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Introduction

CALIFORNIA HAS A LONG HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND CONFLICT surrounding the education of students who come to school speaking a language other than English. This conflict has been evident since before the 1960s, when the federal Bilingual Education Act was signed; presently, state legislation specifies that instruction must be overwhelmingly in English (Unz and Matta-Tuchman, 1998). In June 1998, California voters approved Proposition 227. Authored by businessman Ron Unz and elementary teacher Gloria Matta-Tuchman, the measure called for all students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs) to be placed in classrooms designed to provide intensive English language instruction for one academic year before placement in mainstream English-only classes. The intensive English language program, called Structured English Immersion (SEI), places the instructional emphasis on English language instruction at the expense of other content areas for one to two years. This plan is based on an English-only ideology that denounces the use of any language other than English as a medium of instruction in the public schools and includes a provision that allows parents to sue teachers and school administrators for using Spanish as a means of instruction.
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Proposition 227 does not specifically state that teachers must speak only English or have classroom materials solely in that language. However, the end result is that teachers and districts, fearing lawsuits, reprimand, or public pressure, increasingly focus on English-only instruction in California schools. Most recent California statistics indicate that the percentage of ELL students in English-language mainstream classrooms has continued to increase each year, from 29% in the post-227 year of 1998–1999, to 37% in 2003–2004 (California Department of Education, 2005). Enrollment in other mainly English settings (e.g., SEI) remains steady and enrollment in alternative courses of study with primary language instruction continues to drop. Beyond the implications for instruction, many ELLs are also facing issues of language loss (Macgregor-Mendoza, 2000).

Although there are varying arguments about how English-language learners can best learn to speak, read, and write English (Baker, K., 1992; Collier, 1992; Cummins, 1994; Krashen, 1994; Rossell, 1992; Willig, 1985), proponents of bilingual education have long stressed that the use of primary language instruction facilitates second-language acquisition (Cummins, 1994; Krashen, 1994; Ramírez, 1992; Thonis, 1994; Ulanoff, 1995). Studies in California alone (Krashen, 1999; Krashen and Biber, 1988; Ramírez, 1992) have demonstrated successful academic achievement for ELLs who have had the benefit of properly implemented bilingual programs. Other studies have reported similar success for students outside California (Collier and Thomas, 2002; Willig, 1985).

Even though ELLs account for over 25% of the public school population in California, between 1998 and 2001, bilingual instruction for ELLs declined by more than 50% (García and Curry-Rodríguez, 2000; Rumberger and Gándara, 2000; Ulanoff and Vega-Castaneda, 1999). Before Proposition 227, 30% of ELLs received bilingual services, and yet not even 20% were instructed by fully certified bilingual teachers (Cummins, 2000: 26).

This decline in ELLs receiving bilingual services continues to grow. California schools have seen a dramatic reduction in the number of ELLs enrolling in bilingual programs. From March 1998 to March 2001, the number of ELLs in bilingual classrooms where academic subjects were taught in the primary language declined from 408,879 to 167,163 (almost 60%). As of March 2004, the number in such programs declined to 126,546 (69.9%).

In the 1970s, in an effort to deal with California’s growing linguistic diversity, teacher preparation programs began to design courses and curriculum to better meet the educational needs of ELLs. Since that time, the State of California’s teacher education programs have gone through a number of iterations. Until recently, the California Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) and Bilingual CLAD (BCLAD) credentials have been available. The CLAD credential prepared teachers to teach ELLs in English, with a focus on understanding both cultural and linguistic diversity and the ability to use strategies that help ELLs access the curriculum in English. The BCLAD further prepares teachers to teach
ELLs in their native language while they are learning English. Although BCLAD programs are available in a variety of languages throughout the state, most of them prepare candidates to teach in classes with ELLs who speak Spanish. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) is the chief regulatory agency for all credentials issued in the State of California.

Though many people in California speak a language other than English, bilingually credentialed teachers have always been in short supply (Cummins, 2000). As the number of ELLs continues to rise, schools of education are faced with a dilemma regarding the supply versus demand for bilingual teachers. Many districts prefer to hire bilingual teachers because their bilingual skills give them advantages in terms of interacting with parents and students, but statewide credential reform has intensified the shortage.

In September 2001, the CCTC adopted new sets of standards to govern teacher preparation programs. These standards were adopted pursuant to legislation known as Senate Bill 2042 (CCTC, 2001a and b). The intent of the bill was to align teacher preparation programs with state-adopted academic standards, infuse teacher performance assessment into teacher education, and establish induction programs. The change also reconfigured the CLAD certificate to “infuse” the content into the base credential. SB 2042 did not include guidelines for the development of BCLAD programs.

Many supporters of bilingual education contend that the SB 2042 standards were not adopted to meet the linguistic and cultural needs of ELLs, but instead served to satisfy a few English-only ideologues on the California State Board of Education who were quite vocal concerning bilingual education (Ahlquist et al., 2004). Immediately after the passage of Proposition 227, board members opposed to bilingual education attempted to rescind a policy that allowed school districts to seek waivers to continue the implementation of bilingual education (DeFau, 1998). One board member, who attended many of the SB 2042 planning committee meetings, retired from the California State Board of Education when it became clear that her anti-bilingual education stances had damaged her chances of reappointment. This reductionist treatment of bilingualism is also evident in the removal of the words “bilingual” and “culture” from official state documents (Katz and Kohl, 2002; Sleeter, 2003).

Although there are no BCLAD guidelines to date under SB 2042, the Education Code of the State of California guarantees the existence of bilingual credential programs. In April 2002, CCTC issued a coded correspondence that allowed for the continuation of BCLAD programs under the previous Ryan Act authorization. Teacher education programs that had an approved BCLAD credential program before SB 2042 could continue to issue BCLAD credentials. Institutions of higher education without approved programs could not initiate one since they lacked regulations to guide the process. Faculty members charged with creating new credential programs in 2001 and 2002 were told that BCLAD guidelines would
be forthcoming, but as of mid-2005, the design team responsible for guideline development had not been officially appointed. Indeed, the call for nominations, first issued in 2001, was reissued in June 2005.

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of SB 2042 credential reform on the preparation of prospective bilingual teachers to ascertain whether the new programs in public and private universities in California adequately prepare new bilingual teachers to meet the needs of ELLs. The guiding question for this study is: What are the programmatic changes in the preparation of BCLAD teachers as a result of the implementation of SB 2042?

**Historical Milieu**

It is impossible to separate the issues related to the preparation and credentialing of bilingual teachers from the sociopolitical climate that has led to the decline of bilingual education. Proponents agree that bilingual education enjoyed a “period of opportunity” (Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Baker, C., 2001; Crawford, 1999) when legislative and judicial actions led to the creation of myriad educational programs aimed at providing ELLs with equal access to a quality education. Federal laws that affected programs included Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974, which made it unconstitutional to discriminate or deny educational opportunity on the basis of race, color, or national origin and/or language barriers (MAEC, 1995).

Several court rulings guided the development of bilingual education programs, including *Lau v. Nichols* in 1974, which stemmed from a suit brought by non-English-speaking Chinese students against officials responsible for the operation of the San Francisco Unified School District. The lawsuit claimed that language minority students were receiving unequal educational opportunities since their limited English proficiency impeded their access to the curriculum (*Ibid.*). The Supreme Court ruled that the “district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students” (Crawford, n.d.: 3). In addition to *Lau v. Nichols*, the *Castañeda v. Pickard* decision in 1981 provided criteria for determining whether a district was in compliance with the EEOA of 1974 (MAEC, 1995). *Castañeda v. Pickard* required school districts to design programs based on sound educational theories, to effectively implement those services, and to produce results that “substantiate language barriers are being overcome so as to eliminate achievement gaps between bilingual and English-speaking students” (García, 2005: 80).

Historically, the Bilingual Education Act (1968) and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which followed and was intended to build upon the Civil Rights Act of 1964, were designed to ameliorate environmental factors that were thought to account for the failure of ELLs in school (Wiese and García, 1998: 3–5). Title VII did not recommend any specific programs, but it did authorize grants that were awarded to local educational agencies to plan and develop
programs to meet the needs of ELLs and to provide in-service training to teachers of ELLs (BEA, 1968, Section 704, in Wiese and Garcia, 1998). Bilingual and early childhood programs, as well as adult education programs for parents, were among the approved activities funded by Title VII grants (Wiese and Garcia, 1998). Title VII was reauthorized in 1974, 1978, 1984, 1988, and 1994.

Shortly after the creation of these programs, conservative politicians and educational pundits attacked bilingualism and bilingual education. This opposition is most evident in Epstein’s (1977) work and in the 1978 American Institutes for Research report (commonly referred to as the AIR report). These dubious studies, authored by opponents of bilingual education, provided questionable data for the forces seeking to obliterate bilingual education (Crawford, 1999; San Miguel, 2004). These two government-sanctioned reports questioned the effectiveness of bilingual education for improving the academic achievement of ELLs and opened the door for English-only proponents to wage their vicious campaign against bilingual education.

The systematic dismantling of bilingual programs in the late 20th and early 21st centuries is symptomatic of the current sociopolitical context in California and the U.S. According to Ruiz (1984), the ideological struggle that ensued in our nation’s school boards, school districts, and colleges of education resulted from three orientations toward language that viewed it as a problem, a right, or a resource. This linguistic supremacy and a focus on “language as a problem” were evident in the development of bilingual programs that focused on the teaching of English as the primary goal. Bilingual education advocates and civil rights activists argued for bilingual-bicultural education and waged a political battle contending that language is a resource and a right. However, state departments of education thwarted these efforts and local educational agencies continued to develop programs that were transitional in nature. These programs supported the use of the primary language in instruction until the ELL acquired sufficient English language proficiency to function in an English-only instructional setting.

As Valenzuela (1999) observes, the political climate affecting bilingual education pitted additive bilingual education (English plus the primary language, biculturalism, and bilingualism as an asset) against subtractive bilingual education (eradication of the primary language, assimilation, and English-only instruction). Subtractive proponents arguably won the ideological battle, leading to program planning efforts that would replace a child’s primary language with the dominant language, English. In the U.S., the intended outcome of bilingual education was thus not to create a proficient bilingual person, but served instead the “unconscious assumption” that linguistic minorities (ELLs) would learn English to prevent them from suffering from inequality (Tollefson, 1991). Quickly silenced were political activists who advocated for a broader definition of bilingual education that would encourage learning English, maintain the primary language, and infuse the culture and history of ELLs into the mainstream curriculum.
In practice, school districts, state departments of education, and schools and colleges of education designed programs that focused on English language development (ELD), ignoring the recommendations of global organizations, such as the United Nations, that included language maintenance as a human right (UNESCO, 1954). According to Crawford (1999: 54), systematic dismantling of bilingual-bicultural education began at the outset of the Reagan administration. A major issue centered on whether a language other than English could be used as the language of instruction.

Karen Cadiero-Kaplan (2004) contends that the dispute over the language of instruction for ELLs was most prominent during the "dismissive period" of the late 1970s and early 1980s. During this period, bilingual education programs came under increasing pressure to shift from language maintenance to English acquisition as the primary instructional goal. Another issue at that time was the question of who was more qualified to teach ELLs: a bilingual, bicultural teacher or a teacher that spoke only English. The regulations for teacher preparation programs then, as now, were inextricably linked to the laws and policies governing bilingual teacher preparation. Teacher education programs are defined, established, and changed according to the political climate, which influences their focus on the acquisition of English and access to core curriculum, rather than on biliteracy.

**California**

Beginning with the passage of the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act of 1976 and the Reauthorization of the Bilingual Education Act (1978), the State of California began to issue the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC) (CCTC, 2004; Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004). The BCC was an examination focused on teacher fluency in a language other than English (overwhelmingly Spanish), knowledge of culture, bilingual teaching methodology, and content-area instruction in the primary language.

The Language Development Specialist (LDS) credential accompanied the BCC. The LDS was directed at teachers who were not proficient in a second language, but who taught classes with ELL students in need of differentiated instruction. The idea behind the LDS was to assure that teachers in English Language Development (ELD) classrooms were well versed in second-language theory and pedagogy, including SDAIE (specially designed academic instruction in English) and ELD strategies and methods. SDAIE methods of instruction, which evolved from the concept of sheltered English instruction used in the late 1960s and early 1970s and were aimed at students in the intermediate stages of English language proficiency, became prominent during the 1990s. At that time, the focus on teaching in the content areas had become an important part of programs for ELLs. ELD and SDAIE are components of bilingual instruction and structured English immersion.

In 1992, the CCTC established new guidelines for teacher credentialing. CCTC began to issue the CLAD and BCLAD certificates when these regulations
became effective on July 1, 1994. CLAD certification required teachers to demonstrate competency in three areas: (1) First and Second Language Acquisition, (2) Methodology of Bilingual Instruction, ELD, and Content Instruction, and (3) Culture and Cultural Diversity. Proficiency in a second language was not a CLAD requirement, but teachers were required to verify their experience in learning a second language through one of 16 options, including six semester units or nine quarter units of college-level Spanish, three years of secondary-school Spanish, or a passing scoring on the Spanish Advanced Placement test. The BCLAD extended this competency by focusing on one cultural and linguistic group and added the areas of Methodology for Primary Language Instruction, Culture of Emphasis, and Language of Emphasis in the four modes of literacy development (listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

After the requirements took effect in 1994, school districts throughout California began to use the credential guidelines as placement criteria. Teachers with a BCLAD certification were assigned to classrooms with beginning through intermediate ELL students and in which the primary language of the students was language of instruction. Administrators were directed to place BCLAD teachers in bilingual classrooms and teachers with CLAD certification or other credentials that designated them as able to teach ELLs in non-bilingual classrooms with ELL students.

Though CLAD and BCLAD certification could be attained by passing a test, many universities created certificate programs and a few even integrated the CLAD certificate program into their “regular” teacher credentialing program. Many prospective teachers would enroll in a teacher education program in which they could attain their CLAD or BCLAD while working on their teaching credentials. The coursework option was also available to practicing teachers who could attain their certification through this alternate program by taking a series of classes. Practitioners often preferred the coursework option to taking the test. The alternate process became popular, but is due to sunset in December 2005.

To further prepare teachers to work with ELLs, the California Senate passed SB 1969 in August 1994 to authorize CLAD-like certification for teachers with basic teaching credentials and nine years of teaching experience. These teachers attended 45 hours of staff development in theory and practice related to teaching ELLs. Credentialed teachers with fewer than nine years of experience could take an additional 45 hours to receive the SB 1969 certification. SB 1969 certified the teachers to work with ELLs within the district, but was only a local designation and did not transfer to other districts.

SB 1969 expired on December 31, 1999, and was replaced by SB 395 regulations. SB 395 offers three options: the first calls for 45 hours of staff development that authorizes teachers to teach SDAIE and ELD in the subject and grade authorized by the teacher’s credential; the second adds another 45 hours of staff development; and the third entails 45 hours of staff development for teachers who have nine years of full-time teaching, experience, or training in working with ELLs (CCTC, 2004).
The notion of specific credentials or certificates that authorize teachers to work with ELLs met with criticism. Many veteran teachers argued against CLAD certification, claiming that teaching experience alone was a sufficient qualification for a teacher of ELLs. This was especially true of teachers that were forced to enroll in SB 1969 training. A few teachers even formed anti-bilingual education organizations such as LEAD (Learning English Advocates Drive) and organized to eliminate bilingual education. LEAD spearheaded two unsuccessful initiative drives in Los Angeles that attempted to force the powerful teachers’ union to adopt an anti-bilingual education policy (Colvin, 1989). Despite the narrow defeat of these initiatives, the teachers’ unions, the California Teachers Association (CTA) and the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA), were pressured into lobbying for passage of SB 1969.

In essence, as bilingual education activists sought to improve the schooling of immigrant children in the U.S., the xenophobic views of English-only advocates prevailed. Anti-bilingual education forces continued to organize. In the late 1990s, the California electorate passed several anti-immigrant propositions, including Proposition 227, that facilitated the decline of bilingual education, while legitimizing and legislating educational programs that reflect an English-only perspective. Since SB 2042 standards reflect an ideology of DEbilingualization, the notion that anti-bilingual education activists influenced the development of the new standards for teacher credentialing is not out of the question.

**SB 2042: DEbilingualization in Teacher Education**

SB 2042 guidelines call for the “infusion” of the content of the previous CLAD credential into the basic teaching credential. The SB 2042 credential is standards-based and candidates must demonstrate that they have the proper disposition to be teachers and meet a series of teacher performance expectations (TPEs). TPEs are linked to content standards and the teacher performance assessment (TPA), a formative and summative assessment that evaluates process and product. As an unfunded mandate, the TPA is still in the implementation phase, although SB 2042 programs have been offered since 2002.

The CLAD content was “infused” or added to different courses throughout the programs, and institutions used various methods to do this (Montaño et al., 2004). Though the preparation of BCLAD teachers under SB 2042 is not a priority, supporters of bilingual education have not been deterred from offering the BCLAD. District intern programs cannot offer a BCLAD; until recently, new universities for whom SB 2042 was the first approved program could not offer them either. Most programs that offered the BCLAD updated their courses to comply with SB 2042 requirements.
Methods/Data Sources

Potential participants for this study included faculty involved in bilingual teacher preparation and subject matter, as well as program coordinators and college deans from public and private universities throughout California who were responsible for preparing bilingual teachers. A list of 81 bilingual and other faculty was created by examining university web sites in the state. Each received an invitation to participate in the study by e-mail or phone. Further solicitation took place through personal contact at conference presentations and other meetings. Twenty-eight respondents participated in the study.

Data were collected from May 2004 to April 2005. Participants responded to a 21-question web survey concerning the impact of SB 2042 on the preparation of BCLAD teachers. The survey covered changes in CLAD and BCLAD, but this article is limited to the BCLAD (see Appendix A at the end of this article for the list of questions). Respondents were asked whether they would be willing to be contacted for further information. From those that responded positively, we chose to interview eight bilingual teacher educators and program coordinators to probe responses related to curricular and programmatic changes. We conducted interviews between November 2004 and February 2005. The data set for this article consisted of survey and interview responses, as well as anecdotal notes compiled during interviews.

Data analysis explored the salient themes that emerged from the survey and interviews responses. The analysis reviewed closed and open-ended responses to the web surveys and interviews. Patterns related to issues surrounding bilingual teacher education programs were identified for further analysis of themes related to the specific research question. Questioning and reflection on the data are part of a recursive process that allows the findings to be firmly grounded in the data.

Results

The 28 faculty members from all over California that completed the surveys came from the original list of 81 possible participants or were solicited at conference presentations. Bilingual teacher educators accounted for approximately 46% of the respondents. The remaining respondents included elementary and secondary teacher educators, program coordinators, and directors of teacher education. Approximately 78% of respondents had been teacher educators for more than five years.

The survey results were anonymous, but 20 of the respondents self-identified when they volunteered for follow-up interviews. The identified respondents included 12 from California State Universities, two from University of California campuses, and two from private institutions. Eight in-depth interviews were conducted with selected self-identified teacher educators at five CSUs, two U.C.s, and one private institution. Nine of the respondents were from universities in Northern California, nine from Southern California, and two were from Central California.
Findings from the surveys and interviews indicate that BCLAD programs exist in theory as they did before SB 2042, yet changes have taken place in bilingual teacher preparation in the areas of program development, course content, and shifting attitudes related to bilingual education. We summarize these emerging themes below. Surveys and interviews requested information regarding the types of programmatic changes that were made due to SB 2042. (See Figure 1, which summarizes the types of changes made, at the end of this article.)

Course Changes

The course changes in teacher education programs noted by 82% of the respondents included the number of units in the program, reductions in course offerings or their frequency, and the shifting of courses into prerequisites before students enter the program or to teacher induction after candidates have completed the program. Respondents described the “infusion” of ELD issues into other courses and the elimination of ELD/SDAIE courses. They also indicated that specific courses were dropped to make room for the teacher performance assessment, a requirement of SB 2042.

The addition of the TPA and teacher performance expectations (TPEs) necessitated specific changes in the respondents’ course content and syllabi. Moreover, courses now focused on “signature assignments” that are mandated as part of the TPA. Faculty members must include mandated assignments, thus linking the content to the TPA and TPEs. For some, this reduced the academic freedom of faculty members, who were asked to use specific assignments in certain courses and to eliminate or hand over to others their own faculty-developed assignments.

In terms of other changes related to BCLAD, 44% of respondents noted changes in the number of students in the program. Some reported fewer students and others an increase in the number of bilingual candidates. Fifty-six percent stated that courses had been removed or restructured, and 28% indicated that assignments for BCLAD faculty had been changed. Interview data suggest that some BCLAD faculty members are now teaching courses in the regular program and/or outside the field in which they were hired. For example, one faculty member in a large urban university who was hired to teach language development courses now teaches literacy courses, since the SB 2042 program no longer has a language development course and the content is “infused” into the literacy methods courses.

Changes to Specific BCLAD Elements

To evaluate whether prior elements of the BCLAD credential were addressed in SB 2042, faculty were asked to describe how these elements are addressed in the new programs. According to respondents, SB 2042 guidelines meant that teaching about delivery and assessment in bilingual classrooms is now embedded in a variety of courses (e.g., literacy methods). This topic was addressed through field place-
ments in bilingual classrooms, since coursework and field experiences are linked developmentally and sequentially throughout SB 2042 courses. One respondent stated, “candidates in methods classes have the opportunity to make connections between theory and practice during their fieldwork experiences.” Two respondents said the content was the same as the pre-SB 2042 period, and four were unsure where this content could be found in the current program. Responses were similar for the evaluation and use of primary language materials, with approximately 15% of respondents indicating that both topics were addressed in one three-unit course. In some cases, these elements have been replaced with ELD coursework, even for teachers receiving a BCLAD credential.

Survey responses indicated that bilingual teaching methods are integrated with coursework and fieldwork in bilingual classrooms. Only one respondent said that student teachers were required to deliver instruction in the primary language. Approximately 25% of the respondents noted that they are still teaching the BCLAD classes that cover bilingual methodology, although some reported reduced units for this content. One respondent from a large urban university stated that bilingual methodology is now offered to all BCLAD candidates, in multiple and single subjects, in one eight-hour Saturday seminar.

Finally, we examined the assessment of the candidates’ primary language. This element remained largely untouched and included department exams, entrance tests and coursework in Spanish, informal observations and practica, and specific primary language methods courses. About 10% of respondents indicated that candidates must take either the BCLAD language exam, the BCLAD culture exam, or both exams. If the approved program has a culture component, then they only need to take the language exam. If the program has no culture course, they take both exams.

Changes Resulting from No Child Left Behind

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) plays a role in the implementation of SB 2042 programs. Due to NCLB, teacher candidates and credentialed teachers are required to take the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) (see NES, 2004), a standardized test that measures content knowledge. SB 2042 does not mandate the CSET, but teachers must pass this exam to be considered NCLB compliant or “highly qualified.” Often, new teachers will not be hired unless they have passed the exam.

In 2004, the chancellor of the CSU system issued an executive order that added the CSET as an admissions requirement for CSU credential programs. Though the CSET falls outside the scope of this article, respondents stated that NCLB has led to changes in testing and in the number of students of color currently enrolled in BCLAD programs. Many potential BCLAD teacher candidates are second-language learners and students of color who have benefited less from our inequitable educational system. At one time, teacher-training programs provided assistance to enrolled pre-service teachers to increase their chances of passing examinations such
as the CSET. With the test now an entrance requirement, candidates requiring such assistance are often barred from entry. Among the positive responses to NCLB was one that stated, “all candidates now take second language development.”

**BCLAD Before and After SB 2042**

Approximately 96% of respondents had a BCLAD program before and after SB 2042. But individual responses revealed that this is a subjective answer. Among survey respondents, 56% reported removal or restructuring of courses, 44% saw a change in the number of students in the BCLAD program and in faculty assignments for those who teach in the BCLAD, and 20% cited a reduction in the frequency of course offerings.

Current SB 2042 legislation allows teacher education programs with existing BCLAD programs to offer a coursework option for the BCLAD credential, but it precludes other teacher education programs from creating new bilingual options. The latter programs may work with prospective teacher candidates to prepare them to pass the BCLAD exams, but may not extend coursework options to the new candidate. One respondent’s institution was in this position, as the campus lacked a BCLAD credential program before SB 2042.3

Confusion has arisen from the absence of guidelines for configuring a BCLAD credential. One respondent from a major public university in Southern California reported that the BCLAD program was initially eliminated at his/her campus, even though a large proportion of bilingual teacher candidates and program graduates would likely teach at schools with large numbers of ELLs. At this campus, bilingual faculty struggled to reinstate the program, but the program has not admitted any new bilingual candidates. After the survey, the program at this campus was again in jeopardy. All classes in the BCLAD program were cancelled during the 2004–2005 academic year, leaving BCLAD candidates with few options to finish their coursework before the December 2005 deadline to complete their credentials. Opportunities for language testing are also disappearing at this campus. Within our small sample, there was little difference in responses between public and private universities regarding the maintenance of BCLAD programs. Respondents from private universities maintained the status quo, but one private university respondent expressed confusion over the status of the current program.

Changes in terminology became evident. Approximately 67% of respondents still used the term “bilingual” at their institutions. One respondent stated, “we still adamantly use bilingual [to talk about students, coursework, and programs].” For 21%, there were shifts in language use to ELL, ELD, and Dual Language. Some 13% of respondents had never used the term “bilingual” in reference to coursework or programs. This not-so-subtle de-emphasis of the notion of bilingualism as proficiency in two languages further supports an English-only ideology.
Conclusions: BCLAD Programs Today and Tomorrow

SB 2042 has variously influenced BCLAD teacher education programs in California. Most campuses have continued their BCLAD programs, yet all survey respondents noted changes in programs related to course content and offerings. Content from previous programs has been “infused” into other methodology courses and into the fieldwork components, including student teaching. Superficially, these changes may seem to address critical components of the BCLAD programs, but there are reasons for concern. One reason is the infusion of BCLAD course content into other methodology courses. Although the concept can be portrayed as value added in theory, in practice infusion offers another reality. Even when bilingual pedagogy is supposedly infused into a course, it does not necessarily take place unless the instructor is competent to teach first- and second-language theory and practice, ELD and SDAIE strategies, and other content related to effectively instructing ELLs. If the instructor lacks the background to teach such content, it is often not covered or is addressed in readings that are not discussed or, worse, discussed in ways that reinforce stereotypes or misconceptions. Second, well-meaning faculty members with their own misconceptions, or who lack training or education, can “misteach” BCLAD content. Finally, BCLAD competencies can be listed in the course content, but not covered due to the constraints of already content-laden courses.

Additional challenges are related to demonstrating primary language competency and infusing BCLAD content into bilingual field experiences, including observation, participation, and student teaching. On some campuses, especially the larger ones, Proposition 227 has made it difficult to find bilingual placements for field experiences and student teaching. Even when bilingual placements can be found, those who supervise fieldwork and student teaching may lack proficiency in the language the candidate is teaching, making adequate competency assessment problematic. If field experiences do not offer candidates opportunities to learn infused content, it is missing from the program.

Changes resulting from No Child Left Behind that are concurrent with the SB 2042 credential are also a matter of concern. Enrollment in SB 2042 programs is lower at many campuses with large numbers of candidates who are ELLs. One large urban campus reported that they are at 80% of target enrollment, down 20% from pre-CSET and SB 2042 enrollments. If enrollment continues on this path, the bilingual teaching force will be further challenged.

Implications for the Future of the Bilingual Teaching Force in California

This study describes the impact of the implementation of the SB 2042 standards and CCTC’s lack of attention to the education of a bilingual teaching force. As bilingual teacher educators ourselves, we argue that reinstitution of the BCLAD as a viable alternative to the base SB 2042 credential is only the first step in ensuring that prospective teachers can meet the needs of an increasingly linguistically and
culturally diverse student population. As of June 2005, the design team responsible for SB 2042 guidelines for a bilingual credential had not been formed; nominations are being solicited from CCTC. Deans and associate deans were invited to nominate faculty for this Bilingual Certification Advisory Work Group, which will meet between October 2005 and February 2006 to consider policy and make recommendations regarding bilingual credentials. The group may then be asked to “develop program standards, test specifications, or do other tasks related to updating bilingual certification routes for California teachers” (Swafford, 2005: 1–2).

Since 1992, the number of ELLs in California has increased by 48%. The current ELL student population in California amounts to slightly more than 25%, and over 85% of students identified as ELLs speak Spanish in their homes. State policymakers could view such growth as an opportunity to educate a new type of California teacher, one that is culturally and linguistically responsive, as well as biliterate. California could even set the standard for subject matter experts—pedagogical and instructional specialists that are cultural and linguistic mediators. Policymakers could encourage teachers to learn another language, enabling teachers to act as cultural bridges between our culturally and linguistically diverse student population and the educational institutions they attend.

Instead, as Katz and Kohl (2002: 1) suggest, California has enacted a new teacher credentialing process that will “mold a new generation of teachers who know only rigid standards, high-stakes testing, inflexible Eurocentric curriculum, and English-only.” The current discussion of BCLAD programs opens a possibility for constituents such as linguists, researchers, parents, and organizations such as Migrant Education, California Association of Bilingual Education, and the National Association of Bilingual Education to contribute their expertise to properly address the needs of ELLs.

Many educators and social scientists agree that the SB 2042 standards do not promote social justice or bilingualism and multiculturalism in teacher education programs (Sleeter, 2003; Ahlquist et al., 2004). Ahlquist et al. (2004) argue that SB 2042 regulations minimize the importance of language, culture, and equity. In contrast, the CCTC argues that second language acquisition theory and pedagogy, as well as SDAIE and ELD content methodology, are embedded in the new credentialing process.

As bilingual educators, we must critically assess whether the important course content that was required by CLAD and BCLAD has not been “watered down” or eliminated in new teacher preparation programs. Bilingual education advocates must remain vigilant and ensure that the principal frameworks in second language acquisition, multicultural education, and primary language pedagogy contained in the BCLAD and CLAD programs are integrated into the new BCLAD standards. Since courses related to second language acquisition, methods for teaching ELLs, and multicultural education in most teacher education programs were designed as a result of CLAD and BCLAD legislation, we are concerned that teacher education programs maintain their linguistic and multicultural integrity.
Finally, though most teacher educators and linguists agree that anti-bilingual education policies are educationally unsound, undemocratic, and hegemonic, these policies now represent the status quo. Instead of challenging illogical curricular mandates, schools of education and school boards have contributed to the problem by designing programs for teacher preparation that effectively reduce the numbers of bilingual teachers. The adoption of the new standards has reduced teacher education programs to sameness in curriculum, the use of standardized tests as a measure of student achievement, and to DEbilingualization and subtractive schooling. The subtractive process of schooling deprives students “of important social and cultural resources, leaving them progressively vulnerable to academic failure” (Valenzuela, 1999: 3). This “divestment,” we believe, strips them of their language and leads to their deculturalization and debilingualization. In effect, teacher education in California has officially adopted a subtractive bilingual outlook on teacher preparation.

As activists for educational justice, we should insist that the new BCLAD standards address issues of culture, language acquisition, and biliteracy and ensure that highly qualified teachers enact social justice pedagogy in their classrooms. New teacher education programs must fundamentally challenge political pundits who refuse to address the educational needs of ELLs. Society is the ultimate beneficiary of such teacher education programs. When English language learners have teachers who understand their culture, who use an instructional language that they can understand, who teach them their own language and help them to become biliterate, who validate their being and empower them to become their own strongest advocates, these students will have a better chance of academic success. They will then have the tools they need to become active and productive in righting the injustices in our society and within our educational system. The opposite is unthinkable, and yet so much a reality today: students that are not proficient in either language, who cannot communicate effectively except at the most basic level in English and in their native tongue, who are not academically proficient, and who have fewer options in life. This fight for strong BCLAD standards is both our professional responsibility and our moral obligation.
Appendix A: Survey Questions

1. Please describe your role in the preparation of prospective teachers. How long have you been in that role?
2. What changes were made in the teacher education program as a result of SB 2042?
3. Have there been any other programmatic changes in relation to the BCLAD?
4. The following elements were required before SB 2042. Please indicate below how your program is meeting these requirements.
   a. Delivery and assessment in bilingual classrooms.
   b. Evaluation and use of primary language methods.
   c. Assessment of primary language of teachers.
   d. Methods of bilingual teaching.
5. What changes were made in the teacher education program as a result of No Child Left Behind?
6. What changes, if any, are there in the courses you teach?
7. Did the university offer a bilingual teacher preparation program prior to SB 2042?
8. Does the university still offer a bilingual credential option?
9. Will the university retain the BCLAD after 2005?
10. Do you still use the term bilingual or have you replaced the term?

Figure 1: Changes in Teacher Education Programs as a Result of SB 2042.
NOTES

1. The executive director of CCTC regularly issues what is termed "coded correspondence." These memos announce changes in policy and guidelines for administering such policy.

2. The CSET requirement has had a direct impact on enrollment in teacher credential programs, specifically on campuses that enroll a high number of ELLs as teacher candidates. As enrollment declines, faculty members are considering alternatives to this requirement, including conditional admission and CSET preparation courses.

3. As of June 2005, CCTC has given this campus the go-ahead to write a BCLAD program based on the SB 2042 multiple subjects credential program now in place.
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