

*Third National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues:
Focus on Middle and High School Issues*

Solving the Shortage of Bilingual Teachers: Policy Implications of California's Staffing Initiative for LEP Students

Norman C. Gold
*California Department of Education
Complaints Management and Bilingual Compliance Unit**

** Affiliation for identification purposes only. The author is solely responsible for the views presented herein, and no agency endorsement should be inferred.*

Abstract

Bilingual education theory, instructional design, and practice have been the subject of much controversy but have also advanced substantially since 1980. Nevertheless, the implementation of effective programs for limited-English proficient (LEP) students has been hampered by a lack of administrative support, a scarcity of appropriate materials, a failure to thoroughly apply sound methodologies, divergent levels of majority and minority community support, and a shortage of qualified teachers. This shortage of bilingual and English language development (ELD) teachers is the single greatest barrier to the improvement of instructional programs for LEP students.

This paper provides a description of the steps taken in California since 1987 to provide guidance to school districts on options for staffing programs for LEP students. It describes state and local efforts to expand the training, hiring, recruitment, and retention of bilingual and ELD teachers. The historical description is combined with a discussion of the policy options presented to the state, and an analysis of how the exercise of those policy choices has contributed to the momentum which demonstrates that an eventual remedy of the shortage of bilingual teachers is possible.

Introduction

Bilingual education theory, instructional design, and practice have been the subject of much controversy (Baker and de Kanter, 1981; Willig, 1985), but have also been advanced substantially since 1980 (California Department of Education [CDE], 1981; CDE, 1986; CDE, 1990; Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989; Krashen and Biber, 1988; Ramírez, Yuen Ramey, and Pasta, 1991). Indeed, even previous critics of bilingual instruction have acknowledged the distinct advantages of bilingual education when properly implemented (Baker, 1992).

It has been acknowledged by many that the implementation of ideal programs for limited-English proficient (LEP)¹ students has been hampered by a lack of administrative support, the scarcity of appropriate materials, a failure to thoroughly apply sound methodologies, divergent levels of support from majority and

minority communities, and a shortage of qualified teachers.

This shortage of bilingual and English language development (ELD)² teachers is the single greatest barrier to the improvement of instructional programs for LEP students (CDE, 1991a, 1991b; Gandara, 1986; Macías, 1989; Quezada, 1991). Specially-qualified teachers are essential to ensure that students receive an understandable and challenging curriculum. There can be little disagreement with Quezada's analysis that "Teachers play the most important part in determining what is taught, how it is taught, and in what language it is taught" (1992, p. 1).

The role of the teacher is, of course, central to the entire education enterprise. In an era where ever-increasing emphasis is placed on ensuring that teachers are qualified in the basic and advanced skills needed to do their jobs, we should expect that the special language, cultural, and methodological skills needed to ensure academic success for LEP students would be prerequisites for teachers assigned to instruct these students. Such is not the case.

Boe (1990), in his thorough discussion of teacher demand, supply, and shortage at the national level, observed that, "By the few available measures there was a serious shortage of qualified teachers in the field of bilingual education in the early 1980s—more so, apparently, than in any other teaching field"(p. 23).

It is disconcerting to note that, in the early 1990s, there continues to exist a serious—and even greater—shortage of qualified teachers in this field.

In recognition of this shortage and the impending disaster it means for LEP students, their families, and our state as a whole, a number of educators in California began to focus on teacher and staff development issues in a way that had not previously occurred. It seems in retrospect that there must have been an unspoken agreement at some point during the 1987-88 school year that the time had come to launch a systematic effort to demonstrate the feasibility of eliminating the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers.³ Many of us found ourselves raising the possibility in tones of guarded optimism.

We knew that well-implemented bilingual education programs, appropriately staffed and supported, were clearly successful. These included the California Case Studies schools, and many others, which subsequently have been documented (Crawford, 1989; Krashen and Biber, 1988; Ramírez et al., 1990). We knew of school districts which had completely staffed bilingual programs with qualified bilingual teachers, and some which even had a relative "surplus" of teachers with bilingual credentials carrying out essential roles as counselors, principals, and resource teachers.

We also had tired of the arguments voiced by "friendly opponents" of bilingual education who used the lack of qualified teachers as support for their claim that, while bilingual education might be wonderful, even ideal for *all* students, the lack of teachers led them to the conclusion that it was impossible to implement, and therefore that it was wrong for public policy to support bilingual instruction. We knew that there would be few resources and limited administrative support available for the effort, but were convinced that a demonstration of some success in eliminating the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers would be necessary for there to be any substantive progress in the development of the state program for LEP students.

It seems that dozens of California's bilingual educators⁴ concurrently came to this conclusion, and somehow agreed to invest substantial energy into a demonstration of the feasibility of eliminating the bilingual teacher shortage. What resulted can be termed "California's staffing initiative for LEP students," an initiative which

has both a formal, institutional base in state agencies, and an informal, grass-roots base among bilingual educators, resource agencies, and school districts committed to improving education for limited-English proficient students. This paper attempts to describe some of the key aspects of this initiative and to document the results to date.

Purposes

The purposes of this paper are fourfold: the first is to describe California's demographic, legal, and policy context since the mid-1980s which has influenced the development of bilingual education and set the stage for the current staffing initiative. The second is to describe specific administrative actions related to staffing taken since the sunset of the state bilingual law (AB 507) in 1987.⁵ The third purpose is to provide a discussion of the development and exercise of selected policy options that ultimately impact the staffing for programs serving LEP students. Lastly, the paper will present several policy recommendations.

For several reasons, this case study may be useful for policy makers in other states and at the national level. California has the single largest enrollment of LEP students of all the states (44 percent of the national total in 1991; see Figure 1)⁶, and the largest shortage of teachers. The number of LEP students has more than doubled since 1985, and one out of every five of the 5.1 million students enrolled in public schools (K-12) are LEP. These students are found in most of the state's 7,561 schools and in most of the 1,009 school districts (CDE, 1992). The recent annual increases of LEP students in California (124,000 more from 1990 to 1991, and 93,000 more from 1991 to 1992) have been far larger than the total current LEP enrollments of any other state except Texas or New York.

Figure 1 National LEP Counts for the Ten Largest States by LEP Student Population, 1990-91

[image not included]

$N = 2,263,682$

Source: The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, OBEMLA, 1992.

Now, with over one million LEP students and a current shortage of over 18,000 bilingual teachers and over 17,000 ELD teachers,⁷ California's success or failure in adequately staffing programs for LEP students will determine whether or not hundreds of thousands of students will be educated. It may also establish whether or not the full potential of bilingual education can be realized. An understanding of the policy choices and administrative actions leading toward a solution of the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers in California can inform practice elsewhere, and can contribute to improvements in schooling for LEP students throughout the country.

The challenge for California is an urgent one. Total public school enrollment is projected to increase by about 200,000 per year for most of this decade, and to reach 7.2 million by the year 2005. In that year, Hispanic and Asian enrollments will comprise over 53 percent of the total (California Department of Finance, 1990), ensuring ever-larger enrollments of LEP students for the foreseeable future. This last year's growth of 93,000 LEP students represented 59 percent of the total K-12 enrollment growth in the state.

Bilingual Education Remains Controversial

The controversies over bilingual education are of course not yet resolved but, in certain sectors, there appears to be greater acceptance of bilingual approaches as schools as well as researchers are moving toward an examination of the "possibilities" of well-implemented programs (CDE, 1990; Cziko, 1992). Cziko provides an overview of some of the major evaluation efforts since the late 1970s, and concludes that:

while the research on bilingual education must remain inconclusive concerning the best approach to educating language-minority children, it is far from inconclusive concerning the possibilities (1992, p. 15).

He points out the methodological problems with many of the past studies and the likelihood that it will never be possible to answer satisfactorily the question: "Does bilingual education work?"

Although such a question may never have a conclusive answer for all LEP students in all circumstances, it is likely that an increasing number of examples of the power of bilingual education will be documented, and that these examples will inspire educators seeking to implement the most effective programs for LEP students, as well as to provide effective second language learning programs for majority students (Krashen and Biber, 1988; Crawford, 1989; *Educational Researcher*, 1992; Ramírez, et al., 1991).

It is encouraging to note that even as great a critic of bilingual education as Keith Baker has come to the defense of well-implemented bilingual education programs in his recent *TESOL Quarterly* article critiquing the inaccuracies in Rosalie Porter's book on bilingual education. Baker, while not endorsing a federal mandate for bilingual education⁸ notes that:

the research clearly shows bilingual education programs are superior to all-English programs . . . in the early stages of learning English. (1992, p. 402).

McGroarty acknowledges that the debate regarding bilingual education continues in full force, but suggests that bilingual instructional approaches have, to a certain extent, been institutionalized despite declining federal leadership, and often vocal political opposition. She states:

Even while federal support for bilingual education has declined and symbolic issues regarding presumed need for linguistic assimilation versus the value of bilingualism have come to the forefront, the world of professional educators has witnessed a growing recognition of the validity of bilingual instruction. Bilingual education has become rapidly institutionalized since the early 1970s, with not only ethnic advocacy but professional educational organizations now addressing matters of expertise in bilingual and second-language instruction (1992, p. 9).

Despite the clearly antagonistic stance of the federal government toward bilingual education during the 1980s, there has been a welcome shift in emphasis since 1989, when Rita Esquivel assumed leadership of OBEMLA. Under her administration, the U.S. Department of Education communicated in a noticeably cooperative tone with bilingual educators, organized cost-effective collaborative training institutes with the National Association for Bilingual Education, organized symposia on LEP issues, and sought to disseminate information about effective bilingual programs.

Barriers to Implementation

While the controversies surrounding bilingual education may die down a bit among knowledgeable educators who have kept abreast of the research and evaluation reports, and who have direct experience with efforts to ensure quality education for LEP students, the barriers to implementation of sound programs continue to be many. The first is a lack of administrative support—at the federal, state, and local levels—mainly due to deeply felt attitudes and political positions. These positions are more often based on lack of information and on xenophobia than on some alternative educational rationale (see Crawford, 1989 and 1992; McGroarty, 1992).

The second major barrier is the scarcity of materials for providing content instruction in non-English languages, English language development (ELD) instruction, or specialized materials for use with sheltered English⁹ approaches. Recently, U.S. publishers have greatly expanded the materials available for elementary school content instruction in Spanish, importers have made available excellent materials from Latin America and Spain, and there are now many more materials for ELD instruction. But, overall, materials are not readily available in the ten to fifteen languages in addition to Spanish that are found in substantial concentrations in California's schools (see Table 1 and Figure 2). Teachers and administrators, especially at the middle and high school levels, face a difficult task in identifying and purchasing content materials for LEP students (Berman et al., 1992).

Even when there is administrative support and materials have been purchased, schools fail to thoroughly implement theoretically sound programs due to administrative difficulties, lack of knowledge of the comprehensive program design, or lack of commitment to an articulated, multi-year program. In many cases, bargaining agreements for certified or classified staff inhibit the movement of bilingual teachers and paraprofessionals to schools and grade levels where they are needed. The failures attributed to bilingual education at times seem like blaming a hospital that doesn't have medicines or trained doctors and nurses for the failure of a specific medical treatment. The treatment has not been implemented!

Because of the mixed results of poorly implemented bilingual programs, and the politically-charged atmosphere surrounding them, many programs have experienced divergent levels of support from both majority and minority communities. It is not unusual for parents of LEP students to raise concerns regarding the quality of instruction in a "bilingual" classroom that is taught by a teacher who lacks full command of the home language, and who has inadequate materials to teach the content in that language.¹⁰

The shortage of qualified bilingual and ELD teachers is the most important factor that inhibits improvement of instructional programs for LEP students. Without a teacher trained in language acquisition approaches, who has both general and specific cultural knowledge, and who can communicate effectively with LEP students, these students remain disconnected from the core curriculum of our schools. They are, in effect, enrolled in a track where instruction is not comprehensible. They do not have access to the same rigorous content taught to English speaking students, and do not have the benefit of a strong program of English language development (Garcia, 1992; Quezada, 1992).

A detailed estimate of bilingual teacher need (demand), supply, and shortage was prepared using the 1990 Annual Language Census data for major language groups (CDE, 1991a). Table 1 provides the estimates of bilingual teacher demand and shortage for twenty major language groups which form the basis for subsequent estimates in this paper. Figure 2 shows the 1992 distribution of the top ten language groups represented in California's current LEP student population of over one million.

There had been some staffing gains in California in the early 1980s. But the rapid growth of LEP students (six to eight percent each year, between 1985 and 1988, and almost 14 percent between 1988 and 1989; see Table 2) made it clear that the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers had reached crisis proportions.

Table 1
Need for, Supply of, and Shortage of Bilingual Education Teachers, 1990

(Totals revised to provide an estimate for 1991)

[image not included]

Figure 2
Language Groups Represented in California's LEP Student Population, 1992

[image not included]

LEP Total: 1,078,705

Source: Department of Education 1992 R30-LC, Annual Language Census

Table 2
LEP Students and Estimated Demand, Supply, and Shortage of Bilingual Teachers, 1985-92

Year	LEP Students		Bilingual Teachers		
	Number	Percent Change	Estimated Demand ^a	Supply ^b	Estimated Shortage
1985	524,082	6.6	13,613	7,891	5,722
1986	567,564	8.3	14,742	8,020	6,722
1987	613,224	8.0	15,928	8,025	7,903
1988	652,439	6.4	16,946	7,955	8,991
1989	742,559	13.8	19,485 ^c	7,775	11,710
1990	861,531	16.0	22,365 ^c	8,037	14,328
1991	986,462	14.5	25,608	8,667	16,941
1992	1,078,705	9.4	28,015	9,181	18,834

Notes:

- a. Estimates for total bilingual teacher demand have been extrapolated forward to 1992 and backwards to 1985, based on the 1989-90 detail (see Table 1). The overall demand calculation uses a student:teacher ratio of 38.5 to 1.
 - b. Source: R-30, Annual Language Census. Quezada's independently estimated total supply for 1989 is only three percent less than the CDE-reported supply for that year.
 - c. The calculation of demand is based on a 30:1 ratio for grades K-6, 150:1 for 7-12, and 12:1 for students in special education ungraded settings. These detailed estimates for 1989 and 1990 are borne out by Quezada's independent estimate of the entire 1989 demand from her sample of school districts' own stated demand for bilingual and ELD teachers (Quezada, 1992, p. 18). Quezada's total state demand, independently extrapolated from 137 districts enrolling 79 percent of all LEP students in the state, is only 3.6 percent less than the 1989 demand calculated by this formula.
-

A task force was called together by State Superintendent Honig to examine this problem in depth from 1989 to 1990, and concluded that:

The crisis can be resolved with creativity, flexibility, and additional finances. If conditions are left to deteriorate, California will suffer disastrous economic and social consequences (CDE, 1991, p. 5).

The California Department of Education (CDE) initiative formulated as a response to the task force recommendations states:

If we fail to take ... action now, we will be faced in fifteen years with a greatly-underserved LEP population twice what we have today. The predictable failure of several hundred thousand of our current LEP students and the approaching disaster for the 1.5 million LEP children of the year 2005, for their families, and for all of California cannot be overstated (CDE, 1991b:, p. iv).

The California Legal Framework

California's State Program for Students of Limited-English Proficiency uses both federal law and the state law, preserved after the sunset of AB 507 (CDE, 1987), to set standards for the provision of specialized services to LEP students. The required base program is one of transitional bilingual education. CDE training materials describe this program as,

a dynamic continuum of instruction made up of four special components plus mainstream instruction that may vary in emphasis, time, or intensity according to the diagnosed needs of given students. When correctly arranged, the pieces fit together neatly like pieces of a puzzle, ensuring the LEP students' complete access to the district's core curriculum and acquisition of English.

To provide instruction for LEP students requires a clear instructional language policy, careful planning, and periodic diagnosis of the English proficiency levels of students. Both formal and informal assessments of primary language proficiency and academic performance should

complement English assessments to help establish the correct mix of (1) English language development; (2) primary language academic instruction; (3) sheltered academic instruction; and (4) mainstream academic instruction; and fit these together with (5) self-image and cross-cultural instruction (Gold, 1992).

Although the required basic state program is one of transitional bilingual education,¹¹ the state recognizes the power of extended use of the primary language for content instruction (see Ramírez et al., 1990; Cziko, 1992, Dolson and Mayer, 1992). School districts are encouraged to recognize the advantages of content-based primary language instruction, and may conduct late-exit and two-way bilingual programs where they are feasible (CDE, 1990). CDE training materials point out the distinction between the required minimum program, and an ideal, extended use of the primary language:

Primary language instruction may no longer be required after students have reached advanced proficiency levels in English. Nevertheless, continued use of the primary language for some aspect of content instruction is optimal and contributes to the goals of reinforcing a positive self-image for LEP students and ensuring that they enjoy the personal, social, academic, and professional benefits of additive bilingualism. (Gold, 1992, p. 3)

With careful diagnosis and grouping of LEP students, schools may staff programs in a manner that maximizes the efficiency of a limited number of bilingual teachers. In grades and subjects where LEP students speak little or no English a fully-qualified bilingual teacher should be assigned. In settings where all LEP students are at the high-intermediate and advanced levels, or where teachers are teamed to provide primary language, specially-designed ("sheltered") content instruction and ELD instruction, a Language Development Specialist may provide key aspects of the program in English, while a bilingual teacher delivers instruction in the primary language to an appropriate group of LEP students.¹²

The Demand for Bilingual Teachers

The result of this approach can be self-contained classes, teaming, or departmentalization of instruction. The focus is on delivery of the right instructional services, using the right language channel, or combination of channels. Over the last dozen years we have arrived at a rough rule-of-thumb used to estimate the demand for bilingual teachers.

As noted above, the student:teacher ratios used are: kindergarten through grade 6—30:1; grades 7 through 12—150:1, and special education (ungraded)—12:1 (see Table 1). The overall student:teacher ratio for all LEP students using these ratios is about 38 to 1. Additional ELD and specially trained teachers are needed to ensure that all required services reach all LEP students. These estimates appear reasonable when we compare diagnosed groups of students with actual teacher and class distribution patterns in schools throughout the state. We have opportunities to do this when we examine language census data and conduct on-site program audits and compliance reviews (see also Quezada, 1992, p. 18).

The Demand for ELD Teachers

We have found that these estimates of the demand for bilingual teachers are fairly accurate, but the separate demand for ELD teachers has been harder to estimate due to the great deal of variation in the way ELD instruction is delivered. Quezada developed a statewide estimate of demand for ELD teachers (1992, p.

18) that was 13 percent higher than the need for bilingual teachers, based on LEP staffing plans from a sample of school districts enrolling 79 percent of LEP students in the state for the 1989-90 school year. We have since determined that many of the original estimates for ELD teachers represented a duplicate count of the bilingual teacher demand. An examination of the declared ELD positions and the staffing trends across the state lead me to the conclusion that a separate ELD teacher demand of 80 to 90 percent of the bilingual teacher demand is reasonable.

Lacking a more precise methodology to estimate the separate ELD teacher demand at the present, this paper uses 85 percent of the calculated bilingual teacher demand to estimate the ELD teacher demand (see Table 3, and Figures 4 and 6). The resulting overall ratio of LEP students to a combined demand for qualified bilingual and ELD teachers is about 21 to 1, and is close to the "low" (20:1) ratio reported by Macías (1989, pp. 22-23). It is within the prevalence-based model range (from 20:1 to 25:1) considered by Boe to result in a reasonable estimate of combined bilingual and ESL teacher demand (1990, p. 36).

Table 3
Estimated Demand, Supply, and Shortage of ELD Teachers, 1985-92

Year	Estimated Teacher Demand		Supply ^c	Percent Change	Estimated Shortage
	Bilingual ^a	ELD ^b			
1985	13,613	11,571	471	--	11,100
1986	14,742	12,531	486	3.2	12,045
1987	15,928	13,539	465	-4.3	13,074
1988	16,946	14,404	713	53.3	13,691
1989	19,485	16,562	1,472	106.5	15,090
1990	22,365	19,010	4,096	178.3	14,914
1991	25,608	21,767	4,851	18.0	16,916
1992	28,015	23,813	6,612	36.0	17,200

Notes:

- a. Estimates of bilingual teacher demand are explained in notes at Table 2.
- b. ELD teacher demand is estimated at 85% of bilingual teacher demand. While this provides a complete picture of the need for all ELD teachers--even ensuring that small and scattered numbers of LEP students can be served by qualified teachers--it may be a substantial over-estimate, should greater reliance be placed on teaming and other more efficient configurations.
- c. Source: R-30, Annual Language Census. The supply of qualified ELD teachers assigned to provide specialized instruction in ELD to LEP students.
- d. The ratio of LEP students to the combined total bilingual and ELD teacher demand is 20.8:1.

Teacher Demand for Grades 7-12

A special note is warranted regarding estimates of teacher demand for grades 7-12. While the demand for bilingual teachers in middle and high schools is for far fewer teachers, the supply of bilingual teachers in secondary schools is far smaller. Sietsema (1987), cited by Boe (1990, p. 38) reported that about 85 percent of all credentialed bilingual teachers were teaching at the elementary level. In California, about 70 percent of LEP students are enrolled in grades K-6, but our estimate is that almost 90 percent of the demand for bilingual teachers is at that grade span. This is due to the fact that greater numbers of LEP students at grades 7-12 no longer need primary language instruction, and may be served with departmentalized teachers. In addition, with careful school organization, one bilingual teacher (FTE) can provide primary language content instruction for 150 students per day.

We used several assumptions in selecting our base student:teacher ratio of 150:1 for preparing our demand estimates for grades 7-12 (CDE, 1991a. See Table 1). We assumed that the students requiring primary language instruction (an estimated 35 percent of all LEP students at these grades) should receive an average of one period per day of ELD, three periods in the primary language (from among language arts, science, mathematics, and social science), one period of physical education, plus one elective or another period of ELD. Of course, the program of instruction and the mix of primary language, ELD, sheltered, and mainstream instruction can be expected to vary each year, or even each semester, as students acquire more English proficiency. Many LEP students at grades 7-12 arrive at these grades with oral proficiency in English, and are at the high-intermediate to advanced ELD levels, which would not necessarily require instruction in the primary language.¹⁴

Any alternate selection of student:teacher ratios, as well as assumptions about retention, transfer, and attrition will greatly influence estimates of demand and therefore shortage (Boe, 1990, p. 23). For bilingual teachers, this paper relies on estimates of demand, as defined above, a known supply of qualified teachers employed in the delivery of primary language instruction for LEP students—reported in the Annual Language Census—and the resultant shortage (demand minus supply). See Table 1.

Frame of Reference and Research Questions

Beginning in late 1987, a loose network of California educators set out to demonstrate positive results with a small, but concerted effort to eliminate the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers. We were influenced by a sense of the possible. The teacher training efforts of a number of local school districts had been successful. The state's eleven Bilingual Teacher Training Program centers had trained thousands of teachers in culture, language and methodology during the 1980s, in spite of a budget which decreased in real dollars for a decade, while the number of LEP students more than doubled. A number of regional Multidistrict Trainer of Trainers Institutes (MTTIs) had shown remarkable results in building bilingual professional expertise (see Calderón, 1992; Macías, 1989b).

I was encouraged by the results in another country, when I had the opportunity from 1988 to 1989 to study bilingual education in Catalonia, Spain. There, a government policy promotes the academic use of two languages (Catalan and Castilian) and supports the preparation and placement of qualified bilingual teachers in the schools. The Catalan program had achieved remarkable results in training and retraining thousands of the teachers needed in less than ten years after a decision was made to do so (Generalitat de Catalunya, 1983; Gold, 1989).

In California, many educators were aware of the possibilities, and also of the urgency in developing a remedy to the bilingual teacher shortage. With cautious optimism, and the support of recommendations for a comprehensive, statewide policy on LEP staffing from a 1986 report from the Assembly Office of Research (Gandara, 1986), work proceeded both within state government and in the field to put together a series of steps which now may be characterized as California's staffing initiative for LEP students.

In order to describe this initiative, and its results to date, this paper seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What have been the major factors influencing bilingual education policy options in California since 1987?
2. What key administrative and legislative actions have been taken to address the staffing needs for LEP students?
3. How have the policy choices exercised by key state agencies and policy makers contributed to the momentum toward an eventual remedy of the shortage of teachers?
4. What additional steps can be taken to eliminate the shortage of bilingual teachers?

The major approach used to respond to questions one and two will be a narrative chronology of the five-year period, from 1987 to 1992. This chronology is meant to provide examples of policy choices and actions taken, not to exhaustively document all steps in the development and implementation of the initiative. As I present a response to these questions from the point of view of a participant in the formal, state agency part of the initiative, I will comment as well on the contributions made by a variety of professional organizations, support agencies, county offices of education, local school districts, and individual educators to the development and implementation of key policy options.

Methodology

Rather than a report of a research project, this paper is a policy analysis that is the result of personal and professional reflection on a recent period in history. It relies on a review of state and school district documents, on interviews with policy makers and practitioners, and on notes and recollections of meetings from the author's role as participant-observer in the implementation of state policy on LEP staffing issues. Among the data sources used extensively are the individual district LEP staffing plans, now numbering over 550, and Annual Language Census reports from all California schools ($n = 7,561$).

I have also been greatly influenced by dozens of on-site compliance reviews that my colleagues and I have conducted in school districts throughout the state. These on-site reviews have provided opportunities for direct confirmation of the reasonableness of teacher demand estimates, and of the accuracy of district reports of staffing and reports of their own efforts to remedy the shortages of teachers.

Delimitations

This paper presents a study of a single case—the state of California. I hope that the analysis and recommendations which result will lead to improvements in California and elsewhere. There is no attempt to claim generalizability of any specific finding; rather, the overall approach which evolved may be instructive to educators in other locations. This approach focused energy and resources on what had been an intractable problem. The initiative involved the effort of many individuals, but few new resources were invested. Any results which have been obtained are due to many factors, some of which can not be documented here.

In presenting estimates of teacher shortages, no differentiation has been attempted regarding attrition as a source of those shortages. Ultimately, greater efforts to retain qualified teachers as well as to increase production, will be needed to eliminate the shortages. The data sources used allowed a focus on estimates of demand, using specific assumptions regarding student:teacher ratios. The CDE language census reports of qualified teachers actually employed in the delivery of specific types of instruction for LEP students provided the supply data. I am frustrated, as have been many previous investigators (Boe, 1990; Chapa, 1990; Macías, 1989), by the lack of consistent, reliable data nationwide regarding bilingual and ELD teachers. Nevertheless, I am confident that the estimates reported in this paper are reasonable. They are of sufficient accuracy to facilitate an analysis of the trends that have emerged, and to form the basis for planning improvements.

Findings

This section reports on the factors influencing bilingual education policy options in California since 1987, and on the key administrative and legislative actions that have been taken to address the staffing needs for LEP students. Also summarized are findings regarding the ways in which the policy choices exercised by key state agencies and policy makers contributed to the momentum toward an eventual remedy of the shortage of teachers.

Factors Influencing Policy in 1987

The sunset of AB 507, the state's bilingual education law, in June 1987, was a turning point for bilingual education in the state. In the short term, it initiated a period of instability due to doubts raised about the future of bilingual education in the state. In the long term, in retrospect, the sunset provided the opportunity for a redefinition of bilingual education from one of mandated classes and program types to one of specific language and academic services, tied as closely as possible to the diagnosed needs of LEP students, and linked closely to the curricular content of students' age and grade level.

Advocates of bilingual education (CABE, CAFABE, MALDEF, CRLA, META, the Los Angeles County Bilingual Directors' Association, and others),¹⁵ joined by most major school districts, and teachers' and administrators' associations had spent well over a year supporting compromise legislation which could reauthorize the state bilingual education program. On two occasions, both the state senate and assembly, with Democratic Party majorities, passed bills (AB 2813, and AB 37) to reauthorize AB 507, which was to sunset on June 30, 1987. On both occasions, Governor Deukmejian (R) vetoed the legislation, influenced in great part by strongly-held antibilingual education positions of the Assembly Republican caucus, a strong national English-only lobby, and the passage the previous November of a statewide ballot initiative, Proposition 63, which had declared English the state's official language (Crawford, 1989, pp. 52-53).¹⁶

At the national level, it was also a year of continued attacks on bilingual education by the U.S. Department of Education and by the director and deputy director of OBEMLA. The tone of the federal administration's relationship was one of open hostility that slowed the momentum of many bilingual programs just at a time where some well-implemented programs were beginning to show results (Crawford, 1989, pp. 74-75).

But 1987 was also a year of substantial optimism for bilingual education in California. There was increasing evidence of positive results. The California Case Studies Project (see Crawford, 1989, pp. 126-141; Krashen and Biber, 1988) provided examples of innovative bilingual approaches taken in schools with large numbers

of LEP students. Even before publication of any information on the project, word of mouth had resulted in such interest that it was necessary to establish a limited number of visitors' days at the Eastman Avenue School, and to issue a controlled number of tickets, to avoid overburdening teachers and students with visitors. There were replications of the successful Eastman Avenue School design in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and in other districts. Los Angeles developed a far-reaching Master Plan that gathered support of its school board, and was ultimately adopted in 1988.

At the 1986 CAFE conference, the California Department of Education had showcased *Beyond language* (CDE, 1986), a publication which broadened the discussion of factors to consider in school programs for language minority students to include social and cultural issues beyond language acquisition and linguistics. Jim Cummins' landmark *Harvard Educational Review* article (1986) on empowering language minority students had made a big impact with educators, and the federal General Accounting Office issued a generally-favorable review of the research on bilingual education (GAO, 1987). The stage was set for improvements, in spite of the political setbacks.

Policy and Administrative Choices

The first policy choice presented to the Department of Education was whether to take any action at all in response to the sunset of the state law. Local school districts could have been advised to interpret the impact of the sunset on their own, and to proceed as they saw fit. The advantages of such a choice were that the state would be seen as providing "maximum flexibility" to local school districts—a phrase which was often heard during the debates over the reauthorization of the state law.

Instead, the Department chose to act quickly to notify school districts of the changes that resulted from the sunset of the old law, and of the continuing state and federal requirements to identify and serve LEP students. It was clear that the potential for chaos was great. There had never before been a sunset of any state program, and administrators and the public at large were confused as to the impact. Furthermore, a review of federal requirements, especially *Gómez v. Illinois State Board of Education* (see CDE, 1987b), made it clear that the state had a continuing legal obligation to set standards regarding services to LEP students, and to enforce those standards. It was decided that a detailed program advisory would be issued to school districts.

At the time of the sunset, the trend in school reform had clearly moved away from the isolated enforcement of procedural requirements and toward a performance-based accountability system. This shift, coupled with substantial revisions in the state frameworks for the curricular areas of language arts, mathematics, science and history-social science, made it natural to highlight the ways in which services for LEP students should ensure access to a district's core curriculum as well as ensure the development of proficiency in English.

The three-part standard of *Castañeda* provided the underpinnings for a shift to accountability for the results of the base program for LEP students and for subsequent articulation of a number of staffing and administrative options (*Castañeda v. Pickard*, 1981). That standard requires school districts to take "appropriate action" to eliminate language barriers impeding the participation of LEP students in a district's regular instructional program:

(First), the program must be based on sound educational theory or principles. (Second), the school system must provide the procedures, resources, and personnel necessary to apply the theory in the classroom, and, (third), after a reasonable period of time, the application of the

theory must actually overcome the English language barriers confronting the students and must not leave them with a substantive academic deficit. (CDE, 1987b, pp. 15 - 16)

It was determined that a base program—essentially transitional bilingual education—was required by a careful reading of the eight general purposes of the former bilingual education act, but that the federal and state standards allowed for alternatives in program as long as they met the *Castañeda* standard, and were tightly coupled with accountability for results in fluency in English and academic achievement.

Subsequently, CDE faced choices on how to balance the relative emphasis on technical assistance versus compliance monitoring, how to respond to calls for greater flexibility in the enforcement of requirements, how to respond to political and court challenges, and how to deal with districts that either could not or would not come into compliance with state requirements. The chronology that follows provides some examples of the approaches taken by the CDE and other state agencies charged with implementation of services for LEP students.

Policy Actions - a Five Year Chronology

What follows is a record of the policy actions taken related to staffing programs for LEP students. It provides an overview of the steps taken, and range of activities that occurred during the time from the sunset of the state bilingual law to spring 1992. Of course this chronicle is not exhaustive, and other events have influenced the development and implementation of bilingual education programs, including their staffing. The intent is to illustrate the ways in which the CDE provided leadership, and many other state and local agencies and individuals contributed to the statewide LEP staffing initiative.

1987—a year of uncertainty. Faced with the sunset of the state bilingual education law, staff at the California Department of Education (including the Legal Office, the Bilingual Education Office, and the Consolidated Programs Management and Management Systems Development units) proceeded to examine both the sunset legislation and the former state bilingual law. That examination resulted in recommendations to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bill Honig, that changes be made in the requirements for local school districts. Subsequently, a program advisory (CDE, 1987b) and a revision of the Department's *Coordinated compliance review manual* (CDE, 1987c) were issued. The Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) is the mechanism used to conduct compliance reviews of school districts on a three-year cycle.

Prior to 1987, the CCR had contained 27 items of compliance requirements for bilingual education. These were reduced to 17 in the 1987 manual. Removed from the requirements were: numerical triggers for bilingual classrooms, specific program types, classroom composition ratios (LEP to non-LEP), parent signatures on selected documents, mandatory documentation of individualized learning programs, and the requirement for teachers who lacked state bilingual certification but were assigned to bilingual classes to obtain a waiver from the state. The examination of the sunset law itself, and relevant state and federal statutes and court decisions established that there were eight general purposes of the former law which remained in effect.

Included in these purposes was the need to provide academic instruction through the primary language for those students whose diagnosis makes it necessary. When provided, a qualified bilingual teacher is required. In addition, LEP students are to receive English language development instruction, specially designed academic instruction in English ("sheltered content"), and instruction that reinforces a positive self-image and promotes cross-cultural understanding (CDE, 1987b, 1987c).

The California Department of Education determined that the specific requirement for state bilingual teaching authorizations triggered under the old law had sunset, but that it was still necessary for qualified teachers to be employed in the delivery of English language development instruction and any academic instruction delivered in the students' primary language. It was also necessary for districts to provide training programs to qualify future teachers and other staff, and to employ qualified personnel to implement the general purposes of the law which remained in effect (CDE, 1987b, p. 17).

The state's Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC is an agency independent of the Department of Education) took the position that bilingual and ELD credential requirements remained in effect after the sunset, and sought an opinion from the Attorney General's Office. That opinion, when issued more than a year later, confirmed the CDE position that there could be options to state certification to establish the qualifications of ELD and bilingual teachers (California Attorney General, 1988). The Department subsequently provided technical assistance to school districts, and set forth the conditions which would have to be met to establish a valid and reliable district designation procedure as an alternative to CTC authorizations (CDE, 1989d).¹⁷

1988—state direction and local district protests. Using the 1987 Program Advisory as a guide, Department of Education staff conducted a series of informational workshops around the state in the fall of 1987. Compliance reviews were conducted in 1987-88, based on the revised items, and a great deal of concern was voiced by school district personnel who still remained uncertain of the overall impact of the changes announced the prior year. The state had suggested that greater flexibility existed for provision of services for LEP students, but little specific guidance had been given.

The state's Attorney General opinion that standards other than those embodied in CTC authorizations could be used to establish that teachers are qualified to provide bilingual instruction caused a great deal of confusion. The Attorney General indicated that,

Having a bilingual education credential or certificate does, of course, evidence that the teacher is competent, and a school district may undoubtedly rely upon such teaching staff. All that we conclude is that competence may be established by other criteria. (1988, p. 6)

By May 1988, a second major program advisory was issued. This advisory enumerated five staffing and program options for school districts that included: (1) a performance-based alternative to the state requirements; (2) the use of CTC-authorized teachers to cover required ELD and primary language instruction; (3) a local-designation option as an alternative to CTC authorization of teachers; (4) a multiyear plan to remedy the shortage of teachers, should districts still face a shortage after employing the first three options; and (5) a one- to two-year waiver of teaching in the primary language where there was a documented shortage of materials, bilingual teachers, and teacher training (CDE, 1988). A sixth option was subsequently added (September 1989) to acknowledge the special circumstances where LEP students were found in small and scattered numbers (Reyes and Brynson, 1989).

School districts were to prepare immediately for the exercise of one or more of these options for providing services for LEP students and were given until November 1, 1988, to submit their plans. Only a limited amount of technical assistance could be provided by CDE staff between June and October of 1988, and the November review of district plans for options one, three, four, and five showed that few districts had submitted approvable plans. Many districts provided less than a page of assertions to the effect that, "LEP students are doing well in our district," as a way of seeking approval for Option 1, the performance-based alternative. No data on English language or academic achievement were submitted.

Other districts, seeking to use Option 3, the local designation option, merely asserted that, "qualified teachers will be employed," but did not submit descriptions of the procedures, competencies, and standards that would be applied to make the determination that teachers were qualified. And districts facing a shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers (requiring a plan under Option 4) submitted assurances that, "the district will continue to recruit and train bilingual teachers," but they did not provide an analysis of demand, supply, and shortage, nor a plan describing the strategies to be employed in the effort to eliminate the shortage with objectives for actually remedying that shortage.

The district responses from June through November of 1988, and Department of Education rejection of the majority of these, led to a number of protests from school districts. District staffs insisted that further guidance was needed if they were to comply with the new requirements. They had initially seen the sunset of the state law as providing greater flexibility, but were not prepared to take on the planning and implementation role asked of them by the state. A meeting was held with State Superintendent Bill Honig, who agreed to postpone some of the compliance deadlines, to provide greater technical assistance, and to constitute an advisory committee on LEP issues, which could provide feedback and guidance to the department on the implementation of the staffing and program options.

Meanwhile, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing recognized that thousands of teachers in training who had previously been tracked by CDE's compliance branch were left in limbo by the sunset. They were no longer required to be on an official state waiver but had no clear authorization to provide ELD or bilingual instruction. Legislation was introduced and passed that conferred an interim authorization on teachers who had formerly been on a state waiver and who had completed at least the culture and methodology components of the state Bilingual Certificate of Competency examination.

These teachers were authorized to provide ELD instruction until August 1993, at which time they must complete one of the state authorizations. They were also allowed to continue as the principal teacher of LEP students needing instruction in their primary language, as long as they were assisted by a bilingual paraprofessional. The great increases in the supply of qualified ELD teachers between 1987 and 1989 were primarily due to these provisional authorizations. See Table 3, above.

1989–technical assistance and district responses. By early 1989 the department had prepared technical assistance materials that provided specific guidance on how to develop and implement a plan to remedy the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers. These included both a Resource Guide, and a Sample Plan (CDE, 1989a, 1989b). After CDE staff conducted a round of training sessions throughout the state, districts were expected to submit complete plans by June 1.

In February, the San Francisco Federal District Court issued an Order in a case brought against the Berkeley Unified School District. Among the issues raised by that order were the role of state bilingual credentials. The federal court, while ignoring California law which requires primary language instruction for some LEP students, agreed with the state's Attorney General that state bilingual credentials need not be the sole criteria for determining which teachers are qualified to provide bilingual instruction. The California Department of Education issued an extensive Legal Advisory in May, which summarized the Federal Court Order and reiterated the staffing requirements for programs in the state (CDE, 1989c).

To respond to numerous concerns from both large and small school districts, Superintendent Honig appointed a task force on LEP staffing issues, and asked the group to provide input to CDE staff as they developed the detailed implementation strategies for the various staffing and instructional options that had

been announced in their general form in 1988. The task force was made up of representatives from school districts (including two superintendents), county offices of education, professional associations, higher education, and school boards. In addition to its charge to provide input on interim measures to deal with the present shortage of bilingual staff, the group was asked to formulate a long-range proposal to increase the supply of teachers qualified to work with LEP students.

The thirty member task force met throughout 1989 and presented its draft report in May 1990. The final report provided specific recommendations for statewide efforts that could result in a remedy of the shortage of bilingual teachers. It addressed these recommendations to the legislature, to the California Department of Education, to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to colleges and universities, to the legislature, and to school districts (CDE, 1991a).

During the months the task force held deliberations on its recommendations for remedying the shortage of teachers for LEP students, CDE staff—with the assistance of volunteer field colleagues from local school districts—completed a first round review of district plans to remedy the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers. CDE staff also developed a technical assistance guide and training package for school districts interested in Option 3, the local designation of bilingual and ELD teachers. The technical assistance guide set forth the legal and instructional standards that should be applied in preparing an application for CDE approval of the local designation option (CDE, 1989d).

In response to an early draft report of the task force, four CDE division directors agreed to organize an internal LEP Staffing Work Group. The purpose of the work group was to develop a department response to the recommendations of the external task force, and to prepare work plans for implementing several of the key recommendations.

The CDE staff responsible for bilingual compliance issues continued review of local district plans to remedy the shortage and began individual dialogues with school district administrators regarding improvements needed in these plans and the need to establish district action teams that included directors of personnel, directors of state/federal programs, and directors of instruction, along with the bilingual education coordinator or director.

1990—review, study, and recommendations. In February, the California Teachers Association (CTA) held a one-day workshop on bilingual education for its board of directors. The CTA is the major representative of teachers in the state and its membership plays an important political and policy role in the state.

The momentum on bilingual education staffing issues continued to develop with a national focus during an OBEMLA-sponsored forum on "Staffing the Multilingual Impacted Schools of the 1990s." Superintendents of three of the largest California districts (Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Sacramento) attended.

With the draft Task Force Report (*Remedying the shortage...*) completed in May, a press conference was held in conjunction with the Day of the Teacher, to announce the major recommendations. A limited amount of local and state coverage was given to these recommendations in the print media.

The California Education Round Table, with representatives of K-12 education, community colleges, the University of California, California State University, the California Community Colleges, and independent colleges and universities, formed an Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC) to:

strengthen cooperative efforts among the state's schools, colleges and universities. It also is

designed to . . . identify areas of unmet needs and to serve as a forum for the discussion of critical educational issues. (ICC, 1990b, p. 1)

The ICC discussed issues related to the shortage of teachers for LEP students, and issued a number of recommendations for statewide coordinated action (ICC, 1990a, 1990b). Unfortunately, neither new nor redirected resources were made available to carry out these recommendations—or others aimed at the expansion of educational opportunities for poor and ethnic minority students historically underrepresented in higher education. As the ICC Annual Report noted, in spite of combined requests for augmentations to intersegmental activities in the areas of outreach and student preparation, transfer and articulation, and improvement of teaching and curriculum, totaling over \$23 million:

[T]he California Community Colleges received \$205,000 for their intersegmental requests. None of the augmentations for 1990-91 intersegmental activities which were requested by the California Department of Education, the California State University, and the University of California were funded. (ICC, 1990b, p. 68)

In September, Superintendent Honig announced the publication of a bilingual handbook. The handbook provides guidance based on research as well as state and federal policy on how to design the most effective instructional programs for LEP students. It describes how the requirements of teaching the core curriculum, as reflected in California's subject area frameworks, interact with the special needs of LEP students (CDE, 1990).

In October and November the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) reviewed demographic changes that had taken place in the state, and held discussions with its Bilingual Cross-cultural Advisory Panel about proposed revisions of the bilingual credentials and examination structure. Work was begun on specifications for new credentials: the Crosscultural, Language, and Academic Development (CLAD) credential and the bilingual version of this credential (BCLAD) (CTC, 1992).

And by the close of 1990, CDE staff working on bilingual compliance issues had completed preliminary review of annual reports on the LEP staffing plans that had been submitted by over 500 school districts. Trainings had been held throughout the state, and these reports provided information on the success of recruitment, hiring, and training activities, as well as revised timetables for completely eliminating the shortages of bilingual and ELD teachers. Once again, it was possible to complete the reviews and provide technical assistance comments to districts only with the help of volunteer field colleagues.

1991—CDE LEP Staffing Initiative is launched, some progress reported. A key step was taken to establish an expanded statewide voice for LEP issues among the recognized voices supporting the state's major curriculum reforms. Rosalia Salinas, formerly of the San Diego County Office of Education, was appointed to head the California Language Minority Project (CLMP), a project intended to work directly with the high-status curriculum projects operating under the auspices of the University of California. These projects, including the California Writing Project and similar groups dedicated to improvements in science, mathematics, and social science, now had somewhere to turn for advice on how best to connect the curricular areas with the growing LEP population, and how to improve the staffing of all programs for LEP students.

In addition, CLMP was the vehicle used to expand bilingual teacher training efforts in two previously under-served areas of the state (Sacramento and Alameda counties). It also provided a new focus on the training needed by all of California's teachers on the most effective approaches to use with LEP students.

In January, a *LEP staffing initiative* (CDE, 1991b) received internal Department of Education approval, and was announced by Superintendent Honig in Anaheim at the annual meeting of the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE). That initiative sought to respond to the recommendations made the prior year by the external task force (CDE, 1991a), and included five major target areas: (1) the recruitment of future teachers; (2) the expansion of teacher preparation; (3) expansion of staff development; (4) the improvement of access to bilingual and ELD certification and support for bilingual teachers; and (5) the implementation of a comprehensive public relations campaign. The CDE LEP Staffing Work Group set out to identify staff and resources which could be used to carry out the initiative.

Two other events took place at the January CABE conference that provided additional impetus to the LEP staffing efforts. A small group of CABE officers, representatives of colleges and universities, and CDE staff organized a Deans' Forum to provide further information to deans of schools of education and other key decision-makers engaged in teacher preparation. While only one dean attended, fifteen campuses were represented by faculty or other dean's representatives. This meeting sparked an interest which led to presentations by CDE, CTC, and CABE representatives to full meetings of all deans of the California State University system in December 1991 and April 1992.

A Recruiters' Institute at CABE was jointly sponsored by the CDE and CTC. Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff detailed specifications to be used in the development of the new bilingual and ELD credentials (BCLAD and CLAD). Several school districts reported on success that they had in recruiting and hiring bilingual teachers, and CDE released a new technical assistance document, *Overcoming teacher shortages for LEP students: Promising practices guide* (CDE, 1991c). This guide provides suggestions gleaned from local school districts' staffing plans, and from the doctoral research of María Quezada, one of CDE's volunteer field colleagues (Quezada, 1991), on some of the most effective practices used by California districts in recruiting, hiring, retaining, and training bilingual and ELD teachers, and the approaches used to reconfigure school and district programs to make the most effective use of limited numbers of bilingual staff.

By June the final report of the CDE Task Force on Selected LEP Issues was published and disseminated to school districts, colleges, and universities. Interest continued to grow around the state in ensuring a better match between the teachers produced for the state's schools, and the special needs of the students enrolled.

In September a special hearing was held by the Assembly Education Committee on teachers for the twenty-first century. Laurie Olsen of California Tomorrow was quoted as saying,

While the demographics of California's five million school children have changed dramatically over the last two decades, the state's teaching force remains predominately white, monolingual, and unprepared to deal with a diverse student enrollment. (Lambert, 1991)

Additional trainings were held in the fall of 1991 on the Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) requirements for LEP students, and on the LEP staffing plan annual reports. Three CDE bilingual compliance consultants, now housed together in a new unit (Information Management and Bilingual Compliance), developed new training materials, and continued to work with volunteer field colleagues to conduct reviews of district plans, to negotiate more ambitious timelines for complete remedies of shortages, and to provide technical assistance to school district staffs.¹⁸

Throughout most of 1991, the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) staff worked on a training

module on LEP student issues to be disseminated statewide. The CSLA is charged with providing training for county, district, and school site administrators, and has been one of the principal vehicles for the implementation of many of the state's curriculum reforms. CDE and district staffs provided guidance on the training content to ensure that it reflected both the technical assistance and compliance messages which were being broadcast by other state agencies.

By the end of the year, data from the 1991 Annual Language Census were available to confirm that there had been increases in the numbers of bilingual teachers (up 7.8 percent over 1990), and ELD teachers (up 18 percent). These increases, coming on the heels of the increases of 1990, gave some cause for hope that the statewide efforts were paying off (see Table 4, and Figures 3 and 4).

Table 4
Annual Changes in Total LEP Students, in Bilingual Teacher and ELD Teacher Supply, and in Bilingual Teacher and ELD Teacher Shortages

Year	LEP Percent Change	Teacher Supply Percent Change		Teacher Shortage Percent Change	
		Bilingual	ELD	Bilingual	ELD
1986	8.3	1.6	3.2	17.5	8.5
1987	8.0	0.1	- 4.3	17.6	8.5
1988	6.4	- 0.9	53.3	13.8	4.7
1989	13.8	- 2.3	106.5	30.2	10.2
1990	16.0	3.4	178.3	22.4	- 1.2
1991	14.5	7.8	18.0	18.2	13.4
1992	9.4	5.9	36.0	11.2	1.7

Notes:

From 1985 to 1992, LEP students grew by 106 percent, bilingual teachers by 16 percent, and ELD teachers by 1,304 percent.

a In 1988, the post-sunset regulations allowed former teachers on bilingual waiver who had passed culture and methodology assessments to function as fully-qualified ELD teachers until August of 1993. Much of the gain in ELD teachers in 1988 and 1989 can be attributed to the "grandparenting" of these teachers.

b The results of the first full year of recruiting, hiring, and training under the LEP staffing plans negotiated during the 1989-90 school year were reported beginning in the 1990 census. While the first LEP staffing plans were negotiated in the fall of 1988, few were approved until the fall of 1989.

1992—sharing promising practices, closer monitoring of compliance. February saw the presentation of a

second Recruiters' Institute at the annual CABE conference in San Francisco. Additional training and hiring information was presented by state and school district personnel, with particular emphasis on the formation of future teacher's clubs among bilingual high school students, and the coordination of multidistrict training consortia.

At this institute, CDE staff distributed sample documents that support effective staffing strategies gleaned from school districts around the state, and provided materials illustrating innovative staffing configurations for elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. They also provided direct technical assistance to school district staffs encountering difficulties in recruitment, hiring, and training.

In March, the University of California's Linguistic Minority Research Project sponsored its sixth annual conference in La Jolla, and assembled 120 representatives from schools, districts, county offices of education, IHEs and the state. This two-day conference focused on the theme "Teacher Preparation and Enhancement in Teaching Language Minority Students," and served to alert faculty and researchers in the UC and CSU systems to the teacher preparation needs of schools, and to disseminate current research on bilingual teacher preparation. It was a remarkable gathering of most of the key players concerned with the preparation of bilingual and ELD teachers.

In the spring, the final report of a statewide evaluation of services to LEP students was released. This report provided insights into the diversity of language and academic needs of LEP students, and reinforced the concerns regarding the shortage of well-trained bilingual and ELD teachers (Berman, et al., 1992). In addition the study focused on the costs of various approaches for serving LEP students, on the redesignation standards and criteria, and on the particularly serious gaps in services for LEP students in grades 7-12.

The CDE compliance staff continued compliance reviews of school districts and provided technical assistance on LEP staffing plans. A second meeting sponsored by CABE, the CTC, and the CDE was held with deans of the CSU schools of education in Burlingame, where suggestions were made regarding the need to raise the visibility of bilingual teacher preparation programs at all campuses.

As part of the *CDE LEP staffing initiative*, CDE and CTC staff arranged meetings at CSU-San Marcos and CSU-San Jose to launch continued bilingual teacher training program development with two small grants issued through the CDE Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes and in conjunction with local school districts.

The CDE recommended, and the governor's budget for 1992-93 contained a proposal to augment the eleven Bilingual Teacher Training Program (BTTP) sites by \$1.5 million. But with an overall budget shortfall of \$11 billion, and competing demands for state resources from all sectors, no new funds were approved. This left the BTTP sites with less than one million dollars, an amount which had not increased since 1985. During this time the numbers of LEP students had more than doubled, and the shortage of bilingual teachers had more than tripled. The fiscal year (FY) 92-93 budget resulted in devastating state and local cuts in many programs and several districts are at or near bankruptcy.

Figure 3 **Bilingual Teachers and Percent Change from Previous Year,**

[image not included]

Source: Language Census, California Department of Education

Figure 4

English Language Development Teachers and Percent Change from Previous Year

[image not included]

Source: Language Census, California Department of Education

During 1992, local school districts continued substantial efforts to train, recruit and hire bilingual and ELD teachers, and the Annual Language Census showed an increase of 5.9 percent in the number of bilingual teachers, and a 36 percent increase in the number of ELD teachers employed in California's schools (see Tables 3 and 4, Figures 3 and 4).

Major Factors that Influenced the Statewide Staffing Initiative

Among the major factors contributing to the statewide staffing initiative have been CDE resources for technical assistance and monitoring, CTC staff for development of new credentials, local district efforts for recruiting and staff development, federal grants, and the collaboration among state agencies and with local groups and professional associations. The teacher training efforts of colleges and universities have also contributed to the momentum on LEP staffing but have lagged far behind their potential.

State Resources

The major resource has been the redirection of some state staff away from the monitoring of individual teacher waivers to the technical assistance and monitoring of local districts' LEP staffing plans. This staff work has established a presence in districts throughout the state, and has broadcast the message of support and urgency for the remedy of the bilingual teacher shortage. Three bilingual education professionals in CDE's Compliance and Consolidated Programs Management Division have carried on a sustained training, technical assistance, and monitoring effort with over 500 school districts. As one of those consultants from 1987 through 1992, and now as the manager responsible for the bilingual compliance functions, it is my perspective that the workload covered in the past by three staff members should be supported by a total of six to eight consultants.

Lacking adequate resources, the CDE has relied heavily on volunteer field colleagues to review district plans and to perform other compliance monitoring. Requests to other CDE offices and divisions for additional resources (professional and support staff, and budget for travel and logistics) assigned to implement the LEP staffing initiative received only limited responses. All state agencies have suffered painful budget cuts and it has not been possible to gain ground, even when budget change proposals have received strong support—as was the case with a proposed \$1.5 million augmentation for the Bilingual Teacher Training Program last year. It has been virtually impossible to obtain support for increased state level staff.

The January 1991 CDE LEP Staffing Initiative recommended a first year (1991) assignment of 7.0 professional FTEs and \$364,000 for state operations to support the remedy of the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers. In fact, only one FTE was assigned to the California Language Minority Project. Minimal

funds were allocated for the CSLA LEP training module and for logistics of the LEP Staffing Work Group. No other state funds were allocated for 1991. In 1992, about \$14,000 was provided for minigrants to two California State University Schools of Education, an amount which can be considered seed money and sufficient to support planning for future expanded efforts.

Local District Efforts

These have included use of district staff for recruiting, hiring, and training activities, and the creative use of a variety of funding sources for training teachers, paraprofessionals, and others. The most successful districts maintain a year-round recruiting presence and authorize recruiters to bring qualified bilingual teachers into the district for interviews at any time.

Federal Grants

Title VII training grants have contributed to the staff development efforts of local districts and the teacher training programs at IHEs. However, California receives less than its share of the local assistance grants, and far less than its share of IHE grants from Title VII. For example, in 1989, the state had over 42 percent of all LEP students in the country (see Figure 1), but only 35 percent of the local assistance grants, and only \$3.2 million out of \$19.757 million (16 percent) of the Title VII Part C training grants (OBEMLA, 1991).

Interagency Cooperation

During the past five years, efforts to remedy the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers in California have been given increasing attention by many agencies and their staffs. Principal among these are the California Department of Education and its specific program offices, and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Table 5 provides an overview of the agencies that continue to participate in efforts to remedy the bilingual teacher shortage.

Table 5

Agencies Participating in the Remedy of Bilingual and ELD Teacher Shortages

<p>California Department of Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Language Minority Project • Bilingual Education Office • Information Management & Bilingual Compliance Management) • Intersegmental Relations • Staff Development • Research and Evaluation • Child Development • Special Education <p>Commission on Teacher Credentialing</p>	<p>OBEMLA</p> <p>School Districts</p> <p>California State Universities</p> <p>Independent colleges and universities</p> <p>University of California</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UC - Linguistic Minority Research Project • Intersegmental Coordinating Council
--	---

<p>Bilingual Teacher Training Programs</p> <p>County Bilingual Coordinators</p> <p>CABE, CAFABE, CATESOL, NABE, META</p>

These agencies have worked together to build what I have characterized as the LEP staffing initiative in California. With a state of over thirty million total population, and 5.1 million students in K-12 public schools—over one million of whom are LEP students—it has been necessary to mobilize the energy of various sectors and agencies to bring resources to bear on the problem of adequate bilingual staffing. The small progress noted to date has been due in great measure to the cooperation among the agencies listed in Table 5.

Response of higher education

While the cooperation has been remarkable among staff and officials of various state agencies, the response to the growing shortage of bilingual teachers from institutions responsible for teacher training has been disappointing. Over the last seven years, numerous recommendations have been made regarding the need for colleges and universities to increase their responsiveness to the needs of the public schools for which they produce teachers. These recommendations have often echoed and expanded on those of the Assembly Office of Research:

No other state in the Union has a potential pool of bilingual teachers as large as California. Nor does any other state have as large and well-developed system of higher education as California. This state has both the human and educational resources to more than meet its needs for bilingual teachers. (Gandara, 1986, p. 26).

Unfortunately, colleges and universities nationwide have not responded well to the demand for bilingual teachers. Snyder (1989), noted that:

in 1986-87 our nation's colleges and universities reported graduating 868 bilingual/bicultural and 665 ESL teachers at both the baccalaureate and masters degree levels . . . Available national data do not inspire confidence in the production of recent college graduates in bilingual and ESL majors as the solution to the teacher supply problem. (cited by Boe, 1990, p. 38)

Local districts, aware of the needs, have dedicated enormous energy to training and retraining teachers, but the most intractable part of the problem seems to be the failure of California's colleges and universities to make a shift to the production of bilingual teachers. In 1986, Gandara recommended a modest increase of production of only ten bilingual teachers per year at each of 13 schools of education in the California State University system, and another ten per year at each campus of the University of California (1986, p. 22). This would have resulted in a net increase of about 200 teachers per year, or an additional 1,200 by 1992. In fact, there was not an increase in the rate of production of bilingual teachers; the supply did not even grow by 444 per year, which was the reported 1985-86 California State University rate of production (Gandara, 1986, p. 20). University of California and independent colleges and universities should have contributed even more.

If there was an increased effort, the results cannot be seen in the production figures for subsequent years. The actual number of recommendations for all bilingual credentials¹⁹ from CSU, UC, and independent colleges and universities numbered only 402 for 1985-86, reached 435 the following year, dropped to 402 in 1987-88, dropped further to 358 in 1988-89, and increased to only 418 in 1989-90 (Huddy, 1991, pp. 45, 49, 65). In fact, in 1990, only four percent (518 out of 13,050) of all California IHE recommendations for multiple or single subject credentials were for any of the bilingual teaching credentials, even though the bilingual teacher shortage for that year stood at over 14,000.

Some of those recommended for credentials fail to obtain the credential, or, once hired, are not assigned to work with LEP students. Other sources of supply have included the Bilingual Certification of Competence (BCC) assessment process, teachers hired from other states or countries, teachers returning to bilingual assignments, and emergency bilingual credential holders. From California IHEs and all of these other sources, there was a net average of fewer than 200 bilingual teachers per year added to the total employed supply of bilingual teachers between 1986 and 1992, after accounting for attrition. Clearly the response of the teacher training programs in our colleges and universities has been inadequate.

Results of the Staffing Initiative

Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 depict the relationships among the growth of demand for teachers of LEP students and the recent increases in the supply of bilingual and ELD teachers. Represented in Figures 3 and 4 are both the teacher supply data and its corresponding percent change from year to year. The increases in the supply of teachers, especially after 1989, are cause for celebration, when compared with prior years. Were it not for the concurrent and larger increases in the demand for these teachers, one would be tempted to conclude that the multiple efforts since 1987 have resulted in substantial progress toward a solution of the shortage of bilingual teachers.

Such optimism is not warranted, however. Figures 5 and 6 illustrate the continued growth in the size of both the bilingual and ELD teacher shortages. What is encouraging is that the rate of growth in the shortage of bilingual teachers has continued to decline since 1989, and that the rate of growth in the shortage of ELD teachers continues below the rate of growth in LEP students. Should the momentum in the production of ELD teachers continue, and LEP students grow at no more than 7 percent a year, a complete remedy of this shortage is possible within four to five years.²⁰

The outlook for bilingual teachers, although encouraging, is still bleak. Although the rate of growth of the shortage has decreased in every one of the last three years (Figure 5), the shortage is still growing faster than the growth in the LEP student population (11.2 percent, compared with 9.4 percent from 1991 to 1992. See Table 4). Analyses of the language census (1985-1992) show a major gain in ELD teachers (up 1,304 percent) and a notable increase in the numbers of bilingual teachers (up 16 percent) during the same period. During these years, the number of LEP students increased by 106 percent.

Additional encouragement comes from the 8,126 teachers reported by schools in 1992 to be in training for bilingual certification. Another 12,231 teachers were reported to be in training for ELD certification by means of in-service programs. And over 26,000 bilingual paraprofessionals are employed in these schools; many have the skills and interest in becoming future bilingual teachers. Some have completed university degrees here or abroad.

Figure 5
Bilingual Teacher Shortage and Percent Change from Previous Year

[image not included]

LEP students in the state's schools continue to increase at rates much greater than the rate of growth of total enrollment, and we must plan on meeting today's demand for bilingual teachers plus that of even larger classes of LEP students in the future. It should be clear that the joint efforts at the staff levels of various state and local agencies have produced noticeable momentum. These staff efforts have not, however, been reinforced by public policy positions or allocations of targeted funds by the governor or the legislature, by the state agencies, or by the colleges and universities responsible for training teachers for the state's schools.

Figure 6
English Language Development Teacher Shortage and Percent Change from Previous Year

[image not included]

Conclusions and Recommendations

In this paper I have described the California demographic, legal, and policy context since the mid-1980s that has influenced the development of bilingual education and set the stage for the current staffing initiative. Specific administrative actions taken since the sunset of the state bilingual law (AB 507) in 1987 were described, and a discussion of the development and exercise of selected policy options was presented. This section presents general conclusions and several policy recommendations.

The history of the last two decades, and the large shortages we face today, have led some to conclude that the production of sufficient bilingual and ELD teachers is a challenge which can never be met. If this were so, then current and future LEP students are doomed to an incomplete and inadequate education, since neither fully bilingual nor structured immersion and ELD approaches can be implemented without specially-qualified teachers. Such a conclusion, however, is not warranted because the production of sufficient bilingual and ELD teachers has never been seriously attempted.

Since 1987, policy in California appears to have evolved in a direction that could promote a long-term solution to the chronic shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers. A number of factors has contributed toward this policy shift: (1) increasing political clout of Hispanic, Asian, and other language minority communities; (2) dramatic increases in the numbers of LEP students (more than doubling since 1985) that heightened the awareness of the need for new bilingual and ELD teachers at all levels; (3) the exercise by CDE of policy options that support the use of bilingual approaches where appropriate and feasible (CDE, 1990); (4) a renewed spirit of cooperation on bilingual education between the federal government and the states and local districts after years of open antagonism during the Reagan administration; and (5) efforts by community and professional associations that influenced the CDE to convene a task force on selected LEP issues, and to launch a statewide initiative designed to remedy the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers (see also McGroarty, 1992).

With the sunset of California's bilingual education law in 1987, it first appeared that bilingual education in

the state would lose much of its momentum. Instead, state policy has shifted in ways that suggest some improvements are now possible. A simultaneous shift in federal policy orientation with the Esquivel administration at OBEMLA, and school district willingness to invest in expanded recruitment, hiring, and training have led to an overall increase in optimism that teachers will be found to provide the specialized instruction needed by LEP students.

With great caution, one can interpret the results of the informal and formal California staffing initiative for LEP students to have been somewhat successful. It has been demonstrated that the rates of growth of the shortages of bilingual and ELD teachers can be brought down. What previously appeared to be an unmanageable problem, can now be considered one where the potential exists to provide a solution. But I want to caution that it is merely a demonstration of the potential to eliminate the shortage of teachers—not a demonstration of that remedy.

The training and development of bilingual teachers conducted by the Bilingual Teacher Training Programs and local school districts has been encouraging, but colleges and universities have failed to retool for the production of the bilingual and ELD teachers needed by California's schools. The shortage of these teachers is still growing faster than the total LEP population. The initiative described in this paper has demonstrated that a relatively small number of individuals and a small investment of resources have made some difference—a start toward the eventual elimination of the shortages of bilingual teachers.

Unfortunately, the investment to date has consisted mainly of the personal energy and creativity of a small group of state staff working on bilingual compliance, staff development, and teacher credentials at several of the CDE offices and in the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. This staff work has been supported by a volunteer effort by field colleagues. There have been few new resources explicitly appropriated for the initiative. Those of us working in bilingual education feel like we are swimming up river against a strong current. We are still being carried down stream—just not as fast as before.

The California Department of Education has provided technical assistance and an accountability system for school districts implementing LEP staffing plans. It has set forth in its *Initiative* a three year plan to deploy the efforts of various agencies toward a statewide remedy of the shortage of bilingual and ELD teachers (CDE, 1989; 1991b; 1991c). But two years after the signing of the CDE initiative, little additional investment has been made toward its implementation.

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing has made a major contribution toward the improvement of certification for teachers of LEP students with the new specifications for the CLAD and BCLAD credentials. But these credentials are not yet in place, and there are still few opportunities available for the full bilingual credentialing for languages other than Spanish.

Policy Implications

With K-12 enrollment projected to grow by 200,000 students each year, and with projected teacher retirements, there will be a need for about 15,000 new teachers per year for the next decade (EdSource, 1991). This growth and the opportunity to hire new teachers mean that schools can plan for shifting the capabilities of their teachers. This will only happen if the schools of education produce the teachers needed, and if teacher recruitment and training goals are shaped by an analysis of the special bilingual and ELD needs of students. To accomplish a remedy of the shortage of bilingual teachers multiple strategies must be employed.

Multiple agencies—collaboration is essential. The experience of the last several years has made it clear that interagency cooperation is needed to maximize the impact of the limited resources available for bilingual staffing. There is a need to involve the entire culture of the state of California at state, county, and local levels in this effort to solve the problem of the shortage of bilingual teachers.

A few dedicated individuals can effect change. While thousands of teachers are needed, a sustained effort of only several dozen educators in key positions can work together to increase the supply of teachers. What is needed now are key allies in the legislature, in the Governor's office, and in the highest levels of the University of California and California State University systems.

A long-term strategy is essential. The changes in teacher production and staffing of our schools can only come about with a multiyear approach. The systems are too large and slow moving to produce results on a short-term basis. Planning must be done now for the late 1990s and—since we know that the numbers of LEP students will continue to grow—the long-term view of our schools makes it all the more urgent that action be taken immediately.

New funds are ultimately needed. Although unpopular, we cannot disguise the need for additional resources. Funds are required for the expansion of in-service training by school districts, and for a doubling of the Bilingual Teacher Training Program effort. Major new funds are required for the retraining of faculties in colleges and universities, and for the support of bilingual candidates through bachelor's degree and teacher credential programs. Many of these candidates will require mentoring and special support to ensure that they can complete degrees without dropping out in order to work to support families.

At least some of the remedy of shortage of bilingual teachers can proceed even without full consensus on program. Controversy regarding bilingual education can be expected to continue. But even while the debate goes on, there is sufficient understanding of the need for specially-trained teachers among school administrators, board members, and professional associations to garner support for greatly expanded training of bilingual and ELD teachers. Whenever it is possible to put aside the controversies surrounding bilingual instruction, there is a growing consensus on the need to ensure that our teachers have the language and cultural competencies needed to capture the attention and energy of a student population which consists of ever greater numbers of language minorities.

Both compliance monitoring and technical assistance are essential. Some schools and school districts will always provide the services needed by students in their schools. Others just cannot or do not have the will to do so. As we develop a greater reliance on performance accountability, it will be necessary to combine compliance monitoring with expert guidance to ensure that properly qualified teachers are hired and correctly deployed to serve LEP students. The performance standards being promoted for all students are still years away from full implementation. It will likely be a new century before adequate authentic measures of academic performance are widely available for assessment of LEP students—either in English or in other languages.

Ultimately, the remedy of bilingual teacher shortages may be possible. But we will only know if the remedy can be achieved if we make a concerted investment over time, work together with all concerned agencies, and make the development of these teachers our number one priority.

Recommendations for Action

Action will be needed on the local, state, and federal levels to ensure that the potential for a remedy of the bilingual teacher shortage is realized. Specific policy choices now and additional research can contribute to this outcome.

State resources and efforts must be increased. In California, a minimum number of full-time staff are needed to carry out the LEP staffing initiative. At least three professionals should be added to the three bilingual compliance staff. Two professionals are within the California Department of Education to provide leadership and guidance to the overall initiative—particularly to pursue the areas of great potential in recruiting bilingual individuals (paraprofessionals, and high school students choosing career paths) into the teaching profession. These should be matched with staff assignments within the office of the Chancellor of the California State University system. Once in place, a few staff members can network with the various state agencies working on bilingual staffing issues and can continue to provide leadership and direction that may lead toward a conversion of the teacher credentialing institutions. These are minimal investments to ensure the development of well over 35,000 bilingual and ELD teachers.

The road map for state action is contained in documents, which have been available for several years (Gandara, 1986; CDE, 1991a, 1991b). A vigorous, targeted public relations campaign focused on the IHEs, and on the staff development community will go a long way to increasing the momentum of the LEP staffing initiative. But a core group of full-time staff will be needed to serve as a beacon and to provide the day-to-day coordination and logistical support. These staff members should work to ensure that the following are carried out:

Dissemination of information to school districts, colleges and universities, and teachers and future teachers, to ensure that various constituencies are aware of the demand for bilingual and ELD teachers and the variety of approaches that can be used to meet that demand.

Coordination of training to ensure that cost-effective and consistent in-service training is available for teachers on interim assignment to serve LEP students, and that teachers and administrators participating in various school restructuring and curriculum reform efforts are aware of the program and instructional requirements for serving LEP students. This coordination should include standard-setting for both the content and methodology of training.

Compliance monitoring of local district LEP staffing plans to provide guidance and direction to local school district staffs. This monitoring is essential to ensure that personnel directors, superintendents, directors of staff development, principals, and others work collaboratively with bilingual program coordinators to train, hire, retain, and correctly assign qualified bilingual and ELD teachers.

Technical assistance to local school districts to ensure that they are aware of and use the most powerful means to train, recruit, hire, and retain bilingual teachers. This should include both assistance by state staff and the forging of networks to encourage district-to-district technical assistance.

The federal Title VII program should provide national leadership and support for substantial retraining of current IHE faculty and should support the hiring of new bilingual education teacher trainers. It is proposed that the reauthorized Title VII program dramatically increase funding for staffing and staff development to ensure that any future TBE, DBE, or SAIP programs will have qualified teachers to implement these programs. This revised focus of Title VII will ensure the development of capacity for future effectiveness in schools and districts served by the program.

The aim of the increased funding should be for teachers to attain state or alternative credentials which certify that they are competent to provide required special services for LEP students. At a minimum, \$100 million annually should be appropriated, as follows:

1. to school districts, singly or in consortia, for regional in-service training centers using training-of-trainers and multi-year MTTI models. Included in authorized activities should be the retraining of existing teachers, support for training bilingual paraprofessionals, and support for career guidance, apprenticeship, and other programs that will result in bilingual students, grades 7-12, entering the bilingual teaching profession;
2. to schools of education to immediately expand their capacity to train bilingual and ELD teachers. Expenditures would be allowed for hiring bilingual teacher training experts as part-time and adjunct instructors. It also could include authority to hire full-time bilingual teacher trainers using Title VII and matching funds who will eventually assume tenure-track positions (perhaps within 3 to 5 years);
3. to selected colleges or universities for statewide or regional faculty-retraining centers to provide academic year and summer advanced study programs, including postdoctoral certification (Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study, Ed.D., Ph.D., etc.) that will equip current faculty in schools of education to provide key aspects of theory, culture, and methodology training for future school personnel preparing to work with LEP students (future counselors and administrators, as well as teachers). Ideally, a center like UC Santa Cruz could provide a focal point for such advanced study and retraining of education school faculty so that they can play an active role in ELD and bilingual teacher preparation. Other university sites should continue to receive Title VII fellowships to produce new IHE faculty;
4. Title VII funds should be provided to stimulate IHE investments and shifting of priorities to produce bilingual and ELD teachers in a few key sites based on a careful national analysis of demand, supply, and shortage of teachers;
5. IHEs receiving soft-money grants for faculty must make a commitment to phase in permanent status for these faculty and to use them to dramatically expand bilingual and ELD teacher training. These IHEs should develop a plan to recruit, hire, and train faculty for the express purpose of expanded production of bilingual and ELD teachers. There should be careful monitoring of such grants by OBEMLA and severe consequences for failure to comply with capacity-building commitments; and
6. state education agencies (SEAs) should receive substantial support to continue and expand technical assistance, compliance monitoring, and coordination activities to ensure that teachers are produced to meet the specific regional shortages. Regional efforts through existing Multifunctional Resource Centers (MRCs), including SEA-MRC and interstate agreements should be considered to ensure that there is a cost-effective approach to teacher production, especially for states with relatively small numbers of LEP students.

Recommendations for Future Research

All education agencies can promote dissertation and other research into the barriers to bilingual staff development and how to overcome them. Some recent examples include María Quezada's study of local plans of action to remedy the shortage of bilingual teachers (Quezada, 1991, 1992), Jennifer Robles' study of the influence of specific recruitment practices on bilingual elementary school teachers' choice of school district (Robles, 1992), and Trudy Arriaga's study of perceived barriers and solutions in the ability of selected California state universities to remedy the California bilingual teacher shortage (in preparation).

These three studies represent a productive collaboration of district-based doctoral students, the California

Department of Education, and faculty at the University of Southern California (USC). Other collaborative research may also contribute to our knowledge base while simultaneously serving as a stimulus to the teacher trainers and the to the school systems, which often need both prodding and support from practitioner-researchers.

Among the questions which should be explored are:

- What districts or regions are making better progress with their LEP Staffing Plans? Why? Which are not? Why not?
- How can state and federal leverage be applied to help districts and to push IHEs to increase production?
- What resources and initiatives are needed at the federal and state levels to ensure that IHEs develop their own "Plan to remedy the shortage..." of bilingual education teacher trainers?
- What is the potential for, as well as the potential impact of, establishing several retraining institutes at major colleges and universities that could serve as sites for postdoctoral study and the retraining of faculty now serving in teacher education positions in schools of education?

The net result of focused action at local, state, and national levels, and an expanded research effort can lead to resolving the shortage of bilingual teachers. California's LEP staffing initiative has demonstrated the potential of this solution by showing that a small but significant increase in bilingual and ELD teachers can be accomplished in a hostile political and budgetary environment.

These increases have come with the effort of many individuals but with little new investment. They are the result of collaborative, multi-agency efforts after a period which saw the actual loss of bilingual teachers, and the sunseting of the state's bilingual education law. We can only imagine what powerful results will be accomplished when we have a supportive environment and truly invest in the production of bilingual teachers! If we fail to make this investment, LEP students, their families, and the greater society will all suffer.

Acknowledgments

I am very grateful for the advice, energy, and collaboration of educators throughout California. I appreciate their contributions (directly or indirectly) to this paper; however, the views presented here are solely my own, and I take responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation.

Thanks are extended in particular to colleagues (fellow *tigres*) Leroy Hamm and Arturo Vásquez and to Lynn Baugher, Manager, IMBC (now, CPIM). Their dedication and energy have made a powerful impact throughout California.

Thanks also to field colleagues María Quezada, Laurie Burnham, and Rose Patrón; also to Barbara Allen, Kevin Clark, Harriet Kelly, Mary Jew, Judy Sanchez and Francisca Sánchez, and to Karl Scheff, Gloria Cardenas, Jan Mayer, David Dolson, Dan Holt, Alice Addison, Clara Chapala, Dorothy Martínez, Miguel Navarrette, Pilo Salas, Rosalía Salinas, Sandra Anderson and Chuck Zartman; also to Carol Abbott, Cathy Barkett, Bill Adorno, Elena Vásquez, Sal Villaseñor, Allan Keown, Laura Wagner, and Mary Weaver, and to CDE division directors Wade Brynelson, Harvey Hunt, María Trejo, and Fred Tempes; to Bob Carlson, Priscilla Walton, Sarah Gómez and Yvonne Novelli at the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and to countless others without whose collective effort the recent advances in the preparation of bilingual teachers

in California would not have been accomplished.

Special thanks to Lisa VanBuskirk and to Sally Smith for extraordinary support in every respect.

Endnotes

¹ The term LEP is the current official designation in California for non-English language background students who are not yet fully proficient in English. I am sympathetic with those who propose more positive alternative designations, but use the current term as one which is defined in law, and for which we have over a decade of data.

² English language development (ELD) has become the term of choice in California to describe the comprehensive development of English oral and literacy skills. It is used in the state's compliance documents and training materials (Gold, 1992), and our intent is to signal a program of language development that goes far beyond what (erroneously) was interpreted by many as merely basic vocabulary and grammar skills taught in early English as a Second Language (ESL) classes.

Of course, excellent curricula and materials exist for comprehensive ESL instruction (many schools continue to designate "ESL Classes"), but our aim is to communicate the ways in which the development of English language proficiency for LEP students should parallel in approach and content the state's English-Language Arts Framework, including the teaching of the vocabulary and mechanics of English in natural context, and embedded in engaging content and literature. This development of English is supported by a similar approach to the development of primary language proficiency (CDE, 1990, pp. 18-22 and 34-38).

³ The overall shortages of teachers for LEP students include both bilingual and English language development (ELD) teachers. Specific references to bilingual teachers will be made in this paper when discussing the separate and less tractable shortages of teachers proficient in non-English languages and trained in the methods and materials of bilingual education. While still numbering over 17,000 in California, the shortage of ELD teachers will be eliminated, should their current rate of development be maintained (See Table 3, and discussion which follows).

⁴ Some of these are acknowledged at the end of this paper. Many more have contributed to what might be considered a grass-roots initiative to eliminate the shortage of qualified bilingual and ELD teachers in California.

⁵ In June 1987, the former state bilingual education law sunset, terminating specific program and staffing requirements. Two attempts to pass legislation renewing the law were successful in both the state Senate and Assembly, but were vetoed by then Governor Deukmejian. While specific details of the program sunset, such as triggers for the formation of bilingual classrooms, and the specific form of individual learning programs, the original purposes of the previous law were preserved by the sunset legislation itself, as was the funding mechanism for providing selected categorical aide to most schools enrolling LEP students.

A lengthy analysis and program advisory was issued by the CDE in August 1987, which set forth the effect of the sunset on programs for LEP students in California (CDE, 1987). While many schools and districts have difficulty fully complying with the requirements, there have been no formal administrative or court challenges to the Department's post-sunset interpretation of law to date.

⁶ OBEMLA (1992) recognized a total 1990-91 K-12 LEP enrollment in California of 986,462 out of a national total of 2,263,682. Other investigators have also attributed to California a similar proportion of the total LEP enrollments in recent years. Olsen, (1992) cited California as accounting for 42 percent of a national 1989-90 total of 2.030 million.

Other estimates are provided by Macias (1989), and Chapa (1989), or are cited by Boe (1990). These estimates of national LEP totals in the mid-80s ranged from 1 to 5 million. Boe (1990, p. 36) prefers the GAO estimate of 1.5 million for 1985-86, at which time CA counted 567,564 LEP in its annual census (38 percent). California's annual language census has used a systematic and fairly stable methodology of gathering reports of LEP and FEP students from 7,500 school sites since 1978. The census procedures have been monitored with audits and on-site compliance reviews.

Chapa's estimates that there were 3.68 million LEP students, ages 5-17 in the United States in 1988, and estimates for LEP in California seem to be overcounts. He reports almost **twice** the numbers of LEP students compared to California's language census [1.227 million vs. an actual count of 652 thousand (See Table 2)]. (Chapa, 1990; p. 107). The overcounts probably can not be accounted for by enrollments in nonpublic schools (about 10 percent of all youth, ages 5-17 in California), or even by adding out-of-school youth.

⁷ Teacher shortage figures are the author's estimates. See Table 2, and discussion of methodology and findings, as follows.

⁸ The issue of a federal mandate for bilingual education is a straw man set up to attack one aspect of the voluntary, optional grant program administered by the federal government under Title VII, ESEA. Since no school or district need apply for Title VII funds, and since there is, without those funds, still a federal mandate to teach English and provide LEP students access to the core curriculum of the school, the Transitional Bilingual Education or Developmental Bilingual Education programs can hardly be considered "mandates." The full range of local, state, and other federal supplemental funds can already be spent for English medium instruction for LEP students.

⁹ Sheltered English content instruction is instruction that is specially-designed to communicate curricular content to LEP students who are at the intermediate or advanced levels of English proficiency. It is viewed in the California legal framework as one component of a comprehensive program for LEP students, not as an alternative to primary language instruction. It requires special methods and materials, and—although widely discussed and promoted—is a concept that is only now evolving a firm definition. Efforts are underway to prepare comprehensive descriptions of sheltered English content instruction, to differentiate it from "ESL-content" or "content-based ESL," and to delineate the training and qualifications needed by teachers to provide this component. See Mohan, 1990, for a review of the integration of language and content.

¹⁰ Ramirez et al. (1991) found, however, that parents of LEP students preferred bilingual instruction and bilingual teachers, and noted that there was a higher level of parent participation in programs using greater amounts of the home language. Note also the discussion of the greater parent interaction with the school and students in Dolson and Mayer (1992, p. 134).

¹¹ The post-sunset administrative program and staffing options include Option 1, which allows a school

district to establish compliance with state and federal law by means of an annual evaluation study that shows that former LEP students are performing at academic parity with non-LEP students in a school or district. An alternative approach allows for demonstration of academic progress of current LEP students. When academic standards have been met, a school or school district may be exempt from the state legal requirements for a transitional bilingual education program (CDE, 1988, pp. 2-3). About 12 school districts (out of over 900 enrolling one or more LEP students) are currently operating programs under this option.

¹² This type of differentiation is, of course, possible only where there are large enough numbers of LEP students at each grade who speak the same primary language—a condition which prevails at many schools in the state. Some of the largest LEP-enrolling districts in California (Los Angeles, with over 250,000 LEP students and Santa Ana, with over 30,000, are two examples) have schools with hundreds of Spanish-speaking LEP students. In fact, several elementary schools in Los Angeles enroll over 2,000 students—half to three-quarters of which are LEP Spanish speakers.

An examination of 1991 language census data revealed that over three-fourths (77 percent) of all Spanish speakers were enrolled in 1,745 schools in concentrations of at least 150. Other language groups were less concentrated in schools with at least 150: Armenian (63 percent in 22 schools), Hmong (34 percent in 32 schools), Cantonese (24 percent in 24 schools), Vietnamese (14 percent in 24 schools), Korean (6 percent in 4 schools), and Pilipino (1 percent in 2 schools) [IMBC, 1992].

¹³ Teacher demand has been referred to in the California documents as the "teacher need." This paper uses the term "demand" consistent with Boe (1990), Macias (1989) and Quezada (1992).

¹⁴ The ratio of 150:1 for bilingual teacher demand may be estimated as follows: 35 percent of the 150 LEP students require instruction in the primary language (or are in settings where it is feasible to provide it). They receive three periods per day ($150 \times .35 = 52.5$. 52.5×3 periods = 157.5 FTE students).

Five instructional periods per day is the typical assignment for a secondary teacher. This results in an average class size of 31.5 [$157.5/5 = 31.5$]. The assumption is that each grouping of 150 LEP students generates one FTE (full time equivalent)—or five periods per day—of primary language instruction, taught by a bilingual teacher. In practice, such instruction will be taught by several teachers, each relying on both bilingual skills and their specific subject matter certification. We have urged school districts to prepare estimates of both FTE and individual teacher demand, in order to accurately project training and hiring needs. In schools with few LEP students of the same primary language per grade, it is rarely feasible to provide primary language sections of all core curriculum courses.

¹⁵ CABE, California Association for Bilingual Education; CAFABE, California Association for Asian/Pacific Bilingual Education; MALDEF, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund; CRLA, California Rural Legal Assistance; META, Multicultural Education, Training and Advocacy.

¹⁶ Once again, in 1992, a bitter legislative battle has resulted in Senate and Assembly concurrence in a bill by Senator Mello, SB 2026, to reauthorize the state's bilingual education program. This bill was vetoed by Governor Wilson (R), citing many of the same arguments used by Governor Deukmejian in vetoing bilingual legislation five years before.

¹⁷ The experience to date is that few school districts are able to invest the resources necessary to develop and administer an alternative certification process. Only San Francisco Unified School District has issued

local designation authorizations.

Alternate assessment and certification are discussed widely as means to solve general, English-only teacher shortages; and New Jersey and other states have developed some alternative means to bilingual certification. These approaches have some advantages of flexibility, but a number of drawbacks (Allegro, 1992, p. 365). Garcia makes an argument for the potential of local connoisseurship as an alternative to state bilingual certification (1992, p. 408), but I would argue that extreme caution must be exercised with this notion, given that bilingual program needs often exist in hostile political environments where those opposed to bilingual instruction could end up exercising their taste for minimal bilingual skills.

¹⁸ Leroy Hamm, Arturo Vasquez, and I (and for a part of 1991, Miguel Navarrette) formed the core group of CDE staff working on LEP staffing plans with the local districts.

¹⁹ Bilingual credentials included both multiple and single-subject bilingual emphasis credentials and the bilingual crosscultural specialist credential.

²⁰ Over the last five years, the average rate of increase in the number of ELD teachers has been 78 percent. Assuming a seven percent annual growth in the numbers of LEP students and a 50 percent annual growth in the numbers of ELD teachers, the supply will match or exceed demand in 1996. It is likely, however, that the 50 percent rate of growth in ELD teacher supply will be difficult to sustain without greatly increased resources for both preservice and in-service training.

References

- Allegro, A. (1992). The assessment of alternative certification practices. In *Proceedings of the second annual research symposium on limited English proficient student issues*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs.
- Arriaga, T. (in preparation). Perceived barriers and solutions in the ability of selected California state universities to remedy the California bilingual teacher shortage. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, School of Education.
- Baker, K. A., and de Kanter, A. A. (1981). *Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of the literature*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, OPBE.
- Baker, K. A. (1992). Comments on Suzanne Irujos's review of Rosalie Pedalino Porter's "Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education." *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, (2), Summer.
- Berman, P., Chambers, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., Olsen, L., and Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity—An evaluation of programs for pupils with Limited Proficiency in English. Vol. 1, Executive Summary (R-119/1)*. Berkeley: BW Associates.
- Boe, E. E. (1990). Demand, supply, and shortage of bilingual and ESL teachers: models, data, and policy issues. In *Proceedings of the first annual research symposium on limited English proficient students' issues*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, OBEMLA.
- Calderón, M. (1992). Teacher professional development: Recent findings. Paper presented at the Linguistic

Minority Research Project Sixth Annual Conference, March 1992.

California Attorney General, (1988). Opinion No. 87-1001, Bilingual teacher qualifications (71 Op. Cal. Atty. Gen. 9 (1988)). Sacramento: author.

California Department of Education (CDE) (Ed.). (1981). *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles: California State University, Los Angeles, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

_____. (1986). *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students*. Los Angeles: California State University, Los Angeles, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

_____. (1987a) *English-language arts framework for California public schools*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1987b). Education programs for which sunset provisions took effect on June 30, 1987, pursuant to Education Code Sections 62000 and 62000.2 August 26, 1987. Program Advisory. Sacramento: author.

_____. (CDE, 1987c). *Coordinated compliance review manual*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1988). Five options available to districts for achieving compliance with the staffing and instructional requirements of the state program for students of limited-English proficiency (LEP). Program Advisory. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1989a). *Plan to remedy the shortage of qualified teachers for LEP students — A resource guide*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1989b). *Sample plan to remedy the shortage of qualified teachers for LEP students*. Golden State Unified School District. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1989c) , Teresa P. et al. v. Berkeley Unified School District, et al. Legal Advisory (LO: 1-89). Sacramento: author.

_____. (1989d). *Technical assistance manual. Local designation of qualified teachers for LEP students. Criteria and procedures for designating primary language and/or English language development teachers*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1990). *Bilingual education handbook*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1991a) *Remedying the shortage of teachers for limited-English proficient students*. Report to the Superintendent from the task force on selected LEP issues. Sacramento, CA: author.

_____. (1991b). *Limited-English proficient staffing initiative*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1991c). *Overcoming teacher shortages for LEP students: A promising practices guide*. Sacramento: author.

_____. (1992). *Public school summary statistics, 1991-92*. Sacramento: Educational Demographics Unit, CDE.

California Department of Finance (1990). *Projections of graded enrollment, K-12, by ethnicity, 1985-2005*. Sacramento: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit.

Castañeda v. Pickard. (5th Cir. 1981) 698 F.2d 989, 1011.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). (1992). Proposal for the replacement of the Supplementary Authorization in English as a Second Language with a new Supplementary Authorization in Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD). CTC Agenda Item, August 20, 1992. Sacramento: author.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Trenton: Crane Publishing Co.

_____. (1992). *Hold your tongue*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering language minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Education Review*, 56, 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cziko, G. A. (1992). The evaluation of bilingual education. *Educational Researcher*. Special Issue on Bilingual Education. 21 (2).

Dolson, D., and Mayer, J. (1992). *Longitudinal study of three program models for language minority students: A critical examination of reported findings*. *Bilingual Research Quarterly*, 16 (1&2), Winter/Spring.

Educational Researcher. (1992) Special Issue on Bilingual Education. 21, (2).

EdSource. (1991). *Who are California's students?* Menlo Park author.

Generalitat de Catalunya. (1983) *La campanya per la normalització lingüística de Catalunya*. Barcelona: author.

Gandara, P. (1986) *Bilingual education: Learning English in California*. Sacramento: Assembly Office of Research.

Garcia, E. (1992) Teachers for language minority students: Evaluating professional standards. In *Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, OBEMLA.

General Accounting Office (GAO). (1987). *Bilingual education: A new look at the research evidence*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, GAO/PEMD-87-12BR.

Gold, N. C. (1989). The purposes of bilingual education in Catalonia. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 31, 1989.

_____. (1992). Building bilingual instruction: Putting the pieces together. *BEOutreach*, (3), 1. Sacramento: California Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office.

Huddy, S. L. (1991). *A report on teacher supply: Enrollments in professional preparation programs at California institutions of higher education, 1989-90*. Sacramento: Commission on Teacher Credentialing, State of California.

Information Management and Bilingual Compliance Unit. (1992). Data analysis for setting numerical triggers for a proposed California Language Minority Education Act. Sacramento: CDE.

Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC). (1990a). *Teaching California students who have limited English language skills: Recommended intersegmental efforts to improve the quality of instruction*. A report by the Improvement of teaching cluster coordinating committee. Sacramento: author.

Intersegmental Coordinating Council (ICC). (1990b). *Annual report to the California education roundtable, 1990*. Sacramento: author.

Krashen, S. and Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Lambert, M. (1991) Diverse teaching staffs urged. *The Sacramento Bee*, September 26, 1991.

Macías, R. F. (1989a). *Bilingual teacher supply and demand in the United States*. Los Angeles: University of California Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research; Claremont, California: The Tomas Rivera Center.

Macías, R. F. (1989b). Teacher preparation for bilingual education. In *Bilingual teacher supply and demand in the United States*. Los Angeles: University of California Center for Multilingual, Multicultural Research; Claremont, California: The Tomas Rivera Center, 5-17.

McGroarty, M. (1992). The societal context of bilingual education. *Educational Researcher*. Special Issue on Bilingual Education. 21 (2), 7-9.

Mohan, M. A. (1990) LEP students and the integration of language and content: knowledge structures and tasks. In *Proceedings of the first national research symposium on limited English proficient students' issues*. Washington, D.C.: U.S Department of Education, OBEMLA.

OBEMLA. (1992) *The condition of bilingual education in the nation*. Washington, D.C.: author.

Quezada, M. District remedies to eliminate the shortage of qualified teachers of Limited English Proficient students in California. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1991.

_____. District remedies to eliminate the shortage of qualified teachers of Limited English Proficient students in selected districts in California. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA, San Francisco, April 1992.

Ramírez, D., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., and Pasta, D. J. (1991) *Final report: Longitudinal study of immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education for language-minority children*

(2 vols.). San Mateo: Aguirre International. (Submitted to U.S. Department of Education. Contract No. 300-87-0156).

Reyes, R., and Brynelson, W. (1989) Special issues concerning the six staffing and instructional options related to the state program for LEP students. Memorandum of September 18, 1989. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Robles, J. (1992) The influence of specific recruitment practices on bilingual elementary school teachers' choice of school district. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California, School of Education.

Sietsema, J. P. (1987). *Teachers in elementary and secondary education* (CS 87-324h). Washington, D.C.: Center for Education Statistics.

Snyder, T. D. (1989). *Digest of education statistics: 1987*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Willig, A. C. (1985) A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, (3), 269-317.