

The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, v14 p. 1-22, Winter 1994.

---

# **TRAINING, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPROVEMENT (TDI): A NEW APPROACH FOR REFORMING BILINGUAL TEACHER PREPARATION.**

**Leonard Baca, Jim Bransford, Chris Nelson, Leroy Ortiz**

Note: Every attempt has been made to maintain the integrity of the printed text. In some cases, figures and tables have been reconstructed within the constraints of the electronic environment.

*The University of Colorado at Boulder is participating in the Training, Development, and Improvement (TDI) program, which assists schools and colleges of education in implementing or enhancing multicultural education programs through staff and program development, research, and communication through networking.*

## **I. Introduction**

The task of providing the most appropriate and effective educational programs and experiences for increasingly diverse student populations remains the greatest priority for public school educators in the United States. Limited English proficient (LEP) students as a group have not had their unique educational needs adequately addressed, largely because the numbers of appropriately trained personnel have been inadequate to meet the needs of the large and growing number of limited English proficient students.

According to the United States Bureau of the Census, the U.S. population is projected to increase by 12.3 percent between 1985 and the year 2000. Nearly 60 percent of this projected growth will occur among minority populations. The overall projected growth rate is 23.0 percent for Blacks, 45.9 percent for Hispanics, and 48.4 percent for other groups which include Native American and Asian. This compares to a 6.5 percent increase in the Anglo non-Hispanic population. The minority population in the U.S. is expected to grow two to fourteen times the rate of the mainstream population (Bureau of the Census, 1991).

In response to the projected non-English speaking and minority population growth and their identified educational needs, and the urgent need for the training of teachers to work with these students, the U.S. Department of Education through the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) awarded in 1992 multiyear grants to three institutions of higher education (IHEs) to operate what they termed the Training, Development, and Improvement Program (TDI).

TDI is intended to increase the number and quality of bilingual education and ESL teacher training programs in colleges and universities in the nation and to enhance existing teacher preparation programs by

incorporating multicultural perspectives into current education curriculum. The new priority represents OBEMLA's first major initiative to provide training for current faculty and administrators in postsecondary institutions. By targeting teacher educators and administrators responsible for teacher preparation programs, the new program area encourages organizational and curricular change in colleges and universities to reflect the needs of the growing numbers of limited English proficient and culturally diverse learners.

One current TDI Program grantee is the BUENO Center for Multicultural Education at the School of Education of the University of Colorado at Boulder in a consortium involving Arizona State University, Tempe; New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas; New Mexico State University, Las Cruces; and the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. The other grantees are George Mason University (Fairfax, Virginia) which has joined with the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) to sponsor a series of national and regional institutes in conjunction with ATE conferences focusing on methods, assessment, and research related to teaching LEP students and the San Diego State University Multicultural Education Infusion Center which works with teams from participating institutions on organizational development, systemic change, and infusion strategies for preservice and inservice teacher training through institutes held at San Diego State University.

The University of Colorado TDI BUENO Project addresses the need for improving and expanding training programs to increase both the quality and quantity of bilingual/ESL teachers in thirty IHEs in a twelve state area. This article provides the rationale for the development of the University of Colorado BUENO TDI Project and discusses findings from the first eighteen months of the three-year project.

## **II. Need for Bilingual/ESL Teacher Training and Curriculum and Program Reform**

Two national surveys have been conducted over the past two decades to profile the non-English language abilities and language use of public school teachers one in 1976 and the other in 1980. Although information exists from several states about the number of teachers who have been credentialed or certified to teach bilingually since 1980, there is little else nationally to update or to compare to the results of these two surveys.

Data collected through these surveys and other efforts show that of the 2,266 million public school teachers working in 1980, only 153,000 (6.8%) had local or state bilingual certification. Of all public school teachers, 56,000 used a non-English language for instruction, but only one-half of them had local or state bilingual certification (Waggoner & O Malley, 1984). This means approximately 28,000 teachers had bilingual certification and were using a non-English language in the classroom. It also means some 125,000 bilingually certified teachers were NOT using a non-English language in the classroom. The disparity between certification and practice may not be as dramatic as one would initially perceive if the types of preparation provided to bilingually certified teachers were examined closely.

Of all the surveyed bilingual teachers, 39,000 reported they had proficiency in the non-English language but that they had minimal preparation to teach bilingually (including teaching language arts in the non-English language and other subject areas in the non-English language). An additional 26,000 teachers claimed non-English language proficiency and a basic preparation to teach bilingually including teaching non-English language arts, other subjects in the non-English language, study of the history and culture of the target students, and English as a second language. In addition about 96,000 teachers claimed non-English language proficiency but had no preparation for teaching bilingually. Only about 10,000 of these used the non-English language in the classroom (Waggoner & O Malley, 1984).

Despite the much larger number of bilingual certified teachers, fewer than one quarter had even minimal preparation, while about 1 in 6 had only basic preparation. Although these teachers had non-English language abilities with some preparation to teach bilingually, less than one third of the minimally prepared bilingual teachers (11,000) and only about one-half of those with basic preparation (13,000) used a non-English language in the classroom. Large gaps existed among those certified to teach bilingually, those prepared and able to teach bilingually, and those who actually did teach bilingually either because they chose not to use a non-English language in their bilingual classroom or because their assignment did not call for specialist skills and abilities (Waggoner & O Malley, 1984).

In their survey, Waggoner & O Malley report other findings that are of interest.

1. Teachers who received preparation under the Bilingual Education Act tended to be better prepared (two-thirds had basic preparation) than their counterparts with bilingual training not supported by the Act (only about one-third met basic preparation standards).
2. More teachers prepared in programs supported by the Bilingual Education Act were teaching bilingually (65% of those with basic preparation) than were teachers who had similar preparation but in programs not supported by the Act (22%).
3. About 9,000 teachers met the standard for basic qualifications but were not teaching bilingually or teaching ESL in 1980-81. An additional 22,000 teachers who met a minimal qualification standard and who had accompanying language skills were not using their bilingual capability. These teachers might be candidates for additional training and for future bilingual assignments.
4. Teachers received basic (in all 4 areas) training and preparation outside of academic settings only when support was provided by the Bilingual Education Act.
5. Of the 504,000 teachers who had limited English proficient students in their classrooms, only 56,000 reported using a non-English language for instruction, and another 103,000 reported teaching ESL.
6. While the numbers of public school teachers increased by 3.8% between 1976 and 1980 (from 2,182,000 to 2,266,000), the number of teachers using a non English language ability and basic preparation increased 120% (from 11,000 to 24,000), and teachers with non-English language ability and minimal preparation increased 39.1% (from 23,000 to 32,000) (Waggoner & O Malley, 1984, p. 33).

These findings indicate that the rate, quality, and commitment of teachers who are prepared to adequately teach bilingually must increase dramatically to meet the demand created by the growing numbers of limited English proficient students.

Mathis (1987), in reporting that birth rates and immigration patterns point toward a population configuration in the U.S. in which minority groups are the majority population in the public school system, agrees that the greatest challenge facing institutions of higher education today is the preparation of teachers, administrators, and other service providers to serve culturally and linguistically different (CLD) students (Yates, 1982; Valero-Figuera, 1986; Baca, Fradd, & Collier, 1990).

Teacher preparation institutions are challenged to train more and better prepared personnel to act as leaders both locally at the school level and nationally to improve two dimensions of training as it relates to minority

and minority language populations. The quantitative dimension of the training need must address the current shortage of doctoral level minority teacher educators. The need for minority faculty is and will continue to be great. The number of minority doctoral graduates is diminishing each year at the same time that the number of faculty openings is increasing. Availability of faculty to train teachers and researchers in areas related to culturally and linguistically diverse students is consequently limited. The field of bilingual/multicultural education is beginning to lose its leaders due to attrition (e.g., retirements, promotions, and changes in careers). The need for leadership personnel is well-documented. Paper after paper delivered at the 1988 "Excellence in Doctoral Leadership Training Conference" made the same statement: *The supply of leadership personnel will not meet the demand in the immediate future.*

The qualitative dimension acknowledges that need extends beyond just requiring more personnel. Minority students are underrepresented in doctoral programs in general. Nettles (1990) found that few minority and minority language students enter graduate programs, and fewer still complete doctorates as compared to their Anglo counterparts. She reports that Hispanics, for example, represented only 7% of the graduate student population, and only 2.8% of this group earned doctorates. Nettles suggests that graduate institutions may need to establish different programs, policies, and strategies to address the differences in characteristics and experiences of nontraditional students.

Both minority and nonminority students in doctoral programs need to become culturally responsive. A need exists to develop programs that include content responsive to the qualitative dimension. Such content needs to address (a) culturally diverse leadership and research paradigms and (b) the qualities essential for successful leadership and research. The recognition that culturally diverse populations often value and promote conceptual paradigms divergent from those valued and promoted by the U.S. mainstream or dominant culture has been fairly common knowledge for many years (Hall, 1977). These diverse paradigms, however, have often been perceived to be deficient or inferior. As a consequence, several things occur: (a) minority leadership and research styles are discounted by nonminorities; (b) majority leadership/research styles are either resented or adopted at the expense of minority styles; and (c) leadership/research processes and products are taken out of (cultural) context, leading to further misperceptions and miscommunications (Hall, 1977).

In her appeal to the New Mexico Governor's Commission on Higher Education, Lassiter (1983) incorporates recommendations to promote minority access to higher education. Her definition of excellence in education encompasses access to higher education by all students including minorities. In her words, "access to higher education means the institutions must go beyond the initial step of enrollment; access also includes opportunities for retention and persistence, which are necessary for academic achievement and excellence" (p.2). She identifies the areas in which IHEs can provide access as: (a) provision of financial aid, (b) academic support services, and (c) motivating psychological support via institutional responsiveness to cultural diversity.

Lassiter (1983) states that simply expanding recruitment efforts is not a sufficient response to the low numbers of minority and minority language students in teacher education programs. The qualitative dimension also demands improving program quality. Historically, teacher education programs across the United States have been based on a monolingual, dominant culture, mainstream model reflecting the political, cultural, and social patterns of the larger society (Garcia & Pugh, 1992). The dominant culture model upon which teacher education programs were based typically ignored issues of language and cultural diversity in the preparation experiences of teachers, including liberal arts requirements, foundation and methods courses, as well as the student teaching experience. In teacher education programs that did address questions of diversity, the predominant model viewed language and culture in compensatory, remedial ways,

leading to a deficit-oriented approach (Garcia & Pugh, 1992).

With the realization in the past few years that America is becoming increasingly diverse racially, culturally, and linguistically, teacher education programs across the country are now seeing the need to assist preservice and practicing teachers in developing conceptual frameworks that are responsive to the instructional needs of students from diverse language and cultural backgrounds (Banks, 1993; Barrera, 1992; Dilworth, 1992; Garcia & Pugh, 1992; Nieto, 1992; Reyes, 1992; Zeichner, 1993).

### **III. Teacher Training Models**

At least three basic models have and are being used by teacher education programs to help preservice and practicing teachers acquire competence in the area of language and culture, including (a) the special program model, (b) the inservice or technical assistance model, and (c) the separate course model. All three models can be seen as being distinct delivery approaches, having a variety of content emphases, with each model having particular strengths and weaknesses.

#### **Special Program Model**

The special program model is often a soft money federally funded project which typically focuses on a specific educational need or on a specific population for training purposes. The NDEA (National Defense Education Act) institutes developed in the 1960s to train teachers of migrant children, teachers of reading, and foreign language teachers, as well as Teacher Corps are examples of past special program efforts. Current examples of special programs are those funded by Title VII, including the Personnel Training Program and the Bilingual Education Fellowship Program which are designed to better prepare educators for working with bilingual or LEP (limited English speaking) populations.

As a complete strategy for bringing about real or fundamental change in teacher education programs, the special programs model has several limitations. While many of these special programs are highly effective in providing excellent training for specific individuals and populations, their short-term nature due to funding constraints does not allow for institutionalization once the monies have ceased. Additionally, again because of their special nature, these programs are essentially developed as peripheral or add-on and remain outside of the regular mainstream teacher education programs. Again, these programs often become marginalized since they encounter resistance from regular teaching faculty who view them as affirmative action efforts or as government initiatives to respond to minority groups' pressures and concerns. At any rate, much of the historical record indicates that special programs similar to many ethnic studies programs rarely become institutionalized and permanently integrated into regular mainstream programs which results in little or no significant institutional change.

#### **Inservice Model**

A second type of delivery approach widely used to assist primarily practicing teachers is the inservice or technical assistance model. Historically, public school districts have called upon university faculty or other out-of-town experts to provide technical assistance in the form of workshops or even on-site credit courses to deal with specific needs or problems. This type of quick fix approach is occasionally a response to federal or state mandates or a response to educational hot topics such as new math, values clarification, and global education, or more currently whole language pedagogy and computer technology. Other topics currently being explored through inservice or technical assistance include AIDS and drug education, assertive discipline, site-based management, and bilingual and English as a second language techniques and

strategies, particularly in many school districts across the country which are enrolling large numbers of students arriving from Mexico, Central and South America, Southeast Asia, and other countries throughout the world.

The inservice model has been heavily criticized by both practitioners and researchers. Lieberman and Miller (1990) in a strongly stated critique argue that the inservice approach is based on a deficit model where teachers are seen as objects and not as engaged subjects, and often the result is a reinforcement of the status quo and schooling as usual. Essentially, the inservice model is a top-down, paternalistic, externally imposed approach that results in little or no fundamental institutional change. In place of the inservice model, Lieberman and Miller (1990) suggest the need to create a culture of support for teacher inquiry through study groups, support networks, group curriculum writing, research projects, and other professional development activities.

### **Separate Course Model**

Perhaps the most common model employed in teacher education programs to prepare preservice or practicing teachers to work more effectively in cross cultural settings is the separate course strategy. Such a course, which may or may not be compulsory, frequently focuses on content related to specific minority groups such as African Americans, Native Americans, or Hispanics, with the intent of helping teachers better understand the cultures of various groups they might work with. Frequently these courses tend to be largely descriptive and informational, providing educators with generalizations about group characteristics, customs, and ethnic holidays (Kennedy, 1991).

Although there is no conclusive research evidence, some literature suggests that the separate course model is an insufficient change strategy with major shortcomings. Kennedy (1991) and Zeichner (1993) suggest that separate courses and workshops about cultural differences can serve to reinforce rather than change existing stereotypes and prejudices. Providing cognitive information about cultural groups does not necessarily result in attitudinal or behavioral change.

The inadequacy and limitations of the special program, inservice, and separate course models as approaches to institutional change suggest that teacher education programs must make strong efforts to find new and creative ways of effectively integrating and infusing the study of language and culture into preservice and inservice education. In meeting this challenge, teacher educators must address both content selection and content delivery, including such questions as:

1. What are the important skills, understandings, and competencies needed by preservice and practicing teachers in order to be effective in multicultural or cross-cultural settings?
2. What are the important skills, understandings, and competencies needed by preservice and practicing teachers in order to be effective in working with non and limited English speaking populations?
3. How can teacher education programs define and conceptualize multicultural education beyond ethnic day celebrations to more inclusive and broader approaches to the study of language and culture?
4. How can teacher education programs draw upon such disciplines as sociology, anthropology, linguistics, and the humanities so this interdisciplinary focus can serve to enrich and expand students understanding of language and culture?

5. How can teacher education programs find alternative delivery models for infusing multicultural ideas and perspectives throughout the preservice and inservice programs, moving beyond special programs, technical assistance, and separate course models?

#### IV. TDI Program Structure

The University of Colorado BUENO TDI program is a consortium of 30 institutions of higher education (IHEs) from a 12 state region. Participating IHEs are listed in Table 1. The 12 state directors of bilingual, ESL, or multicultural education participate as members of an Advisory Board along with the Deans of Instruction or their representatives from each of the 5 trainer IHEs. The project is being implemented through an alliance of five IHEs which have institutionalized bilingual/ESL training programs. The five alliance universities serve as trainer institutions.

*Table 1. Participating IHEs and Contact Persons*

1. University of Colorado at Boulder - Linda Molner\*
2. University of New Mexico - Richard Van Dongen\*
3. Arizona State University - Alfredo Benavidez\*
4. New Mexico State University - Rosalinda Barreras\*
5. New Mexico Highlands University - John Juarez\*
6. University of Northern Colorado - John Halcon
7. University of Colorado at Denver - Kathy Escamilla
8. Metro State College at Denver - Chuck Mena
9. University of Arizona - Carol Evans
10. Arizona State University - West - Inez Marquez Chisholm
11. Northern Arizona University - Robert Carrasco
12. Boise State University - Jay Fuhriman
13. Weber State University at Ogden - Linda Oda
14. University of Utah - Nola Lodge
15. University of Nebraska at Lincoln - Teresita Aguilar
16. University of Nebraska at Kearney - Leonard Skov/Lucille Freeman
17. University of Nebraska at Omaha - Bob Mortensen/Yvonne Vigil-Tixier
18. University of Texas at El Paso - Josefina Tinajero
19. University of Nevada at Las Vegas - Maria Ramirez
20. University of Nevada at Reno - Valentina Flores
21. Eastern New Mexico University at Portales - Julia Rosa Enslie
22. South Dakota State University at Brookings - Lowell Amiotte
23. Black Hills State University - Junior Bettelyoun
24. Emporia State University - Charles Cornell
25. Minot State University - Mary Person
26. University of North Dakota - Mary Harris
27. Fort Hayes State University - Charles Leftwich
28. Eastern Montana College - Jon Reynor
29. University of Montana - Larry La Counte
30. University of Texas at San Antonio - Robert Milk

## \* Trainer IHEs

The five trainer institutions are working to expand and improve bilingual/ESL teacher preparation programs in their own institutions as well as the 25 other IHEs in the 12 states. The trainer institutions receive federal dollars to assist in the implementation of bilingual education training programs. All have undergraduate and graduate level bilingual/ESL programs that have been institutionalized and state approved. Additionally, all have tenure track faculty and Title VII Fellowship programs.

The five trainer institutions have also established research programs, training programs, or both, that provide outreach opportunities and which supplement and expand the degree and certification programs. The specialized centers include the BUENO Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado, the Mountain States Multifunctional Resource Center at Arizona State University, the Evaluation Assistance Center, Western Region (EAC-West) at New Mexico Highlands University, and Multicultural Education Centers at the University of New Mexico and New Mexico State University.

Each of these centers has additional training expertise and staff who hold positions as faculty and research associates. Each of these centers has a long history of collaboration among faculty, other IHEs, and local school districts. Further, each of these centers has an extensive collection of research and instructional materials that can be used in the preparation of bilingual/ESL teachers. These additional resources at each of the trainer institutions, along with approved degree programs and tenure track faculty, provide the project with the personnel and resources necessary to attain project goals.

The five Alliance members have designed and are implementing a series of training institutes for IHE faculty and administrators within the 12 state region to encourage reform, innovation, and improvement in higher education programs. These institutes provide faculty and administrators with knowledge, strategies, and information needed to improve teacher preparation programs for all prospective and practicing teachers.

The Alliance sponsors four meetings/institutes each year. A general institute serves to convene deans or department chairs from each of the participating IHEs, along with SEA technical assistance unit representatives from each of the 12 states in the service area. Discussion topics focus on new ontological and organizational paradigms, systemic change, language learning strategies, bilingual education and ESL methodologies, and multicultural infusion into the regular IHE teacher preparation program curriculum. The deans or department heads of the Alliance IHEs and SEA Title VII technical assistance unit representatives in each state serve on an Alliance Training Advisory Council.

Three annual regional institutes serve to enhance the ability of key faculty from each of the targeted institutions in the development and improvement of the teacher preparation curriculum to enable better implementation of effective instructional practices for LEP students. Institute topics include reinventing schools of education, language, and culture, developing home/school partnerships, improving student assessment/evaluation processes, and curriculum reconceptualization. A "Trainer of Trainers" model is used as a vehicle to provide participating faculty with leadership strategies as well as with new information for encouraging educational reform and change in their home institutions.

Each of the 30 IHEs in the project develops an action plan which specifies goals or objectives the institution has for improving its bilingual, ESL, or multicultural teacher training program. Each action plan reflects the unique needs of the IHE; thus the goals of the IHEs range from restructuring a school of education, starting

a bilingual/ESL endorsement program, or hiring bilingual/ESL faculty to develop bilingual/ESL or multicultural courses in order to improve already well-developed programs. In the periods between meetings, collaborative efforts toward achieving action plan goals occur among project institutions. Faculty and staff at trainer institutions provide assistance to other project institutions through site visits and via telephone, FAX, and mail.

Institutes, meetings, and technical assistance activities are directed toward achievement of three project goals: (a) to develop the capacity of regular IHE faculty to prepare all education personnel (bilingual/ESL and regular classroom teachers) to participate in programs for LEP students, (b) to assist IHEs without bilingual/ESL training programs to establish undergraduate and graduate programs, and (c) to establish a bilingual education/ESL consortium among participating IHEs to ensure resource sharing in support of individual capacity building efforts.

## **V. Program Evaluation**

### **Methodology**

The implementation and effects of the University of Colorado TDI model are being examined from a participant-observer perspective. Data are being collected for program evaluation and research purposes using a variety of means including surveys, direct observation, interviews, and document review. The purposes of the evaluation and research activities are to provide a historical record showing the evolution of program implementation, to provide formative feedback to program staff and participants, and to document the effects of the program. Ultimately, as part of a separate effort, information generated from these activities will be combined with similar information from the two other TDI sites (George Mason University and San Diego State University) in order to identify which elements of the three TDI models work best under which conditions.

The evaluation and research plan blends quantitative and qualitative methodologies, involving objectives-referenced evaluation (Tyler, 1942), discrepancy evaluation (e.g., Provus, 1972), formative and goal-free evaluation (e.g., Scriven, 1972), and ethnographic and case study approaches (e.g., Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 1990). Evaluation questions being addressed are:

1. How is the University of Colorado TDI model being implemented? How does this compare to the implementation plan? How is program implementation evolving?
2. What progress are IHE participants making toward carrying out the activities and achieving the objectives specified in their action plans? What has helped or hindered action plan implementation?
3. What unanticipated outcomes are accruing as a result of TDI?

At each of the four annual institutes/meetings, surveys are filled out that provide feedback about satisfaction with topics, presenters, and other activities as well as suggestions for follow-up or future activities. This feedback is shared among Alliance planning staff and used to develop agendas for succeeding meetings and to provide technical assistance activities between meetings.

Additional information is collected through a survey given once a year asking participants to report on action plan activities and progress as well as to describe any effects participation in the project has had on

them personally or on their institutions. Representatives of institutions also give oral reports at each meeting/institute on the action plan progress; these reports are recorded anecdotally. Alliance members are asked annually to provide information about technical assistance provided. As the project and the evaluation plan evolve, a case study component is being added to the evaluation by intensively studying through site visits and interviews the change process at two participating IHEs.

## **Findings/Outcomes**

### ***Alliance Meetings***

Participating IHEs have provided positive feedback on surveys administered after each of the six meetings held over the first one and one-half years of the program. In addition to their satisfaction with the information presented at the meetings and the quality of the presentations, members appear to have been especially pleased with the networking and interactions that occur among members. Comments gleaned from the evaluation surveys on which participants were asked what they felt was the best part of the meeting identified: (a) the interactions, sharing, and networking in a safe, protected environment; (b) exchanging information with colleagues and becoming aware of the many activities being conducted in the other institutions; (c) interesting, dynamic, and purposeful discussion; (d) the opportunity to continue the dialogue with colleagues; (e) good interaction wonderful opportunity to renew acquaintances; and (f) time to talk to colleagues and get acquainted, good feedback during sessions.

Suggestions for improving the meetings have centered around allowing more time for presentations and discussion, moving away from the lecture format that characterized some of the presentations toward more interaction activities, and building on the activities that take place at the meetings.

The importance of networking and interactions had been anticipated; what was unanticipated was that the establishment of a working alliance based on this networking would be the most significant accomplishment of the project's first year. In the Alliance, participants appear to have found a supportive network of colleagues with whom they can discuss professional as well as personal interests and development that they don't necessarily find in other settings. The meetings provide a setting and a structure where the networking can occur.

### ***Site Visits and Other Technical Assistance***

While Alliance activities center around the quarterly meetings, the other important component of the program has been the technical assistance provided to Alliance members by faculty or staff from another Alliance institution. This technical assistance has taken place via phone, FAX, mail, and site visits. The site visits are made to supplement assistance provided during the meetings or through other means. Topics dealt with during these visits have included: review of action plans; needs assessment; identification of IHE personnel important in effecting institutional and program restructuring; developing goals; and curriculum infusion of bilingual, ESL, and multicultural themes.

Discussions with one of the TDI coordinators indicated that not as many site visits were made as had been anticipated during the first year of the program. Few requests had been made for on-site help, and the coordinator wondered whether this reflected lack of real action at the campus level regarding such topics as planned program or course restructuring, or whether site visits simply were not a preferred way to provide or receive technical assistance due to problems such as time constraints. As the program has moved into its second year, site visit requests by Alliance members have been increasing, and faculty exchanges have been planned.

***Institutional Change***

Reports given during the quarterly meetings about progress toward objectives specified on action plans have been generally positive. As might be expected, Alliance members report on aspects of their programs in which many have a mutual interest such as recruiting or hiring minority faculty, program, or course restructuring and development, and infusion of bilingual, ESL, or multicultural concepts into education courses. All institutions have reported making progress toward their action plan objectives.

To gain a better picture of the type of progress that Alliance members had made at the end of the first program year, their action plans were reviewed, and a survey was given which asked them to rate their progress on eight objectives that represented a consolidation of the objectives across each institution's action plan. Representatives of institutions were also asked to describe any products or outcomes that had resulted due to action initiated or completed relative to each of the eight objectives. Completed surveys were returned by 14 of the 21 (67%) institutions which participated in the Alliance during its first year. Reports of progress made toward achieving action plan objectives are summarized in Table 2.

The table shows that, in regard to the first five objectives, most Alliance members reported either initiating action toward or completing what they had planned. A somewhat lower initiation or completion rate was reported for the remaining three objectives. Responses to open-ended items indicated that actions taken regarding course or program development primarily consisted of developing new bilingual, ESL, or multicultural courses, developing a plan to develop or restructure courses, or reviewing course content as a precursor to restructuring.

Objective	Objective Completed	Action Initiated	No Action Taken	Not Applicable
1. Develop or improve bilingual, ESL, or multicultural courses.	21%(3)	64%(9)	0%(0)	14%(2)
2. Infuse bilingual, ESL, or multicultural content into existing teacher education courses.	21%(3)	64%(9)	14%(2)	0%(0)
3. Develop or improve a bilingual, ESL, or multicultural program (a series of courses leading to a degree, certification, and/or endorsement).	29%(4)	57%(8)	0%(0)	14%(2)
4. Develop faculty understanding, sensitivity, and competence to work with language minority students.	0%(0)	77%(10)	15%(2)	8%(1)

5. Recruit and retain minority and language minority faculty.	7%(1)	64%(9)	7%(1)	21%(3)
6. Recruit and retain minority and language minority students for teacher training programs.	7%(1)	57%(8)	35%(5)	0%(0)
7. Assess community, faculty, and student needs.	7%(1)	36%(5)	36%(5)	21%(3)
8. Develop faculty and student understanding of the importance of parental involvement.	0%(0)	31%(4)	46%(6)	23%(3)
Note: Items were answered by 14 people with the exception of items 4 and 8 which were answered by 13 people.				

Actions taken to increase faculty understanding, sensitivity, and competence to work with language minority students are less easily characterized. Activities aimed at increasing faculty awareness such as faculty workshops addressing this issue or the use of outside speakers were cited most often.

Five of the 14 Alliance members responding to this survey reported hiring minority faculty during the year. Actions taken to recruit and retain language minority students in teacher training programs were reported by five of the Alliance members, and two institutions reported having developed plans to do so.

Six of the 14 institutions reported conducting some type of needs assessment for purposes of course and program development such as holding a statewide meeting or meeting with local school districts.

The least amount of activity occurred relative to parent involvement. Those who reported taking some action only noted that this is a continuing component of their programs.

One item on the survey asked Alliance members to rate their overall satisfaction with the progress they made toward action plan objectives during the first program year. Of the 13 who responded to this item, 23% (3) were very satisfied, 62% (8) were satisfied, and 15% (2) were dissatisfied.

Alliance members were also asked to describe barriers they had encountered in implementing their action plans. Two barriers were cited most frequently. One was lack of resources time, funding, and faculty. A second was resistance to change by affected programs or the "bureaucracy."

Asked to describe what had helped them implement their action plans, Alliance members most often cited: (a) the support of the university or college administration; (b) the involvement, unity, or support of faculty in the effort; and (c) support received through the Alliance.

When asked what the TDI program could do to help in achieving action plan objectives, those who responded mentioned most often the need for outside consultants who could provide assistance.

***Professional Development***

At the end of the first program year, 19 Alliance participants commented in writing about how participation in the Alliance over the first year had influenced them. They cited most often: (a) the opportunity the TDI network provided for communication with colleagues, meeting them, and exchanging ideas; (b) the influence and quality of the presenters; (c) increased awareness and discussion of important issues in bilingual, ESL and multicultural education; and (d) personal growth, professional development, and intellectual stimulation.

It is useful to consider some of their comments in whole:

#### Response 1

In brief, participation in TDI the first year has: helped in the identification of appropriate components in the development of ESL and bilingual-multicultural curriculum; provided encouragement and has helped me define, modify, and validate ideas and plans for ESL/bilingual programs; helped me focus upon areas (e.g., language needs of Native Americans, or the relationship and need for interaction between ESL/bilingual and special education programs) that might otherwise have been overlooked in curriculum or course development; helped me to develop criteria for IHE and LEA joint efforts in bilingual and multicultural education; helped me to find the courage to take chances in promoting bilingual and multicultural activities when I feel they are right for those needing to be served; given me the feeling of family and the knowledge that there is a network of colleagues working toward the same goals and facing many of the same setbacks and frustrations that I face.

#### Response 2

In a sense, TDI is like a personal and professional gift. It's rare as faculty to have an opportunity to talk with colleagues across campuses about issues common to us. We can, together, get stuck in the particular perspectives, research topics, etc., that predominate in our individual institutions. It moves us much closer to work in progress and is a welcome time to relax among at least somewhat like minded colleagues. Certain bottom-line issues are taken for granted (i.e., value of bilingualism, multiculturalism, etc.), and defenses can be lowered. For me as an individual, it is intellectually stimulating, has allowed friendships and professional relationships to grow, and, selfishly, may enhance my career as my face is attached to my name, and my words are heard. Of course, being outspoken can also carry risks, but this group is so supportive! I look forward to these meetings in a way that I don't to others.

#### Response 3

The key message I convey is that my level of thinking has been lifted at each of the meetings. Personally, emotionally, academically, I have grown. I have learned from each person. I have commented to my colleagues that I have served on units from national to local scope, and I did not grow from those interactions as I have from these. The formal and the information sessions have to be kept in place.

#### Response 4

As a newcomer to this region of the country, this set of meetings has given me a chance not only to meet my colleagues, but also to learn more about issues which are particular to this (region). Additionally, of course, is the empowering sense of collegiality which TDI creates and which enables us to build on an individual basis. The exchange of information is simply wonderful, and I thank you for your work in

preparing the sessions. I also am grateful for the constant sense of encouragement to be active. I am eager to hear and talk about the question which seems always to underlie our discussions: What have you done lately about these issues?

## VI. Summary and Conclusion

This article has attempted to highlight the tremendous and growing need for more and better prepared bilingual/ESL teachers in this country. TDI, a new OBEMLA initiative targeted at this concern, has been described. Preliminary data, participant feedback, and personal anecdotes from the University of Colorado BUENO TDI Project have been presented. Three common teacher training models have been discussed and critiqued. The BUENO TDI Project is presented as an innovative approach to moving beyond the limitations of the three existing teacher education and training models. Through the TDI Project, participating IHEs and SEAs have formed a learning community of faculty, department chairpersons, state agency heads, and deans. All have committed to a three year effort and have thus established a viable planning and self-renewing learning community whose sole purpose is to redesign bilingual/ESL teacher training programs and to contribute to the reform and reinvention of schools of education.

## References

- Baca, L., Fradd, S. H., & Collier, C. (1990). Progress in preparing personnel to meet the needs of handicapped limited English proficient students: Results of a survey in three highly impacted states. *The Journal of Education Issues of Language Minority Students*, 7, 5-20.
- Banks, James A. (1993). *Multicultural Education: Development, Dimensions, and Challenges*. Phi Delta Kappan, 22-28.
- Barrera, Rosalinda B. (1992). The cultural gap in literature-based literacy instruction. *Education And Urban Society*. Sage Publications, 24 (2), 227-243.
- Bureau of the Census. (1991). *Current population reports. Series P-60, No. 175: Poverty in the United States 1990*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Dilworth, May E. (Ed.) (1992). *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- Garcia, Jesus, & Pugh, Sharon L. (1992). Multicultural education in teacher preparation programs: A political or an education concept. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 214 219.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hall, E. T. (1977). *Beyond Culture*, NY: Anchor Press.
- Kennedy, Mary M. (1991). Some surprising findings on how teachers learn to teach. *Educational Leadership*, 14-17.
- Lassiter, R. F. (November 1983). *Minority access to excellence in higher education*. Paper presented to the Governor's Commission on Higher Education. Santa Fe, NM.

- Lieberman, Ann, & Miller, Lynne (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. *Teachers College, Columbia University*, 92, 105-123.
- Mathis, C. (1987). Educational reform: The aging society and the teaching profession. *Journal of Education*, 169 (1), 80-98.
- Nettles, M. T. (1990). Black, Hispanic, and White doctoral students: Before, during, and after enrolling in graduate school. *Educational Testing Service Report*. Princeton, NJ.
- Nieto, Sonia (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. University of Massachusetts: Longman Publishing Group.
- Patten, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park: CA: Sage Publications.
- Provus, M. M. (1972). The discrepancy evaluation model. In P. A. Taylor & D. M. Cowley (Eds.), *Readings in curriculum evaluation*. (117-127). Dubuque, IO: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Reyes, M. de la Luz. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically diverse students. *Harvard Education Review*, 62 (4), 427-446.
- Scriven, M. S. (1972). The methodology of evaluation. In P. A. Taylor & D. M. Cowley (Eds.), *Readings in curriculum evaluation*. (117-127). Dubuque, IO: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Tyler, R. W. (1942) General statement on evaluation. *Journal of Education Research*, 35, 492-501.
- Valero-Figueira, E. (1986). Bilingual special education personnel preparation: An integrated model. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 9, 82-88.
- Waggoner, D., & O Malley, M. J. (1984). Language minority children at risk: Concepts, definitions, and estimates. National Council de la Raza Office of Research, Advocacy and Legislation: Washington, DC.
- Yates, J. (1982). Teacher training associated with serving bilingual exceptional students. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 5 (3), 61-68.
- Zeichner, Kenneth M. (1993). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, Michigan State University, 1-23.

---

**Leonard Baca**, PhD, is a professor and director of the BUENO Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Colorado.

**Jim Bransford**, EdD, is the associate director of the Multicultural Education Center, College of Education at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Co-Director of the TDI Project, BUENO Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Colorado.

**Chris Nelson**, PhD, is an assistant professor at New Mexico Highlands University in Las Vegas, New Mexico.

**Leroy Ortiz**, PhD, is an associate professor and director of the Multicultural Education Center in the College of Education at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico

[Return to JEILMS v.14 Table of Contents](#)

---

*The HTML version of this document was prepared by [NCBE](#) and posted to the web with permission of the author/publisher.*

[go to HOME PAGE](#)

www.ncela.gwu.edu