

## COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING

1000 STREET  
SACRAMENTO 95814

(916) 445-0184

78-7901

Dear :

I am pleased to send you a copy of the final report on the Commission's Bilingual Workshop of June 5-6, 1978 in which you were a participant. The report, including the staff recommendations on pages 11 and 12, was accepted by the Commission at its July 7th meeting. It is sent to you, in the spirit of the workshop itself, which was, in part, to ensure that practitioners in the field of bilingual education are informed of Commission activity and decisions in bilingual education.

Any further suggestions or information you may wish to share with us would certainly be appreciated. These would be made available to the panels yet to be constituted and convened which are mentioned in the staff recommendations of the report. Please send any further suggestions you may have to Dr. Gustavo Getner, our Bilingual Coordinator.

Again, I thank you, on behalf of the Commission, for your contributions to the workshop.

---

Sincerely,

Peter L. LoPresti  
Executive Secretary

Enclosure

REPORT ON THE BILINGUAL WORKSHOP  
HELD BY THE COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING  
AT WOODLAKE QUALITY INN, SACRAMENTO  
JUNE 5-6, 1978

I. Background

On March 2, 1978, representatives from the University of California, Berkeley, California State University, Hayward, San Mateo County Office of Education, and Merced County Office of Education met with the Programs Committee to request a conference on bilingual education, involving representatives of local education agencies and institutions of higher education assessing for the Certificate of Competence. One month later, May 2, 1978, a planning committee consisting of representatives from the University of California, Berkeley, California State University, Hayward, University of Southern California, San Jose State University, Fresno County Office of Education, San Diego County Office of Education, Oakland Unified School District, Los Angeles County Office of Education, Tulare County Office of Education, and the State Department of Education met at the Commission offices to offer suggestions on the proposed bilingual conference. This committee identified eleven topics to be discussed at the conference. At that time, tentative dates of June 5-6, 1978 were set for the conference.

On May 12th, a letter went out to the field inviting each local education agency approved to assess for the Certificate of Competence and each institution of higher education having a Commission-approved bilingual program to send one delegate to the conference, to be held at the Woodlake Quality Inn, Sacramento.

On May 15th, a staff coordinator and a part-time consultant were assigned the task of making the arrangements for the workshop. These arrangements included deciding how the issues were to be presented, selecting presenters for the workshop, and making provisions for the workshop to be held at the Woodlake Quality Inn.

## II. Description of Workshop

There were eighty-five participants at the workshop, including twenty-one presenters. This large group was divided into six subgroups to facilitate discussion and interaction. Each subgroup, consisting of LEA and IHE representatives, had a Commission staff person assigned to it as facilitator.

The two major questions to be dealt with at the workshop were 1) issues related to the Certificate of Competence, and 2) the possible revision of the Emphasis and Specialist guidelines. The original plan was to deal with them in a manner that would allow for the maximum discussion and resolution of problems: presentation of topic, either by a speaker or a panel and/or demonstration to the entire workshop, subsequent discussion by small groups (of ten participants) and later, a report to the full conference, at which time further refinement of recommendations and resolutions would take place. This plan was modified in the interest of time when the agenda was finalized, although the basic idea remained.

Further, drastic changes were made in both days' schedule because of the pressure of time. In spite of these scheduling changes, and others, in the format of presentations and personnel making the presentations, staff made no changes in the objectives or in the evaluation instrument designed to evaluate those objectives. (See Appendix A for Workshop Program.)

## III. Evaluation of the Workshop

A two-part evaluation instrument was developed by Commission staff prior to the workshop (see Appendix B). It was designed to elicit two types of responses from participants: a) an indication of the degree to which the thirty workshop objectives were achieved, according to the following three-point scale: 1--achieved; 2--partially achieved; 3--not achieved; b) responses to four questions which focused on the overall evaluation of the workshop.

For convenience of administration, the evaluation instrument was divided into two parts, A and B. Part A encompassed eighteen objectives, to be covered during the first day of the workshop, and Part B twelve objectives, to be covered during the second day, and the four evaluation questions.

A. Analysis of Evaluation Data

1. The following is a summary of the evaluative responses given by the workshop participants. Thirty-four A forms and thirty-one B forms were submitted to CTPL staff by the workshop participants. The following is a summary of responses to the four questions and their subparts:
  - 83% indicated that the time allocated to achieving workshop goals was unrealistic.
  - 63% supported the focus placed on workshop topics.
  - 80% agreed that the topics selected were the ones that most needed attention.
  - 56% indicated that important topics had been omitted.
  - 55% believed the workshop was timely and on target.
  - 42% indicated the workshop was reasonably relevant.
  - 3% felt the workshop was irrelevant.
2. There were twenty-one objectives designed to inform participants of bilingual issues. The information was provided via panelists, speakers, and reports made available to the participants.

---

Of those responding:
  - 40% indicated that those twenty-one objectives had been fully achieved.
  - 39% believed that those twenty-one objectives had been partially achieved.
  - 21% stated that those twenty-one objectives had not been achieved.
3. There were nine objectives related to making recommendations about the workshop issues.

---

Of those responding:
  - 24% stated that those nine objectives had been partially achieved.

- 36% stated that those nine objectives had been partially achieved.
- 24% indicated that those objectives had not been achieved.
- 16% did not respond to those objectives.

B. Summary of Evaluation

1. Workshop participants rated the degree of achievement of information objectives higher than the objectives related to recommendations to the Commission (79% to 60%).
2. The majority of respondents (83%) indicated that the time allocated to achieve the thirty conference objectives was unrealistic.
3. The majority of delegates (80%) agreed that the topics selected for workshop discussion were those that most needed attention.
4. The workshop was endorsed by the majority of respondents (97%) as being either timely and on target or reasonably relevant.

C. Staff Comment on the Evaluation

Staff was aware that of the two broad issues covered at the workshop: the Certificate of Competence and the Revision of the Emphasis and Specialist Guidelines, the former would be of greater interest to the local education agencies, and the latter to the institutions. However, ~~small grouping was made deliberately heterogeneous~~ so as to encourage interaction and sharing by these two entities. Since responses were not coded, it is impossible to tell, if there was any difference in the rating of objectives related to one or the other of the two issues by the two different entities (LEAs and IHEs).

In setting the tone for the workshop, broad goals were outlined in an introductory statement. They were: 1) to inform participants of all issues related to implementing the Certificate of Competence (at LEAs and IHEs); 2) to have participants make recommendations to the Commission on the implementation of the Certificate of Competence; 3) to discuss the possible revision of the Emphasis and Specialist Guidelines; 4) to have the group suggest a forum at which the guidelines might be revised; 5) to give participants

the feeling that their participation was meaningful; 6) to make all participants aware of the general state of the art in bilingual teacher certification.

Judging by the formal evaluations, it could be concluded that the objective of informing participants was generally achieved, that the objective related to recommendations to the Commission was less well achieved (60% of the responses indicated that it was either fully or partially achieved). Informal evaluation by participants, included the suggestion of a further meeting for revision of the Emphasis and Specialist guidelines, a feeling of being meaningfully involved in discussing the issues, and of generally being made aware of the state of the art and its complexities.

It was stated several times before the full workshop, and often, informally, that getting local education agencies and institutions of higher education to share their experience and concerns at the same bilingual workshop was a major accomplishment.

Staff was not satisfied with the efficiency level of the workshop and its effectiveness. It was hoped (perhaps unrealistically) that the product for Commission consideration--recommendations--would be more definitive. However, it is hoped that subsequent smaller panels will refine recommendations to a more implementable stage.

#### IV. Recommendations and Comments by Discussion Groups

Recommendations and comments were supposed to reflect the degree to which participants accepted the recommendations by Commission staff included in the two monitoring reports: one on the monitoring of the Certificate of Competence at local education agencies and the other at institutions of higher education, and any other recommendations or comments participants chose to make to the Commission on the Certificate of Competence and the possible revisions that should be made to the Bilingual Emphasis and Specialist Guidelines, as a result of the impact of the Certificate of Competence on these two credential programs.

A. The staff recommendations included in the monitoring report of the Certificate of Competence at LEAs are included with comments indicating agreement or disagreement by the small groups with these recommendations:

1. That the assessment process should proceed, as approved, during 1978-79, except as otherwise stated in recommendations 2 and 4.

(3 groups agreed.)

2. That LEAs be required to develop multiple forms of instruments presently used.

(4 groups agreed.)

3. That no standardization of instruments be considered at the present time since the assessment process, as approved, is identifying qualified candidates for the Certificate of Competence.

(3 groups agreed, 1 group wanted it modified.)

4. That the assessment for oral language proficiency for each candidate be for a minimum of twenty minutes in length and in the language of the target population, and that it be audiotaped as is presently the case.

(3 groups agreed; 1 group did not understand.)

5. That culture competency No. 4 and language competency No. 6 be reviewed with the participants at the two-day workshop in May for retention, modification or deletion.

(2 groups agreed that the competencies should be reviewed; 1 group had reservations.)

6. That the monitoring process should proceed, as approved, during 1978-79, except as otherwise stated in recommendations 7 and 8.

(3 groups agreed; 2 groups disagreed.)

- 
7. That a survey of the classroom performance of candidates recommended for the Certificate of Competence be conducted in order to validate the assessment process.

(2 groups agreed; 4 groups disagreed.)

8. That a body external to the Commission and the LEAs review audiotapes to determine reliability of scoring.

(1 group agreed; 5 disagreed.)

9. That the Commission approve up to three LEAs to operate with a panel of three (3) members, on a pilot basis, to study the feasibility of reducing panel membership from five to three.

The panel to consist of one bilingual-credentialed classroom teacher; one full-time higher education faculty; and one community lay person who is bilingual and biliterate. Decisions to recommend for the Certificate of Competence to be by unanimous vote.

(5 groups agreed.)

B. Comments by Discussion Groups

1. Language tapes should be retained for at least one year.
  2. The reduction of interview panels from five to three should be optional (4 groups).
  3. Language competency No. 6 should be reworded to require a sound knowledge of language acquisition and the ability to recognize more adequately non-developmental language problems.
  4. CTPL should retain language competency No. 6 and culture competency No. 4, but restate them using recognized authorities in language acquisition and culture.
  5. Language competency No. 6 should refer to first and second language acquisition.
  6. The Commission should establish a uniform interview panel system to be used for the Certificate of Competence and verification of language proficiency for the Bilingual-Crosscultural Specialist Credential by direct application.
- 
7. The Commission should initiate survey/research with the aid of LEAs and IHEs for the purpose of establishing the level of language competency required for the Certificate of Competence.
  8. CTPL should standardize criteria to be used by both LEAs and IHEs.
  9. CTPL should establish uniformity of content areas to be examined.
  10. The assessed oral language proficiency should not be contaminated with the simultaneous testing of culture and educational terminology.
  11. CTPL should select a committee of representatives from LEAs and IHEs assessing for the Certificate



of Competence to review current assessment instruments, to formulate a common understanding of the skills expected of candidates and to recommend common assessment procedures. This committee should make its recommendations to the CTPL and respective institutions by February 15, 1979.

12. A panel of experts in culture, language, and measurement should be convened to evaluate existing instruments to recommend approved procedures.
13. CTPL should study the possibility of administering one standardized written exam in the target language for the Certificate of Competence for LEAs and IHEs as a screening device which will decide if candidates continue in the assessment.
14. Performance of Certificate of Competence holders should be monitored, but that should not be the responsibility of LEAs.
15. Methodology should not be assessed in the LEA assessment for the Certificate of Competence.
16. CTPL should develop an itemized monitoring form specifying the areas to be examined.
17. CTPL should consider expanding the pool of legally constituted visiting consultants to include field personnel linguistically competent and oriented toward bilingual education.
18. ~~CTPL should establish criteria for the frequency of site visitations, based on satisfactory performance.~~

C. The recommendations included in the report of the monitoring of the Certificate of Competence at IHEs, are included, with comments indicating agreement or disagreement by the small groups:

1. That IHEs wishing to assess and recommend candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence submit a plan for approval by the Commission, describing the process and procedures to be utilized.

(3 groups agreed; 1 group disagreed; 1 group agreed and added a comment.)

2. That IHEs follow the same assessment plan procedures as local education agencies approved by the Commission, with the exception that use of a panel of three persons to determine language proficiency be authorized.

(1 group agreed; 2 groups agreed and added a comment; 2 groups wanted it modified; 1 had only a comment.)

3. That the assessment process be administered and controlled by the Dean of the School of Education or the Head of the Department of Education.

(2 groups agreed; 1 group suggested modification; 1 group only commented.)

4. That the competencies to be assessed for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence be those adopted by the Commission.

(3 groups agreed; 1 disagreed.)

D. Comments by Discussion Groups

1. Any assessment plan submitted by IHEs should include sound measurement criteria.
2. The panel of three recommended for Certificate of Competence Assessment of IHEs should include a bilingual classroom teacher with one of the three types of certification: Specialist, Emphasis or Certificate of Competence.

---

3. Three-member panel composition for IHEs assessment should be the same for LEAs.
4. There should be a standardized format for training interview panels.
5. The IHEs should follow the same assessment procedures and guidelines as LEAs.
6. The relationship between the Certificate of Competence and the Emphasis on the one hand, and the Specialist on the other, should be established.
7. The Certificate of Competence should be phased out by 1980.

E. Comments on the Review of Specialist and Emphasis Guidelines

A group of IHEs, the majority, met separately to discuss the Emphasis and Specialist Guidelines. While they shared verbally with the workshop what the substance of their discussion was, they did not leave written recommendations since they had not yet reached consensus. It is the understanding of staff that their recommendations will be forwarded to the Commission.

One of the objectives of the Review of the Specialist and Emphasis was to decide on a forum for revision of guidelines. That forum was not suggested, but the need for the revision of guidelines remain. The recommendations from the IHE group could be used as a basis for the discussion of the guidelines. The Commission might proceed to convene a panel and to request that the IHEs share their recommendations with the panel. One presenter delineated the responsibilities bilingual teachers are expected to discharge. While this information is not included in this report, it could be used in the discussion of the revision of the Emphasis and Specialist guidelines.

F. General Comments and Recommendations by Groups

1. Guidelines for all bilingual certification should be reviewed.
  2. A study on the effectiveness of bilingual education should be conducted.
  3. There should be a closer monitoring of supervisory personnel in bilingual education at LEAs and IHEs.
- 

G. Staff Recommendations

The following recommendations are being made after full consideration of the recommendations included in the monitoring reports on both LEAs and IHEs, the reactions to those recommendations by the small groups at the workshop and additional comments made by those groups. These new recommendations will include reference to the recommendations in the monitoring reports on LEAs and IHEs.

1. On the Certificate of Competence

- a) A group largely composed of LEA representatives should be convened to review all assessment procedures, including panel composition and operations, and competences for the purpose of standardizing procedures and competencies and specifying criteria. This standardization process will be followed by both LEAs and IHEs. (LEA Report 1, 2, 4, 5.)
- b) A panel of practitioners in the assessment process should be convened to work on a) above. (LEA Report 1, 2, 4, 5.)
- c) The Commission should approve the use of panels of three (3) at LEAs wishing to reduce their panels from five to three members. The panel should consist of one bilingual, biliterate credentialed classroom teacher; one full-time higher education faculty who is bilingual, biliterate, bicultural; and one community lay person who is bilingual, bicultural; and recommendation would be by unanimous vote. (LEA Report, 9.)
- d) IHEs wishing to assess and recommend candidates for the Certificate of Competence should submit a plan for approval by the Commission, describing the process and procedures to be utilized. (IHE Report, 1.)

---

- e) ~~IHEs should use the same assessment procedures and competencies as local education agencies approved by the Commission. (IHE Report 2, 4.)~~
- f) The Commission should not consider using a single standardized battery of instruments for assessment. Such a battery is not now in existence. (LEA Report, 3.)
- g) A survey of the classroom performance of candidates recommended for the Certificate of Competence should be conducted in order to validate the assessment process. This survey will be for the purpose of gathering information on the assessment process and will be financed by the Commission. (LEA Report, 7.)

- h) A body external to the Commission and the LEAs should review audiotapes to determine reliability of scoring. This review will be for the purpose of gathering information on the assessment process and will be financed by the Commission. (LEA Report, 8.)
- i) Systematic procedures, including criteria, should be developed for monitoring all assessor agencies (LEAs and IHEs) and this process should be communicated to all assessor agencies. Bilingual practitioners from the field should be involved in the monitoring process: an LEA representative should be included in monitoring visits to the IHEs and an IHE representative in visits to LEAs. (LEA Report, 6.)
- j) At IHEs, the assessment process should be controlled by the Dean of the School of Education or the Head of the Department of Education. (IHE Report, 3.)

2. On the Emphasis and Specialist Guidelines

- a) A panel, largely composed of IHE representatives, should be convened to do the following:
  - Review the guidelines for the Emphasis and Specialist Credentials.
  - Review the standardized process agreed upon by the panel mentioned in 1. a), b) above.

COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING  
WORKSHOP ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

at  
Woodlake Quality Inn, Sacramento  
June 5-6, 1978

Program  
Monday, June 5, 1978

- 10:00 - 10:30 a.m. Registration and Welcome  
Welcome - Peter LoPresti, Executive Secretary,  
Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing
- 10:30 - 12:30 p.m. Issues Related to Certificate of Competence
1. 10:30 - 11:00 Report on Monitoring of LEAs  
Panelists: Aurora Martinez Quevedo, San Jose  
Unified School District  
Mary Jew, San Mateo County Office of Education
  2. 11:00 - 12:30 Review of Problems Related to Language  
Competency #6 and Culture Competency #4  
  
11:00 - 11:30 Panelists: Rosalia Salinas, San Diego County  
Office of Education  
Ray del Portillo, San Francisco Unified School  
District  
  
11:30 - 12:00 Speakers: Heidi Dulay and Marina Burt,  
Bloomsbury West  
  
12:00 - 12:30 Small Group Discussion on Topic 1  
  
12:30 - 1:45 Lunch
- 
3. Waiver from Bilingual Certification-Presentation: State  
Department of Education - T. Serrano
  4. Bilingual Development Grants: Presentation - Dennis Beamon,  
Student Aid Commission
- 1:45 - 3:00 p.m. Small Group Discussion on Topics 1 and 2
5. 3:00 - 3:45 Development of Consistent Scoring Criteria:  
Presentation -  
Frank Cirizo, University of the Pacific  
Joe Lucero, Orange County Office of Education
  6. 3:45 - 4:30 The Assessment of Methodology - Panelists:  
Roberto Aguilar, Tulare County Office of Education  
Alba Ortiz, San Jose State University
  7. 4:30 - 5:30 Training of Panels to Conduct Interviews

APPENDIX A

Monday, June 5, 1978

- 4:30 - 5:00 Workshop-Demonstrations by Manuel Vizcaino,  
Norwalk-LaMirado School District  
Henry Dalton, San Bernardino Office of Education
- 5:00 - 5:30 Small Group Discussion
- 5:30 - 6:00 Small Group Reports to Full Conference
- 6:00 - 6:45 No Host Cocktail
- 6:45 - 9:00 Dinner  
Speaker: Assemblyman Peter Chacon

## WORKSHOP ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Tuesday, May 6, 1978

9:00 - 11:45 a.m. Issues Related to Certificate of Competence  
(continued)

8. 9:00 - 9:45 IHE Monitoring Report

9:00 - 9:15 Presentation: Gustavo Getner, Commission  
for Teacher Preparation and Licensing

9:15 - 9:45 Small Group Discussion

9. 9:45 - 11:45 Should One Standardized Instrument Be Used To  
Assess for the Certificate of Competence?

9:45 - 10:45 Panelists:

Robert Cervantes, State Department of Education  
Henry Dalton, San Bernardino County Office of Ed.  
Chuck Acosta, Los Angeles County Office of Ed.  
Reginald Corder, Educational Testing Service

10:45 - 11:45 Small Group Discussion

11:45 - 1:15 Lunch

Speaker: Toni Metcalf, University of San Francisco

1:15 - 3:30 p.m. Review of Emphasis and Specialist Credential  
Programs

1. 1:15 - 1:45 Relationship between Emphasis and Certificate  
of Competence - Panelists:  
Rudy Suarez, University of Southern California  
Consuelo Gallegos, California State College,  
Stanislaus

---

2. 1:45 - 2:30 Relationship between Specialist and Emphasis  
Panelists -  
Alberto Ochoa, San Diego State University  
Herminio Rios, California State University, Hayward  
Speaker:  
Blair Hurd, Director of Programs and Licensing,  
Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing

2:30 - 3:30 Small Group Discussion on Topics 1 and 2

3:30 - 4:00 p.m. Recapitulation of Recommendations of Entire  
Conference (6 speakers)

4:00 - 4:15 p.m. Closing remarks by Dr. Francisco Jimenez, Chairman,  
Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.



APPENDIX B

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing  
Workshop on Bilingual Education  
June 5 & 6, 1978

EVALUATION FORM, Part A

Please rate each topic based on the extent to which the objectives have been achieved by checking the columns to the right (see below for legend). Use, also, the space provided at the end of each topic for additional comments.

	1	2	3
Topic: Report on Monitoring			
Objectives: 1. To inform conference participants of findings and recommendations.	27	7	0
2. To have participants make implementable recommendations arising out of the Report.	10	16	8
Comments:			
Topic: Review of Competencies (Language #6, Culture #4) that Have Been Found Difficult to Assess			
Objectives: 1. To inform conference participants of the difficulty encountered in assessing these competencies.	22	9	2
2. To inform participants of how these competencies may successfully be assessed.	4	16	14
3. To inform participants of materials and aids available to facilitate the assessment of these two competencies.	5	15	14
4. To have participants make implementable recommendations related to these two competencies.	8	12	13
Comments:			
Topic: Training of Assessment Panel Members to Conduct Interviews			
Objectives: 1. To identify problems related to successful panel interviews.	15	12	5
2. To identify successful practices in accomplishing interviews.	12	13	7
3. To identify the key elements in successful panel performance, including -			
a. selection criteria and process	9	15	7
b. training of panel	9	14	7
c. interviewing and screening techniques	8	15	7
d. scoring of interview performance	9	13	8
4. To inform participants of 1, 2, 3 above.	10	17	4
5. To have participants acquire skills in constituting a successful panel.	6	13	13
Comments:			

	1	2	3
Topic: Development of Consistent Scoring Criteria			
Objectives: 1. To inform participants of the variability in scoring criteria that now exists.	18	13	3
2. To suggest or recommend ways in which standardization of scoring may be achieved.	5	18	11
Comments:			
Topic: Should Methodology Be Assessed			
Objectives: 1. To inform participants of procedures now being employed, and the strengths and weaknesses of those procedures.	14	12	8
2. To have participants make implementable recommendations on whether or not methodology should be assessed.	8	14	11
3. To provide participants with possible ways of assessing methodology, if the decision to assess is affirmative.	6	11	15
Comments:			
Topic: Waiver From BL/CC Certification			
Objectives: 1. To inform participants of the provisions of the waiver:			
a. period of the waiver	23	6	3
b. when waiver provision expires	23	6	3
c. who may get a waiver	24	5	3
d. who administers the waiver	24	5	3
e. how to obtain a waiver	23	5	3
Comments:			
Topic: Bilingual Development Grants			
Objectives: 1. To inform participants of the availability and requirements for grants:			
a. who administers the program	29	3	2
b. who may apply	29	3	2
c. what the priorities are	29	3	2
d. the amount of each stipend	23	3	3
e. how to apply for a grant	23	3	3
f. important dates related to grants	23	3	3
Comments:			

Rating Scale

1 - Achieved, 2 - Partially Achieved, 3 - Not Achieved

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing  
 Workshop on Bilingual Education  
 June 5 & 6, 1978

EVALUATION FORM, Part B

Please rate each topic based on the extent to which the objectives have been achieved by checking the columns to the right (see below for legend). Use, also, the space provided at the end of each topic for additional comments. Please answer the additional questions at the end of the evaluation.

		1	2	3
Topic:	IHE Monitoring Report			
Objectives:	1. To inform participants of the findings and recommendations.	23	3	2
	2. To have participants make implementable recommendations on procedures IHEs should follow, including whether IHEs should follow the same procedures as LFAs.	16	9	3
Comments:				
Topic:	Should One Standardized Instrument Be Used For The C of C			
Objectives:	1. To inform participants about the instruments now being used, their strengths and weaknesses.	7	14	9
	2. To inform participants of available standardized instruments.	1	14	9
	3. To inform participants of the implications, impact, problems, costs, related to the use of a single standardized instrument.	9	11	9
	4. To inform participants of the implications, impact, problems, costs, related to the use of CTPL-adopted multiple instruments.	4	19	5
	5. To inform participants of implications, problems, etc. related to continuing present practice.	8	13	6
	6. To have participants make implementable recommendations on this issue.	8	13	7
Comments:				
Topic:	Review of Emphasis and Specialist Credential Programs			
Objectives:	1. To inform participants of the relationship of one type of bilingual certification to another (C of C to Emphasis; Emphasis to Specialist).	15	10	4
	2. To have participants make implementable recommendations on what changes, if any, should be made in the Emphasis as a result of the C of C.	11	10	7

	1	2	3
3. To have participants make implementable recommendations on what changes, if any, need to be made in the Specialist program as a result of the C of C and direct application.	8	14	5
4. To have participants suggest the possible forum at which revision of the Emphasis and Specialist would take place, if revision is recommended.	6	11	8
Comments:			

Rating Scale

1 - Achieved, 2 - Partially Achieved, 3 - Not Achieved

Evaluation Questions

1. How realistic were the goals of the Workshop in terms of:
  - a. Time 6 realistic, 29 not realistic  
Comment:
  - b. Focus on topic 19 adequate, 11 inadequate  
Comment:
2. Were the selected topics the ones that most needed attention during this Workshop?  
25 yes, 6 no
3. Were any important topics omitted?  
13 yes, 10 no  
If yes, please list them.
4. Based on the most pressing needs in the area of bilingual certification, how do you rate this Workshop?  
17 timely and on target  
13 reasonably relevant  
1 irrelevant