification options and opportunities available to individuals seeking a bilingual authorization, particularly for experienced teachers.
3. The current bilingual examination should be revisited and updated.

It should be noted that a majority of stakeholder meeting attendees identified the same points during the public meetings as described below.

Stakeholder Meetings

Staff initially prepared for the stakeholder meetings in accordance with the plan adopted by the Commission at the June 1, 2005 meeting. This plan proposed that five meetings would be held between July 15 and November 30, 2005. CTC staff had planned to publicize the regional stakeholder meetings via e-mail to county offices of education and through teacher preparation programs, to be disseminated to local schools and other constituents where stakeholder meetings would be held. However, CTC staff discovered that many of these offices and schools were not staffed during the summer months, so publicizing the stakeholder meetings would be nearly impossible. Additionally, many of the individuals who were interested in attending these meetings would not be available during the proposed time period because of family vacations. For these reasons, staff rescheduled the four meetings from September, 2005 to January, 2006.

A second change to the adopted plan occurred as a result of overwhelming requests and support from the field to hold additional stakeholder meetings. In one instance, stakeholders in Sacramento requested an additional meeting after the first was held on September 30, 2005. Attendees at this first stakeholder meeting expressed concerns that there was not enough advance notice provided to parents and K-12 teachers who wished to attend the Sacramento meeting. Staff response to this concern was to hold a second stakeholder meeting in Sacramento on January 28, 2006. In two other instances, institutions of higher education invited Commission staff to hold additional stakeholder meetings in Southern California, and generously offered meeting space and support for the extra meetings. The University of California, Riverside hosted a meeting the day after the one was held at the Los Angeles County Office of Education on October 26, 2005, so that stakeholders in San Bernardino, Riverside, and other Inland Empire communities could attend. Similarly, CSU San Marcos hosted a meeting the day after the scheduled meeting held at San Diego County Office of Education on December 14, 2005, so that stakeholders from North San Diego County were able to participate. These additional meetings greatly expanded the locations and opportunities for those who wished to participate, with negligible fiscal impact to the Commission.

A total number of eight stakeholder meetings were held throughout the state. Table 1 below, shows the dates and locations of each of the stakeholder meetings.

Meeting Date	Location	Total number of participants
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------------

September 30, 2005	Sacramento (Commission offices)	20
October 26, 2005	Los Angeles (Los Angeles COE)	26
October 27, 2005	Inland Empire (UC Riverside Extension offices)	59
November 2, 2005	East Bay (Alameda COE)	25
December 14, 2005	San Diego (San Diego COE)	36
December 15, 2005	North San Diego County (CSU San Marcos)	17
January 12, 2006	Fresno (Fresno State U.)	14
January 28, 2006	Sacramento (CSU Sacramento)	52
	Total	249

Table 1: Stakeholder meeting dates, locations, and number of participants

The design of the stakeholder meetings was based upon a focus group format. Depending upon the number of stakeholders attending a given meeting, participants were divided into breakout groups so that the discussion questions were discussed in groups having no more than eight individuals. It was decided that this small group format would be preferable to having individuals address the larger group to allow greater opportunities for all attending stakeholders to participate. For example, parents and other individuals not accustomed to addressing a large audience might be more likely to participate in the smaller discussion group. CTC staff began each stakeholder meeting with a brief introduction and orientation, then facilitated break-out groups of four to eight stakeholder participants. Depending upon the number of stakeholders in attendance, work group members, Commissioners in attendance, or other volunteers would also facilitate a break-out group. These facilitators asked five questions for group discussion—four of which were modeled after the four policy questions. A fifth question asked participants to express any other concerns or offer other suggestions relative to bilingual certification that had not been addressed in the responses and discussions regarding the other four questions. Group responses to each of the five questions were written by a note taker for each group, and then shared in a report out of all groups after the breakout sessions. An individual participant could also write responses to the five questions, or submit any other written testimony regarding bilingual certification, and submit these to Commission staff. The individual responses were added to the group stakeholder data, and all data from the stakeholder meetings was forwarded to the expert work group (BCAWG) for its consideration. An overview of the group responses for each stakeholder meeting was posted on the Commission’s Bilingual Certification web page: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/bilingual-cert.html>.

In addition to the data collected from the group responses described above, the work group members elected to add another data collection method for stakeholder input. Work group members designed a stakeholder questionnaire, to be filled out by individual stakeholder meeting participants and tabulated separately from the group responses. This questionnaire was also posted on the Commission’s Bilingual Certification web page, along with the facilitator guidelines, so that stakeholder meetings could be held for parents and other stakeholders who were not able to attend a Commission-sponsored stakeholder meeting. This questionnaire was first used at the Los Angeles stakeholder meeting, and at each subsequent meeting. The data from the completed questionnaires were analyzed by work group members to inform their recommendations to the Commission regarding the four policy questions.

Summary of findings of the stakeholder groups

The group data and the questionnaire data gathered from the stakeholder meetings were highly consistent with the findings of the on line survey. These data showed that most stakeholders were in favor of the following changes to bilingual certification routes:

1. Multiple, flexible, yet rigorous routes to bilingual certification should be available to already-credentialed teachers.
2. Bilingual certification requirements should include components within SB 2042 preliminary credential pathways, including performance assessments and an induction requirement specific to bilingual classroom settings.
3. The Commission should allow for an increased number of language authorizations for bilingual certification depending upon local needs. Language assessments for less commonly taught languages could be addressed through assessor agencies (a route currently available for Portuguese BCLAD certification) and the use of other language proficiency tests developed for other purposes, as long as they were accepted by the Commission as meeting all of the language proficiency requirements for bilingual certification.
4. Most stakeholders agreed that bilingual certification should require the teacher to be knowledgeable about models of primary language instruction, including dual immersion. Many individual stakeholders and groups felt that it was necessary to expand the bilingual specialist credential to address the following needs in California schools: programs aiming for advanced levels of biliteracy; teachers working in secondary bilingual settings; and/or administrators of bilingual/English learner programs.

It should be emphasized that these are the broader findings of the stakeholder meetings based upon the combined group data, questionnaire data, individual testimony, and public comments. Table 2 shows the number of stakeholders that took part in these various activities and provided information that the work group considered prior to responding to the four policy questions related to bilingual certification. A summary of the proceedings of each stakeholder meeting can be found on the Bilingual Certification web page: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/bilingual-cert.html>.

Table 2: Total Number of Stakeholder Participants (by Activity) Who Provided Feedback on Bilingual Certification

Stakeholder Activity	Number of Participants
Bilingual survey	350
Stakeholder meetings	249
Forum questionnaires	330
Total Number of Stakeholder Participants	929

Proceedings of the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group

The Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group (BCAWG) met four times, on the following dates:

October 13 – 14, 2005
November 16 – 17, 2005
February 7 – 8, 2006
March 21 – 22, 2006

All four meetings were held in Sacramento at the Commission offices. Each work group meeting was held in public, with specific times set aside at each meeting for public comment. At the beginning of the first meeting, the work group members agreed that all findings, procedures, and recommendations put forth by the work group should be reached by consensus. One of the nominees selected for the work group could not fulfill the commitment over the six month commitment time period, and excused himself from the BCAWG prior to the first meeting. Based upon strong recommendations from the work group members and from the field, it was decided that the work group needed more representation from Southeast Asian languages and culture. For this reason, an expert in Vietnamese language and culture was selected to replace the excused BCAWG member for the remaining three work group meetings.

In addition to the voting work group members, a liaison from the California Department of Education attended each BCAWG meeting and provided expertise in bilingual education policy and programs. Two Commissioners served as liaisons and also attended a work group meeting. They were also kept informed of the work group proceedings and of preliminary policy recommendations in the course of the BCAWG's deliberations. The Commission liaisons also attended the October 13-14, 2005 meeting and the Los Angeles and Riverside stakeholder meetings held in October.

The charge to the panel is shown in Table 3:

Table 3: Charge to the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group

To synthesize feedback from the public regarding bilingual certification in accordance with the plan adopted by the Commission, as well as research and best practices from field of education, to answer the following four policy questions relevant to bilingual certification for California teachers:

1. Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers
2. How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?
3. Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?
4. How should newer models of instruction be considered in the development of

updated requirements for bilingual certification?

The Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group is to develop recommendations to the above policy questions, and provide other information considered essential and relevant to revising bilingual certification for California teachers, for CTC staff to present to the Commission for their consideration no later than Spring, 2006.

In addition to the online survey data and the stakeholder feedback gathered from the statewide stakeholder meetings, the work group also considered information provided by experts in the field of bilingual education and education policy to assist them in making relevant and timely recommendations to the policy questions. These expert presentations addressed the following topics relevant to bilingual certification:

1. Demographic trends for California's school age population, including numbers of English learners by grade and language;
2. Best practices for teachers of English learners;
3. Research-based bilingual program models for English learners;
4. Unique challenges and possible solutions for providing quality bilingual certification programs in less commonly taught languages (LCTLs)
5. Innovative and experimental programs that prepare bilingual certification teachers in ways that address high literacy rates for children, or that address local and regional needs in unique ways.

Recommendations by the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group Relative to the Four Policy Questions

The work group developed the following recommendations to the four policy questions for the Commission's consideration. For those recommendations that are currently within the Commission's purview, Education Code and/or Title 5 Regulations are cited. Recommendations that would require changes in law or regulations are noted with an asterisk (*).

Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?

Teachers who hold a credential that does not authorize them to teach in a bilingual classroom may add a bilingual teaching authorization by passing the Bilingual Crosscultural and Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Examination. The work group considered whether an examination route should be the only route to earn a bilingual authorization for those teachers already credentialed (as is the current policy) or whether there should be additional routes to bilingual certification, such as completion of a program of coursework, or a combination of both coursework and passage of an examination.

Policy Question 1: Work Group Recommendations:

A	<p>For currently credentialed teachers, BCAWG recommends that the current prerequisites to earning bilingual authorizations should continue for future bilingual authorizations issued by CCTC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Candidates must possess a valid credential or permit as authorized in Title 5 Regulations, Section 80015.2(a) 2. Candidates must hold an English learner authorization (CLAD authorization or equivalent) as authorized in Title 5 Regulations, Section 80015.1.
B	<p>The BCAWG recommends that a Certificate of Staff Development, as outlined in Education Code § 44253.10, should also be considered for partial fulfillment of the English learner authorization prerequisite outlined in A-2, above.*</p>
C	<p>The BCAWG recommends that the Commission revalidate the six domains currently specified in the Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development examinations and authorizations as outlined in Education Code §44253.5(c). <i>It should be noted that Domains 1 – 3 have been already revalidated through establishment of the California Teachers of English Learners Examination (CTEL):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First- and second-language development and the structure of language, 2. Methodology of English language development and specially designed content instruction in English 3. Culture and cultural diversity 4. Methodology of content instruction in the pupil’s primary language 5. Knowledge of the culture associated with a specific language group 6. Competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited-English-proficient pupils in California. <p>These domains, once revalidated, would be satisfied by all candidates wishing to pursue bilingual certification in California.</p>
D	<p>Requirements for Domain 4, “methodology of content instruction in the pupil’s primary language”, could be met through examination, CCTC-accepted IHE coursework, or CCTC-approved professional development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is recommended that the Commission review and revalidate the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) of the current methodology component.

Policy Question 1: Work Group Recommendations:	
E	<p>The requirements for Domain 5, “culture associated with a specific language group” could be met through examination, Commission-accepted IHE coursework, or Commission-approved professional development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is recommended that the Commission review and revalidate the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) of the current cultural component of the BCLAD Examination.
F	<p>The requirements for Domain 6, “competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited-English-proficient pupils in California” could be met in any of the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The candidate passes a CCTC-approved examination (example, Test 6 of the current BCLAD Examination). This is currently authorized in Education Code Section 44253.6. 2. The candidate holds a California Single Subject or Standard Secondary Teaching Credential with a major in the language to be authorized. This is currently authorized in Title 5, Section 80015.1(4)(B). 3. The candidate has earned a higher education degree from a foreign institution in which the instruction is delivered in the language to be authorized. This is currently authorized in Title 5, Section 80015.1 (4)(A). 4. The candidate has passed the language portion of the CSET Language Other Than English (LOTE) examination.*

Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

Under the Ryan Credential structure, program standards were developed specifically for BCLAD Emphasis programs so that teacher candidates could earn a bilingual authorization in addition to their Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential. The work group considered whether teacher candidates should be able to continue to earn a bilingual authorization as part of their credential program requirements within the SB 2042 credential structure, or whether candidates should earn bilingual authorization through a concurrent program. The Commission currently issues Multiple and Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis SB 2042 Credentials pending the update of bilingual certification pathways for new and experienced teachers.

Policy Question 2: Work Group Recommendations	
A	<p>The BCAWG recommends that the Commission develops bilingual teacher preparation program standards that align with SB 2042 Standards and include the following knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current research and best practices related to pedagogy, first and second language development, linguistics, and biliteracy. 2. Current legislation and policies pertaining to second language learners and teacher preparation. 3. Bilingual program models, (e.g., transitional, two-way/dual language immersion, foreign language, maintenance, etc.). 4. Other instructional program settings for English Learners, including those that provide specialized English language development instruction for secondary students. 5. Social, economic and cultural contexts of the target community. 6. Student teaching or internship in bilingual instructional settings with English Learners in K-12 public schools.
B	<p>Maintain existing multiple pathways to earn a bilingual credential that include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program coursework (e.g., university programs, blended programs, and internships), and 2. CCTC-approved language competency, culture and pedagogy examinations.
C	<p>Develop a form of the teaching performance assessment (TPA) that is appropriate to measure teaching in a bilingual setting.</p>
D	<p>Develop induction support for bilingual teachers in the following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support will continue from the preliminary credential through induction to the professional clear credential, 2. Support will include assignment of a bilingual support provider when available, and 3. Complete SB 2042 Induction Standard 19 in a bilingual educational context when available.

Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?

Currently, there are ten language authorizations available through the BCLAD Examination and a total of fourteen language authorizations available through BCLAD Emphasis programs yet over fifty different languages are spoken in California classrooms. In an attempt to address the regional needs for bilingual teachers to provide instruction in less commonly taught languages

the BCAWG recommends that the Commission increase the number of authorizations from that currently issued for bilingual credential authorizations.

In an attempt to address the needs of all English learners, the BCAWG explored ways that would allow the Commission to expand the number of language authorizations for bilingual certification, yet maintain rigor and flexibility for bilingual certification in Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs).

Policy Question 3: Work Group Recommendations	
A	The BCAWG recommends there would not be a limit to the number of languages for which the Commission could provide bilingual authorizations. Additionally, the work group advises that all recommendations outlined in Policy Questions 1 and 2 are also applicable to those candidates wishing to pursue a bilingual authorization in a LCTL.
B	<p>Candidates for the LCTLs must satisfy the requirements for the six domains currently outlined in Education Code §44253.5(c):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First- and second-language development and the structure of language, 2. Methodology of English language development and specially designed content instruction in English, 3. Culture and cultural diversity, 4. Methodology of content instruction in the pupil’s primary language, 5. Knowledge of the culture associated with a specific language group, and 6. Competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited-English-proficient pupils in California.
C	Maintain language competency examinations in those languages that are currently offered in the BCLAD Examinations, maintaining rigor in the target language competency in accordance with CCTC approved standards. The exams should include listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation ability, as well as communicative and academic language skills.
D	Maintain the current KSAs for language competence for the current BCLAD Examinations.
E	Currently, BCLAD examinations are only offered in LCTLs only one time per year. BCAWG recommends that language competency examinations for less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) should be administered at least twice a year.

Policy Question 3: Work Group Recommendations	
F	<p><i>For language examinations not currently available through the CCTC-approved testing contractor and/or not administered at least twice a year:</i></p> <p>The CCTC could consider the establishment of language panels for the development of assessment criteria and test specifications for the LCT language competencies.*</p>
G	<p>Outside agencies (e.g., county offices of education, institutions of higher education) may develop one examination per target language, to be approved by CCTC for each of the less commonly taught languages, with the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CCTC would be responsible for initial and on-going review and revalidation of these examinations, and 2. CCTC approved language exams would be accepted by all institutions that offer teacher preparation programs as meeting the language proficiency requirement for bilingual certification.*
H	<p>Outside agencies (e.g., ACTFL, Defense Language Institute) could develop and administer examinations for each of the less commonly taught languages. Passing scores on these examinations would fulfill Domain 6 requirements and would be accepted by all institutions offering bilingual certification in that target language.*</p>

Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?

The knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the current BCLAD have not been updated since 1994. Since that time, two-way or dual immersion models of bilingual education instruction have become more predominant in California bilingual education classrooms. Some experts report that higher degrees of language proficiency are required for these newer instructional models, and that other knowledge, skills, and abilities are required besides those needed for traditional bilingual instruction models. The work group members considered whether two-way immersion models of instruction should require a different kind of authorization and whether a specialist credential would be more appropriate for teaching in two-way immersion classrooms.

Policy Question 4: Work Group Recommendations	
A	<p>Bilingual certification should continue to authorize teachers to deliver instruction in all bilingual program models.</p>

Policy Question 4: Work Group Recommendations	
B	Review and revalidate guidelines and standards for the current Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Crosscultural Education, as authorized in Education Code §44265, based upon a current job analysis and changes in policies, program models and methodologies in bilingual education. Guidelines for the new authorization could consider the structures of the Reading Certificate (Education Code §44254) and the Reading Specialist Credential (Education Code §44265).
C	Consider exemplary professional development models and experimental programs in the development of the bilingual specialist credentials.

Additional Considerations by the Work Group

Although the BCAWG recognizes that a formal recommendation outside the parameters of the four policy questions is not within its purview, based upon committee deliberations and a preponderance of stakeholder testimony, the BCAWG felt compelled to suggest the following for possible consideration for future development:

Additional Considerations
<p><i>Consideration 1</i></p> <p>Develop a credential that would meet the need articulated for teachers of English language development in a departmentalized setting, particularly at the secondary level.</p>
<p><i>Consideration 2</i></p> <p>Develop a bilingual/biliteracy emphasis certificate for other service and teaching credentials (e.g., Administration, School Psychologist, Special Education, etc.).</p>

Possible Next Steps

Staff proposes that the Commission consider the recommendations of the Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group as it proceeds with a plan to update bilingual certification routes for California teachers. Should the Commission wish to act upon the recommendations of the BCAWG, the following activities could be begun to implement some or all of the work group’s recommendations:

1. Reconvene the BCAWG or convene a new advisory work group for the purpose of updating standards for new and experienced teachers. These new standards would need to be based upon a job analysis and would require field validation before they are adopted by the Commission. This work group would also update bilingual specialist credential requirements, based on the job analysis and validation study.
2. Work with NES, the test contractor for the BCLAD examination, to explore revalidation of the three tests that make up the BCLAD Examination. It is anticipated that Test 6 of the BCLAD, which assesses language proficiency, may not need to be validated for most of the nine languages that are assessed as part of this examination. Commission staff would also work with the testing contractor to gather information on the costs associated with increasing the number of yearly administrations for Test 6 for less commonly taught languages.

Should the Commission wish to adopt any of the proposed recommendations, staff is prepared to develop a detailed plan for proceeding with updating bilingual certification routes for new and experienced teachers wishing to teach English learners in their primary language in California schools. This plan would include feasibility issues of implementing a plan, such as timelines and cost estimates, and could be brought to the next Commission meeting.

Appendix A:
**Languages Spoken in California Schools and Bilingual
Certifications Issued (1997-2004)**

**Table A1: Most Frequently Occurring Languages of English Learners in
California Schools**

Table A2: Total BCLAD Authorizations Issued (1997-2004)

Table A3: BCLAD Certificates (Exam route) Issued (1997-2004)

Table A4: BCLAD Credentials (Course route) Issued (1997-2004)

Appendix A: Languages Spoken in California Schools and Bilingual Certifications Issued (1997-2004)

**Table A1: 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/ Cambodia	Punjabi	Russian	Arabic	All Other
2002-2003	1,348,934	36,574	25,199	24,004	20,650	17,627	12,105	11,727	11,360	8,751	7,980	7,751	66,880
2003-2004	1,359,792	34,444	23,423	22,867	20,895	17,132	11,347	10,660	10,011	8,977	7,654	7,556	63,777
2004-2005	1,357,778	34,333	22,776	22,475	20,939	16,463	11,825	9,698	9,563	9,259	7,678	7,646	61,092

**Table A2: Total BCLAD Authorizations Issued 1997-98 through 2003-04
(Certificate, Emphasis, & Internship Credentials Combined)**

	Spanish	Hmong	Cantonese	Korean	Vietnamese	Armenian	Mandarin	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Chinese	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Portuguese	Laotian
1997-2004	11,676	142	129	82	51	26	37	23	21	11	6	5	3

**Table A3: BCLAD Certificates Issued 1997-98 through 2003-04
(Available through exam route for new and experienced teachers)**

	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	
2003-04	434		7	6	3		4	1	4			1
TOTAL	2,637	3	46	41	17	25	29	8	18	2	3	5

**Table A4: BCLAD Emphasis Credentials Issued 1997-98 through 2003-04
(Available through course routes for newly credentialed bilingual teachers only)**

	Spanish	Hmong	Cantonese	Korean	Vietnamese	Armenian	Mandarin	Tagalog/ Pilipino	Chinese	Khmer/ Cambodian	Punjabi	Laotian
1997-98	1,243	23	15	4+1			3	11		2	2	2
1998-99	1,061	12	16	5	2			1	1	2		
1999-00	1,067	12	16	5	8				1	1		
2000-01	1,246	26	9	3	4					2		
2001-02	1,549	30	11	6	6		2	1		1		1
2002-03	1,291	22	5	3	5	1	1	2	1			
2003-04	1,482	14	11	14	9		2			1	1	
TOTAL	9,039	139	83	41	34	1	8	15	3	9	3	3

* 731 Spanish and 1 Korean credentials were issued based on completion of Internship programs

Appendix B:
Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group Members

Bilingual Advisory Work Group Members

1. Estella Acosta *Orange County Office of Education*
2. Ruth Barajas *Woodland Joint Unified School District*
3. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan *San Diego State University*
4. Sara Fields *Culver City Unified School District*
5. Claudia Lockwood *San Joaquin County Office of Education*
6. Teresa Marquez-Lopez *University of California, Riverside*
7. Marjo Mitsutomi *University of Redlands*
8. Huong Tran Nguyen *California State University, Long Beach*
9. Margaret Olebe *California State University, Office of the Chancellor*
10. Lettie Ramirez *California State University, East Bay*
11. Lilia Romero *Pasadena Unified School District*
12. Alexander Sapiens *San Jose State University*
13. Sandra Villegas-Duvanich *Chula Vista Elementary School District*
14. Gay Q. Yuen *California State University, Los Angeles*
15. Charles Zartman *California State University, Chico*

Appendix C:
Demographics of Respondents to Online Survey
and
Responses to Multiple-Choice Questions

