



BILINGUAL AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM STANDARDS CONTENT ANALYSIS WHITE PAPER

Prepared by the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group

March 2020



Loyola Marymount University
School of Education
Center for Equity for English Learners

The
SOBRATO
Family Foundation

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overarching Issues	3
Crosswalk of Standards	3
Standard Analysis	5
Standard 1: Program Design	5
Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence	6
Standard 3: The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism	8
Standard 4: Bilingual Methodology	8
Standard 5: Culture of Emphasis	9
Recommendations and Conclusion	10
References	11
APPENDIX A: Analysis Tables for Each Standard	25
Table A1: Standard 1-Program Design	25
Table A2: Standard 2-The Assessment of Candidate Competence	29
Table A3: Standard 3-The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism	32
Table A4: Standard 4-Bilingual Methodology	35
Table A5: Standard 5-Culture of Emphasis	38
APPENDIX B: Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group Proposed Glossary of Terms	41

Bilingual Authorization Program Standards Content Analysis White Paper

Prepared by the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group

Introduction

In May 2018, a collaborative between the Center for Equity for English Learners at Loyola Marymount University, California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education (CABTE), Californians Together (CalTog), and the California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), formed to discuss a critical issue resulting from the passage of Proposition 58: a predicted shortage of highly qualified and well-prepared bilingual/dual-language teachers in the state. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) established a timeline to update the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards (BAPS) and the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSAs) in 2022; however, this collaborative of stakeholders urged a more timely response to build and connect to the bilingual teacher education knowledge infrastructure in the state. Through an agreement with the CTC and the aforementioned organizations, and with funding from the Sobrato Family Foundation, the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group was formed with the following two goals.

1) *Support the accelerated timeline of the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel.* The CTC will convene the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel in 2020. The initial concern was the potential delay in implementation: by the time the Work Group/Expert Panel convenes, conducts their analyses, recommends changes to the standards, collects public feedback related to the standards, and then submits these new or revised standards for state board approval, likely two years would have passed. This brings the earliest end date of revisions to the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards to 2022. In an effort to provide initial support for the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel and to avoid delays to the process of advancing the standards of quality for bilingually authorized teachers in California, the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group could provide support via field-generated analyses of the existing standards conducted by representative colleagues.

2) *Solicit input from the field of bilingual education scholars/teacher educators/practitioners.* The aforementioned organizations represent the collective and coherent support and knowledge base for bilingual teacher preparation and professional development. As such, they urge and stand ready to support the CTC's work by offering their expertise and by collaborating with the CTC to create and analyze a statewide survey with the purpose of providing recommendations to update the content in the current Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and KSAs. These would include the integration of the Dual Language Standards that are currently being developed with the Council on the Accreditation of Educator Preparation as a part of the "refresh" of the current standards, along with other relevant and recent research in the field.

To respond to these goals, the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group was formed with the task of reviewing the existing Bilingual Authorization Program Standards, KSAs, and other CTC standards on teacher preparation (e.g., Preconditions, Common Standards), and analyzing these with a focus upon current research in the field of bilingualism, equity, and dual language programs. Statewide experts in bilingual teacher preparation were invited to join the work group by Dr. Magaly Lavadenz, Distinguished Professor of English Learner Policy, Research, and Practice at Loyola Marymount University (LMU) and Executive Director of LMU's Center for Equity for English Learners (CEEL). The 12 work group members

included professors, directors, and scholars from two University of California campuses, three California State University campuses, and four private colleges and universities.

Cristina Alfaro, Ph.D., Interim Associate Vice President for Global Affairs, San Diego State University

Clara Amador-Lankster, Ph.D., Professor & Fulbright Senior Specialist, National University

Elvira Armas, Ed.D., Director of Programs and Partnerships at CEEL and Affiliate Faculty, Loyola Marymount University

Rhianna Henry, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Sonoma State University

Sandy Chang, Ph.D., Assistant Director of Biliteracy at CEEL, Loyola Marymount University

Grace Cho, Ph.D., Professor, CSU Fullerton

Cheryl Forbes, Ed.D., Director of Teacher Education, UC San Diego

Margarita Jimenez-Silva, Ph.D., Associate Professor, UC Davis

Magaly Lavadenz, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor of English Learner Policy, Research and Practice and Executive Director of CEEL, Loyola Marymount University

Lyn Scott, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, CSU East Bay

Michelle Soto-Peña, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, CSU Stanislaus

Diane Sharken Taboada, Ph.D., Teacher Candidate Supervisor, CSU East Bay & Sonoma State University

The Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group first convened in person on April 13, 2019 at Loyola Marymount University. A lead team consisting of members of the Work Group met a few weeks prior to draft an agenda, set activities, and create a pre-meeting reading list. During the April 13th convening, the Work Group established processes to deeply examine the content of the current Bilingual Authorization Program Standards; review and document considerations; identify the current research that could inform possible additions to the standards; discuss the survey that would go out to the field; and, draft a plan and timeline to produce recommendations. To build consistency across the analytic procedures, the entire group worked together to review one standard to calibrate processes and document how to analyze the standards. The process included using a matrix that excerpted language from the existing standard; identifying what was missing and additions that were needed; and commenting on assessment, policy, and practice implications. Additionally, the Work Group agreed to the importance of identifying references and words or phrases that should be defined for each standard. Once these procedures were agreed upon, the Work Group divided into subgroups of two to three members, and each subgroup was responsible for analyzing one standard.

The Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group met in person an additional time on August 29, 2019 at CEEL-LMU. Between the April and August face-to-face meetings, subgroups met several times via video conference calls to complete their analyses of the standards, and the whole group met via video conference on June 6, 2019 to review each subgroup's analysis of the standard they had worked on. During the August 29th in-person meeting, the group worked on a standards crosswalk document, reviewed references and the proposed glossary of terms,¹ decided on the contents of the white paper, created new timeline and tasks, and further discussed content and process for survey of the field. Additionally, virtual meetings were scheduled between September 2019 through January 2020 for drafting and review of standard analyses and this white paper.

¹ The updated [reference list](#) includes new references (in blue font) that are added to the original list from the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards Handbook. Our proposed glossary of terms to ensure consistency in the field appears in [Appendix B](#). These terms are based on current research in the field, but it is not an exhaustive list.

The Bilingual Authorization Standards Content Analysis White Paper is thus intended to be a resource to the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel for their consideration and in support of the task ahead of them. It has been developed in the spirit of collaboration and mutual support in our common purpose to prepare the most highly-qualified, bilingually-authorized teachers that our TK-12 students deserve.

Overarching Issues

Across the standards, there were several issues that emerged as important considerations for the CTC's Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel. Although the content of each standard is reviewed in this document ([Appendix A](#)), the Work Group did identify the critical issues of field work and clinical experiences in the preparation of bilingual teachers as largely absent from the current standards. Recognizing that these reside in the Program Preconditions and Conditions, and that these have changed substantially in general teacher preparation, our group affirms that learning to teach in bilingual/dual language classrooms requires field and clinical experiences in bilingual/dual language classrooms that can be accomplished in both simultaneous and sequential program designs at each institution. Thus, our recommendation to the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel is to address this vital component of bilingual teacher preparation accordingly.

Crosswalk of Standards

After each subgroup completed their work in analyzing each standard ([Appendix A](#)), we reconvened to identify cross-cutting themes that appeared in each of the standards, as reflected in Table 1. Themes that appeared address larger contextual issues (e.g., equity) that align with larger state policies (e.g., CA EL Roadmap) and serve as signals for discussion for the Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel.

Table 1. Themes Appearing Across Standards

Theme	Applies to BAPS	Rationale
Equity-orientation	All	Bilingual teachers work with diverse students in multilingual settings. All standards need to reflect and be responsive to the socio-linguistic, socioemotional, sociocultural, and sociopolitical factors for the contexts and students they will serve. Teacher candidates and program leaders need to have an advocacy orientation.
CA English Learner Roadmap	All	The design of programs, curriculum, and assessments should align to the TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap principles and follow an assets-based approach.
Bilingual Learners/Emergent Bilinguals/ELs	All	Program standards should include the use terms that embrace an asset-based approach when working with students of diverse language backgrounds.
Current research on bilingualism,	All	Much research has been done on bilingualism, multilingual education, translanguaging, dual language programs,

<p>multilingualism, etc.</p>		<p>culturally sustaining pedagogies, etc. since the standards were first adopted in 2009. Revisions of the standards need to include updated research related to these relevant fields, including an update of terminology (e.g., emergent bilinguals).</p>
<p>International/binational/transnational perspectives for bilingualism/multilingualism</p>	<p>3, 4, 5</p>	<p>Revisions of the standards need to expand bilingualism beyond the California context to towards a national and international/global perspective for diaspora communities and countries of origin. Revisions should extend the notion of bilingualism to multilingualism.</p>
<p>Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs)</p>	<p>2, 4</p>	<p>New Bilingual/Multilingual Teacher Performance Expectations should be proposed and adopted.</p>
<p>Necessity of bilingual/dual language clinical fieldwork</p>	<p>1, 2, 4</p>	<p>Bilingual/dual language candidates should have bilingual/dual language clinical fieldwork, and this should be cross-referenced to the Common Standards.</p> <p>Cross-reference to Common Standards: Fieldwork and clinical experiences work need to be situated and contextualized in educational settings designated in a range of bilingual/dual language program types.</p>
<p>Integration of clinical practice – connection to common standards, bilingual TPEs, and consistency of PQRs</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Standards should address concerns about trends in having the bilingual authorization as a “post” or sequential credential program, creating a lack of opportunity for practice, mentorship, and guidance in learning to teach in bilingual/dual language programs.</p> <p>Focus on the need for articulated sequencing of bilingual/multilingual fieldwork and clinical practice over the arc of the program, honoring bilingual instructional settings across a spectrum of program designs, e.g., developmental bilingual, two-way immersion, heritage language programs.</p>
<p>Target language linguistic proficiency Linguistic Contrastive analysis</p>	<p>1, 2, 5</p>	<p>Identify how target language linguistic proficiency works with Standard 6 and in developing bilingual teachers’ language proficiency across a program.</p>
<p>Cultural literacies, cross-cultural understanding and intercultural competence</p>	<p>1, 4, 5</p>	<p>Focus on need to develop cultural knowledge, cross-cultural understanding, and intercultural competence to develop students’ identities and sense of community.</p>

The following pages provide a summary of the standard-by-standard analysis from the Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group.

Standard Analysis

The Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group reviewed all six of the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and engaged in deeply analyzing Standards 1 through 5. The Work Group did not do a deep analysis of Standard 6 (Assessment of Candidate Language Competence) as we agreed that the current content is appropriate as written. Below are the analyses for Standards 1-5, which include three areas: (1) descriptions of key elements within the standard; (2) recommended revisions; and (3) implications related to assessment, policy, and practice. Tables created as part of the analysis for each standard that are referenced in the narratives below are found in the [Appendix A](#).

Standard 1: Program Design

Key elements. Standard 1 affords bilingual teacher preparation programs the opportunity to develop and commit to a program philosophy that communicates an equity orientation responsive to sociolinguistic, socioemotional, sociocultural, and sociopolitical factors for diverse learners in multilingual settings. Several key elements included in the existing version of Program Standard 1 serve as a guide for program design and will benefit from significant revisions in order to reimagine, reignite, and bolster the quality and potential impact of bilingual teacher preparation programs throughout the state. The design of the program and curriculum should align to the TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap Principles and follow an assets-based approach. [Table A1](#) delineates these interconnected elements, including program leadership committed to the development and operationalization of an infrastructure that demonstrates high priority for bilingual/dual language teacher education. Standard 1 also addresses intentional curriculum design and candidates' developing depth of knowledge regarding research-based theories and approaches that help all learners access grade level content in multilingual settings. This is facilitated in collaboration with local district partners that have culturally and linguistically diverse student populations, including those with high numbers of English Learners (ELs) wherever possible, and those with research-based biliteracy/dual language programs. Program options are delineated as part of program design, denoting implications for course sequencing and candidate assessment.

Recommended revisions. Based on our analysis of the key elements for Standard 1, we recommend the following revisions (see [Table A1](#)).

- 1) Include an equity-orientation and an explicit reference to/alignment with the TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap principles within the program philosophy. Philosophy should be based upon an assets-based approach and include an expanded version of typologies of learners in multilingual settings. Program philosophy should align with Standard 5 and include information about the socioemotional, sociolinguistics, and sociopolitical needs of ELs in bilingual and multilingual settings.
- 2) In alignment with Standards 2-6, the program leadership team includes reference to institutional infrastructure that demonstrates high priority for bilingual teacher education (e.g., resources, personnel, recruitment) and includes criteria for leadership qualifications and characteristics in socioemotional, sociolinguistics, and sociopolitical expertise, in addition to teacher preparation and bilingual/dual language instruction and education.
- 3) Expand the definition of "Collaboration with Local Districts" to include other opportunities (e.g., varied clinical experiences, school-based clinical faculty) and settings. Include criteria and expectations ensuring that selected local district partners have culturally and linguistically diverse

contexts with high numbers of ELs (wherever possible) and have research-based biliteracy/dual language programs to assure support and preparation of receiving teachers, mentors, and educational leaders.

- 4) In alignment with Standards 2-6, the curriculum design includes language across KSAs to establish socioemotional, sociolinguistics, sociopolitical, and sociocultural elements as a critical knowledge base. Include explicit reference/alignment to TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap principles ensuring an assets-based approach and an expanded version of typologies of learners in multilingual settings.
- 5) The language describing candidate knowledge of biliteracy research should be reframed around multiliteracy, research-based theories which include references to emerging and re-emerging literature (e.g., bicognition, bi-cognitive development, translanguaging) and include considerations for third languages, including indigenous languages, Standard English Learners (SEL), and language varieties.
- 6) Candidate knowledge of access to content and progress benchmarks should explicitly refer to access to content in multilingual settings and to monitoring progress in multiple languages. This should include current research-based practice in bilingual settings and considerations for benchmarks and assessments based on recommendations in the CA ELA/ELD Framework.
- 7) Program completion options identify/re-define options for each pathway (see Standard 2 recommendations) and include language about expectations for clinical/fieldwork experiences, including for test completers.
- 8) Criteria for Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and/or Online Program Options be established.

Assessment, policy, and practices. Given that Standards 1 and 2 do not include Program Planning Questions (PPQs), several recommendations for PPQs are proposed to guide program assessment and development of policies and practices for Program Design (see [Table A1](#)). These include consideration of how the program engages diverse stakeholders in the development of each element of the program (i.e., program philosophy, leadership team, collaboration with local districts, curriculum design, candidate knowledge, and completion options) and how program metrics inform continuous improvement across each element. PPQs should also explicitly address how the program identifies and operationalizes criteria for leadership team members and collaboration with local districts. Also recommended is that Common Standards address bilingual authorization through continuous improvement processes.

Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Key elements. As written, Standard 2 defines a program's responsibility for assessing a bilingual teacher candidate's competence across multiple dimensions, including contexts for bilingual teaching and learning, methods and pedagogical approaches for biliteracy/dual language settings, and language proficiency competencies. This standard also specifies assessment processes that programs employ to provide formative and summative feedback and collect evidence to verify candidate competence. The key elements of this standard will require significant revisions grounded in a clear definition and delineation of research-aligned elements of multilingual education in order to hold programs accountable for documenting evidence for candidate performance. We contend that the base Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) do not suffice to address the competencies of specialized knowledge for bilingual teachers and thus a critical consideration for redesigning the content of this standard is to create and release new Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BMTPEs), subsequently allowing for the creation of updated KSAs for bilingual educators prepared to serve in multilingual settings. Specific recommended revisions to existing key elements for this standard are further delineated below.

Recommended revisions. [Table A2](#) presents an overview of our analysis of this standard. Key recommendations for revisions are summarized here.

- 1) Align assessment of candidates' competence criteria to elements in Standard 1 and Standards 3-6.
- 2) Based on the creation and release of Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BMTPEs), provide a clearer definition of "satisfactory performance" to guide programs in making decisions about processes and procedures to document performance evidence, inclusive of knowledge, skills, and abilities on the context of bilingual/dual language education, bilingual/dual language methodology and pedagogy, and language proficiency.
- 3) Expand the concept of "bilingual instruction" beyond technical competencies to include the full range of competencies a bilingual teacher engages in, such as initial and diagnostic assessment of bilingual learners, instructional design based on asset-based pedagogy, universal design for learning across language systems, differentiated instruction, and equity pedagogy.
- 4) Expand the concept of assessment to include diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment processes and strengthen this element of the standard by aligning assessment processes for bilingual authorization candidates to show demonstration of a full range of professional competencies as defined in the proposed Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BMTPEs).
- 5) Consider alignment to summative teacher performance assessments (CalTPA) and create clear criteria for requirements, and document submission and assessment, including processes for calibrated bilingual assessors.
- 6) Be more specific regarding qualifications of individual(s) who verify a candidate's performance to include consideration for type of credential and specialist credentials, as well as expectations for an assessor's current knowledge base on bilingual/biliteracy teaching and learning.
- 7) Ensure that criteria for institutional and clinical practice evaluators/assessors corresponds to individuals in multiple pathways (e.g., sequential, simultaneous, residency, intern, traditional student teaching).

Currently unaddressed in this standard is consideration for robust verification of competency for multiple pathways of program completion (e.g., sequential, simultaneous, residency, intern, student teaching), as well as test-only option completers. With the growing demands to respond to the bilingual teacher shortage, our team's commitment to quality bilingual educator teacher preparation requires CTC to identify viable options for programs to establish processes to collect field-based evidence of candidate's expertise/teaching performance to substantiate verification of competence for multiple pathways as well as for test-only completers.

Assessment, policy, and practices. Currently, Standard 2 (as well as Standard 1) does not have PPQs to support added authorization programs in responding to the elements of the standard. Several recommended PPQs are delineated in [Table A2](#) to guide program assessment and development of policies and practices. These include consideration of how programs specify processes for documenting evidence of satisfactory performance across required dimensions, as well as programs' definition and use of a comprehensive assessment plan (i.e., diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment processes) to guide and coach candidate performance. Related to this is a question on how program assessments align to and support candidates' performance on state-required summative assessments. To ensure quality of support and supervisory personnel, we recommend the establishment of criteria for institutional and field-based individuals responsible for monitoring, supporting, and assessing bilingual teacher candidates' performance.

Standard 3: The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

Key Elements. Standard 3 supports candidates in their understanding of the local, state, national, and international context of language policy, and how these contexts inform bilingual education, bilingual program models, and research associated with program effectiveness for bilingual learners in K-12 schools.

Recommended revisions. Since this standard confounds the context with application/instruction, our recommendation is that this standard focus more clearly on the connection between context, research, and policy. We suggest this standard concentrate on the philosophical, theoretical, legal, and legislative foundations of bilingual/dual language education as it relates to instructional practice and intercultural communication with parents and community at large. Moreover, based on our analysis of the key elements and recommended revisions found in the [Table A3](#), we also recommend Standard 3 should focus on the context for bilingual education not only in California and the U.S., but in the global multilingual community. It must reference the local, state and national landscape as well as the global context.

Lastly, it seems beyond the scope of the standard to include the development of bilingualism and biliteracy as developmental processes connected to principles of language transfer, contrastive analysis, cognitive and metacognitive research-based processes, language use, interlanguage, and translanguaging. We would like to suggest that these themes be transferred to Standard 4 so that they would be included in bilingualism, biliteracy, and bilingual methodology. We are not proposing minor surface-level cosmetic changes to Standard 3; rather we are suggesting some structural changes to the fabric of this standard for consideration.

Standard 4: Bilingual Methodology

Standard 4 identifies the general bilingual pedagogic skills as applied to practices for bilingual candidates as they relate to the four interconnected language domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). This standard also addresses assessment, adaptation and use of instructional materials, knowledge of bilingual program types, and the intercultural interactions that are pedagogically and culturally responsive.

Recommended revisions. Based on our analysis of the key elements and recommended revisions found in the [Table A4](#), our first recommendation is that the CA ELA/ELD frameworks and current content area frameworks be addressed throughout the methodology standard. We also recommend that integrated and designated ELD instruction is incorporated across Standard 3. We recommend the integration of bilingual student assessments and bilingual “signature” assessment for teacher candidates. Signature assignments help provide fidelity across a program. We also need to include the latest research around translanguaging, as well as incorporate linguistic and culturally sustaining pedagogies. Clinical practice using research-based practices across a variety of bilingual program models needs to be incorporated into Standard 4. We also recommend binational, international, and global perspectives and authentic materials need to be integrated across the standard.

Assessment, policy, and practices. We call attention to the need for the bilingual TPEs as a way to assess candidates’ pedagogic abilities that can complement the non-bilingual TPEs as part of a new teacher assessment policy. Further, as applied to simultaneous versus sequential bilingual teacher program design, this issue warrants greater consideration. This consideration includes potential (mis)interpretation of the metaphor of the “common trunk” and its branches in regards to *when and*

how bilingual candidates can demonstrate these abilities in the context of research and policies supporting enhanced clinical experiences for teachers who add the authorization after initial certification.

Standard 5: Culture of Emphasis

Key elements. Standard 5 calls for professional teacher preparation programs to have a breadth and depth of understanding of the cultures aligned to the target languages being taught in bilingual education settings throughout California, the United States, and globally. Based on the analysis of the standard, recommendations of key elements needing to be addressed are as follows: (1) all language stating “Culture of Emphasis” needs to be reworded as “Target Ethnic Group” or an alternative to acknowledge and reflect the cultural diversity that is found within an ethnic group, nation state, or group of people with a shared language; (2) key elements addressed in the standard description should reflect the most up-to-date research inclusive of culturally sustaining pedagogies to reflect the dynamic nature of culture as it relates to the values, traditions, practices, and beliefs of the target ethnic group; and (3) professional teacher preparation programs within the field of bilingual education should also prepare candidates to develop an asset-oriented frame of reference rooted in equity and social justice.

Recommended revisions. Considering the key elements that needed to be addressed, there were several recommendations for revisions outlined in [Table A5](#). To begin, there were several discrepancies found between the standards description and PPQs. For example, in the first question of the PPQ, emphasis was made in understanding the traditions, roles, status, and communication patterns of the target ethnic group; however, this expectation did not explicitly correspond with the program planning questions. Therefore, modifications and additions were made for each program planning question to mirror the expectation of the standard description (see [Table A5](#)). We also suggested additional language in the standard description to reflect the additional PPQs proposed. For example, key elements aligned to PPQ 5.6 should reflect a knowledge of the cultures, values, beliefs, experiences, and contributions of the target ethnic group to the United States. Moreover, teacher candidates should have an in-depth understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogies that complement their working knowledge of cross-cultural, intercultural, and intracultural relationships of students represented in the target ethnic group. This will equip candidates with the tools needed to value and sustain the cultural diversity of students who share membership within the target ethnic group. Lastly, a second component was added to [Table A5](#) titled, *Additional Key Elements: Standard Language & Program Planning Questions to be Considered*. This section reflects the language omitted from the original key elements. Understanding the historical roots of bilingual education are founded in equity and social justice, so we recommend including explicit language that captures a program’s ability to build an awareness among its candidates of educational inequality perpetuated by structural barriers, in addition to the tools needed to advocate for marginalized students in the target ethnic group as well as engage community members of the importance of educational equity in compulsory classroom settings.

Assessment, policy, and practices. In order to successfully achieve the recommended revisions aforementioned, we included and/or revised additional program planning questions to the Standard 5 description. These additional questions can be found in the third column of [Table A5](#). PPQs reflect the change in language from “culture of emphasis” to “target ethnic group.” Throughout the PPQ revisions and additions, we also included language that emphasizes the importance of social justice education and equity-oriented instruction strategies rooted in culturally sustaining pedagogies. One element not included in [Table A5](#), but in need of further examination, is guidance in how Standard 5 can be operationalized across bilingual authorization programs. This guidance can be inclusive of program logic

models and/or vignettes. In our analysis, we grappled with the best way to approach Standard 5. For example, should Standard 5 be operationalized as a class taught in the target language? Can a credential program develop a course inclusive of all Standard 5 PPQs to reflect a region (e.g., Latin American, South East Asia, Middle East) rather than a specific nation-state (e.g., Mexico, Korea, Portugal, Saudi Arabia)? Does the LOTE reflect and/or align with the current research as it relates to the experiences of the target ethnic group, and/or should it be revised to reflect the revised program standards? These questions have not yet been resolved, and warrant further analysis.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group engaged in this eighteen-month process in the service of the formal CTC's Bilingual Authorization Work Group/Expert Panel. This white paper is intended to support the statewide preparation of bilingual/dual language teachers so that they can, in turn, deliver the most up-to-date practices to support their students' biliteracy development and academic success. The time has come to intentionally reverse the harm Proposition 227 has caused our current teacher candidates and thousands of students in grades PreK-12. In addition to the standards-specific recommendations, the following considerations are essential to the process:

- Determining appropriate terminology(ies) to be used for ELs, multilingual learners, emergent bilingual, etc.;
- Clarifying implementations of the Common trunk (see Standard 4 recommendations) as it relates to bilingual authorization;
- Addressing Bilingual Teacher Performance Expectations;
- Updating the Common Standards and Preconditions to address bilingual/dual language teachers; and
- Integrating the updated Common Standards and Preconditions in design of the program to address bilingual/dual language clinical practice as well as through the standards.

We must find ways to certify bilingual teachers who are not only highly skilled in their content areas, but most importantly in the linguistic abilities (Faltis & Valdés, 2016) needed to meet rigorous biliteracy standards. Collaboration, shared resources, and joint commitments amongst university systems and across departments are necessary to ensure maximum success. It is incumbent on those of us that continue to advocate for quality bilingual/dual language education to organize ourselves to meet the growing demands and current challenges in preparing highly qualified bilingual teacher candidates in California.

References

(Note: This reference list includes new references in blue font that are added to the original list from the Bilingual Authorization Program Standards Handbook, which appears in black font.)

Acosta, R., & Blanco, G. (1978). *Competencies for university programs in bilingual education* (Report No. DHEW-OE-78-07903). Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Acuña, R. (2014). *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.

Aguila, V. (2009). Schooling English Learners: Contexts and Challenges. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Alfaro, C. (2019). Preparing critically conscious dual-language teachers: Recognizing and interrupting dominant ideologies. *Theory into Practice, 58*(2), 194-203. DOI: 10.1080/00405841.2019.1569400

Alfaro, C. & Bartolomé, L. (2017). Preparing ideologically clear bilingual teachers: Honoring working-class non-standard language use in the bilingual education classroom. *Issues in Teacher Education, 26*(2), 11-34.

Alim, H. S. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics. In H. S. Alim, J. R. Rickford, & A. F. Ball (Eds.), *Racilinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race* (pp. 1-30). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Anaya, R. (1972). *Bless Me, Ultima*. Berkeley, CA: Tonatiuh-Quinto Sol International, Inc.

Anzaldúa, G. (2012). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.

Anzaldúa, G. (2015). *Light in the dark/Luz en lo oscuro: Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press Books.

Aquino-Sterling, C. R., & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2016). Developing teaching-specific Spanish competencies in bilingual teacher education: Toward a culturally, linguistically, and professionally relevant approach. *Multicultural Perspectives, 18*(2), 73-81.

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

August, D., Goldenberg, C., & Rueda, R. (2011). Restrictive state language policies: Are they scientifically based? In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (Eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Baker, C. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Bankston, C., & Zhou, M. (1995). Effects of minority-language literacy on the academic achievement of Vietnamese in New Orleans. *Sociology of Education, 68*, 1–17.

Betancur-García, M. C. (2014). Mestizaje lingüístico y cultural. *Revista Venezolana de Análisis de Coyuntura, 20*(2), 103-129.

Beykont, Z., Editor. (2000). *Lifting every voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Publishing Group.

Bialystok, E., Craik, F., Klein, R., & Viswanathan, M. (2004). Bilingualism, aging, and cognitive control: Evidence from the Simon Task. *Psychology and Aging, 19*(2), pp 290-303.

Boyer, J., & Baptiste, H., Jr. (1996). The crisis in teacher education in America: Issues of recruitment and retention of culturally different (minority) teachers. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 779–794). New York, NY: Schuster Macmillan.

Boyle, A., August, D., Tabaku, L., Cole, S., & Simpson-Baird, A. (2015). *Dual language education programs: Current state policies and practices*. Washington, DC: American Institute of Research.

Brisk, M. E. (2005). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, J. E., Smallman, S., & Hitz, R. (2008). Partnerships to recruit and prepare bilingual teachers. *Metropolitan Universities, 19*(3), 54–67.

Burns, A. F. (1993). *Maya in exile: Guatemalans in Florida*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K., & Rodríguez, J. L. (2008). The preparation of highly qualified teachers of English language learners: Educational responsiveness for unmet needs. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 41*(3), 372–387.

Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *The literacy curriculum and bilingual education: A critical examination*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers.

Caldas, B., Palmer, D., & Schwedhelm, M. (2019). Speaking educación in Spanish: Linguistic and professional development in a bilingual teacher education program in the US-Mexico borderlands. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(1), 49-63.

California Department of Education. (2009). *Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento, California Department of Education.

California Department of Education. (2018). *California English learner roadmap: Strengthening comprehensive educational policies, programs, and practices for English learners*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/rm/rmpolicy.asp>

California Department of Education. (2015). *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.mydigitalchalkboard.org/cognoti/content/file/resources/documents/ac/ac1376ba/ac1376ba78a91e80241cb0e458caaa57310d0763/elaeldfmwfeb17.pdf>

California Law: California Education Code (2009). Sections 300-313. Accessed at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/calawquery?codesection=edc&codebody=&hits=20> on March 6, 2009.

Capdevila-Gutierrez, M. & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2018). El español como herramienta para forjar una globalización inclusiva: Equidad lingüística en las aulas de doble inmersión de California. *Ikala: Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 23(2), 287-302.

Caplan, N., Choy, M. H., & Whitmore, J. K. (1991). *Children of the boat people: A study of educational success*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Caplan, N., Whitmore, J. K., & Choy, M. (1989). *The boat people and achievement in America: A study of family life, hard work, and cultural values*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Bilingual teacher shortages in California: A problem likely to grow [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Bilingual_Teacher_Shortages_California_FACTSHEET.pdf

Castaneda, A., & Gray, T. (1974). Bilingual processes in multicultural education. *Educational Leadership*, 32(3), 203-207. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197412_castaneda.pdf

Castek, J., Leu, D. J., Jr., Coiro, J., Gort, M., Henry, L. A., & Lima, C. (2008). Developing new literacies among multilingual learners in the elementary grades. In L. Parker (Ed.), *Technology-based learning environments for young English learners: In and out of school connections* (pp. 111-153). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G., Dorner, L., Palmer, D., Heiman, D., Schwerdtfeger, R., & Choi, J. (2017). Combating inequalities in two-way language immersion programs: Toward critical consciousness in bilingual education spaces. *Review of Research in Education* 41(1), 407-427.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 64-82.

Chang, E., & Diaz-Veizades, J. (1999). *Ethnic peace in the American city*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London, UK: Sage.

Cheng, L., & Yang, P. (2000). "Model minority" deconstructed. In M. Zhou & J. Gatewood (Eds.). *Contemporary Asian America: A multidisciplinary reader*. (1st ed., pp. 459- 482). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Cho, G., Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (2004). What do we know about heritage languages? What do we need to know about them? *Multicultural Education*, 11(4), 23-26.

Cho, G. (2001). The role of heritage language in social interactions and relationships: Reflections from a language minority group. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(4), 369-384.

Cho, G. (2015). Perspectives vs. reality of heritage language development: Second-generation Korean-American high school students. *Multicultural Education*, 22(2), 30-38.

Cho, G., & Krashen, S. (1998). The negative consequences of heritage language loss and why we should care. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, and J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage language development* (pp. 31-39). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Chun, K. T. (1980). The myth of Asian American success and its educational ramifications. *IRCD Bulletin*, 15(1 & 2), 1-12. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED193411.pdf>

Collier, V. (1985). University models for ESL and bilingual teacher training. *Proceedings of a conference on issues in English language development for minority language education: English language development* (pp. 81-90). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Colón Muñiz, A., & Lavadenz, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Latino civil rights in educational: La lucha sigue (The struggle continues)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Corson, D. (1998). *Language policies in schools*. England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (5th ed.). Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing.

Crawford, J. (2000). *At War with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. England: Multilingual Matters.

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: language diversity in the classroom* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.

Crawford, J., & Krashen, S. (2015). *English learners in American classrooms: 101 questions, 101 answers* (2nd ed.). Portland, OR: DiversityLearningK12.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 139-167. Retrieved from <http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8>

Cummins, J., Brown K., & Sayers, D. (2007). *Literacy, technology, and diversity: Teaching for success in changing times*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Cummins, J. (2009). Transformative multiliteracies pedagogy: School-based strategies for closing the achievement gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 11(2), 38-56.

Darder, A., Torres, R., & Gutiérrez, H. (1997). *Latinos and education: A critical reader*. New York: Routledge.

De Avila, E. & Duncan, S. (1981a). Bilingualism and the metaset. In Durán, R. (Ed.) *Latino language and communicative behavior*. (pp. 337-354). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha. (1994). *Sociocultural change through literacy: Toward the empowerment of families*.

del Rosal, K., Roman, D., & Basarba, D. (2018). Debemos escuchar a los maestros: Perspectives of bilingual teacher candidates in teacher education partnerships. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(2), 187-205.

Dover, A., & Rodríguez-Valls, F. (2018). Learning to “brave up”: Collaboration, agency, and authority in multicultural, multilingual, and radically inclusive classrooms. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 20(3), 59-79.

Dow, P., Krashen, S., & Tinajero, J. (2009/2010). Early (grade 2) reading ability in the first language correlates with subsequent (grade 6) reading ability in the second language: A longitudinal confirmation of the Interdependence Hypothesis. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 5(2), 2-3.

Dow, P., Tinafero, J., & Krashen, S. (2011). A note on English language development in one-way and two-way bilingual programs. *TABE Journal*, 13(1), 82-87.

Escobedo, D. (1999). Propositions 187 and 227: Latino immigrant rights to education. *Human Rights Magazine* (summer), pp. 13–15.

Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian American Panethnicity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015, Public Law No. 114-95, S.1177, 114th Cong. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf>

Faltis, C., & Hudelson, S. (1998). *Bilingual Education in Elementary and Secondary School Communities: Toward Understanding and Caring*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Faltis, C., & Valdez, G. (2016). Preparing teachers to teach in and advocate for linguistically diverse classrooms: A vade mecum for teacher educators. In D. Gitomer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 549-592). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 1–40). New York: Longman.

Ferdman, B., Weber, R., & Ramirez, A. (Eds.), *Literacy across Languages and Cultures*. Albany, NY: University of New York Press.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149-171.

Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2009). *La enseñanza de la lectura y escritura en español en el aula bilingüe* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Freidman, T. L. (2007) *The world is flat 3.0: A brief history of the Twenty-First century* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Picador Publishers.

Freire, P., Macedo, D., Koike, D., & Oliviera, A. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Gándara, P., & Escamilla, K. (2017). Bilingual education in the United States. In O. García, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education, encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 439-452). New York, NY: Springer International Publishing.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Garcia, A. (2017). *Leveraging school district and university partnerships to grow the bilingual teacher pipeline*. Retrieved from <https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/school-district-and-university-partnerships-bilingual-teacher-pipeline/>

García, O., & Otheguy, R. (1988). The language situation of Cuban Americans. In S. McKay & S. Wong, *Language diversity: problem or resource?* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.

García, O. (2017). Reflections on Turnbull's reframing of foreign language education: Bilingual epistemologies. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(5), 628-638. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2016.1277512

García, O., & Wei, L. (2013). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., & Valdés, G. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2007). *Educating English Language Learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1991). *The saturated self: Dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. New York: Basic Books.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). *Teaching English language learners: What the research does – and does not– say*. *American Educator*, 32(2), 8-24, 42-44.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005) *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodwin, A., L., Genishi, C., Asher, N., & Woo, K. A. (1997). Voices from the margins: Asian American teachers' experiences in the profession. In D. M. Byrd & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Teacher education yearbook* (Vol. 5, pp. 219–241). Thousand Oaks, CA: Association of Teacher Educators and Corwin Press.

Gordon, J. (1994). Why students of color are not entering teaching: Reflections from minority teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45, 346–353.

Gordon, J. (2000). Asian American resistance to selecting teaching as a career: The power of community and tradition. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 173–196.

Gort, M., & Pontier, R. W. (2013). Exploring bilingual pedagogies in dual language preschool classrooms. *Language and Education*, 27(3), 223-245. DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2012.697468

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Guzman Johannessen, B. G. (2016). Current conditions of bilingual teacher preparation programs in public universities in USA. *Education and Society*, 34(2), 27-48.

Hernández, A. M. (2017). Reflective and transformative practice in bilingual teacher preparation examining cross-cultural and linguistic equity. *Issues in Teacher Education, 26*(2), 67-86.

Hofer, B., & Pintrich, P. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(1), 88-140.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D., & Cain, C. (2001). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hollins, E. (2011). Teacher preparation for quality teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 395–407.

Hopkins, M. (2013). Building on our teaching assets: The unique pedagogical contributions of bilingual educators. *The Journal of the National Association of Bilingual Educators, 36*(3), 350-370.

Hopkins, M., & Heineke, A. J. (2017). Teacher learning through culturally relevant literature. *Teacher Education and Practice, 30*(3), 501-522.

Howard, E. R., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., Rogers, D., Olague, N., Medina, J., Kennedy, B., Suarman, J., & Christian, D. (2018). *Guiding principles for dual language education* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hsu, S. (2005). Help-seeking behavior of student teachers. *Educational Research, 47*(3), 308–318.

Hutchinson, S. (2001). Education and grounded theory. In R. Sherman & R. B. Webb (Eds.), *Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods* (pp. 122-139). London, UK: Routledge-Falmer.

Ima, K., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1989). Southeast Asian refugees in American schools: A comparison of fluent-English-proficient and limited-English-proficient students. *Topics in Language Disorders, 9*(3), 54-75.

Jimenez, R. T. (1997). The strategic reading abilities and potential of five low-literacy Latina/o readers in middle school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 32*(3), 224-243.

Johnson, D. M. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Joseph, T., & Evans, L. M. (2018). Preparing preservice teachers for bilingual and bicultural classrooms in an era of political change. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(1), 52-68.

Kincheloe, J. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: Developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly, (31)*1, 49-66.

Kitano, H. (1969). *Japanese Americans: The evolution of a subculture*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kloss, H. (1999). *The American bilingual tradition* (Language in Education, Book 88). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

Kloss, Heinz. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition. Language in Education: Theory and Practice* No.88. Washington D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

Knobel, M. & Lankshear, C. (Eds.). (2007). *A new literacies sampler*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Koda, K. (2005). Learning to read across writing systems: Transfer, metalinguistic awareness and second-language reading development. In V. Cook & B. Bassetti (Eds.), *Second language writing systems* (pp. 311-334). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Krashen, S. (1998). Do other countries do bilingual education? *CABE Newsletter*, 21(5), 14,15-36. Retrieved from <http://www.languagepolicy.net/archives/UW-euro.htm>

Krashen, S. (1998). Heritage language development: Some practical arguments. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage Language Development* (pp. 3-13). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, S. (1998). Language shyness and heritage language development. In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage Language Development* (pp. 41-49). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Krashen, S. (2002). Does transition really happen? Some case histories. *The Multilingual Educator*, 3(1), 50-54.

Krashen, S. (2005). The acquisition of English by children in two-way programs: What does the research say? In V. Gonzales & J. Tinajero (Eds.), *NABE Review of research and practice* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Krashen, S. (2010). Does the power of reading apply to all languages? *Language Magazine*, 9(9), 24-27.

Krashen, S., & Brown, C. L. (2005). The ameliorating effects of high socioeconomic status: A secondary analysis. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 185-196.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). Who will Teach our Children? Preparing Teachers to Teach African American Learners. In E. Hollins, J. King, & W. Hayman (Eds.), *Teaching diverse learners: Formulating a knowledge base for teaching diverse populations* (pp. 129–158). Albany, NY: State University Press.

Lavadenz, M., & Duque de Reyes, S. (2001). *Los Estándares de Lecto-Escritura en Español, K-12* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: San Diego County Office of Education.

Lavadenz, M. (2005). Como hablar en silencio: Culture and language identity of Central Americans in Los Angeles. In: Zentella, A. *Latinos and language socialization in families, communities, and schools: Anthropological Perspectives*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Lavadenz, M. (2011). *Pedagogies of questioning: Bilingual teachers and transformative inquiry*. Covina, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Lavadenz, M., & Baca, R. (2017). Introduction: Preparing bilingual teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 3-9.

Lavadenz, M., & Colón Muñiz, A. (2018). The education of Latino/a teachers: A LatCrit analysis of the role of university centers and Latino/a teacher development. In P. C. Ramirez, C. J. Faltis, & E. de Jong (Eds.), *Learning from emergent bilingual Latinx learners in K-12: Critical teacher education* (pp. 79-102). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lemlech, J. K., & Hertzog-Foliart, H. (1993). Linking school and university through collegial student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(4), 19–28.

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Genesee, F. (2009). Dual language programs for English Learners. *Educating English Learners: Research-Based Approaches*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lipman, P. (1998). *Race, class, and power in school restructuring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (2011). *English with an accent* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge, Inc.

López, F., & Santibañez, L. (2018). Teacher preparation for emergent bilingual students: Implications of evidence for policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(36) 2-47.

López, G. R., Scribner, J. D., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001). Redefining parental involvement: Lessons from high-performing migrant-impacted schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 253-288.

Lortie, D. C. (2002). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study* (2nd ed). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be...a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(2), 154-167. DOI: 10.1080/14790710902846715

Macclure, M. (1993). Arguing for Your Self: Identity as an organization principle in teachers' Jobs and Lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19, 311-322.

Makaroff, J. (1967). America's other racial minority: Japanese Americans. *Contemporary Review*, 210: 310-314.

Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of language minority education in the United States. In: A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Advances in Language Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Sage Publications.

Manning, D. T. (1977). The influence of key individuals on student teachers in urban and suburban Settings. *The Teacher Educator*, 13(2), 2-8.

Martinez, R. R., & O'Donnell, J. (1993, April). *Understanding the support systems of Hispanic teacher candidates: A study through In-depth Interviews*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 12-16.

Martínez-Álvarez, P., Cuevas, I., & Torres-Guzmán, M. (2017). Preparing bilingual teachers: Mediating belonging with multimodal explorations in language, identity, and culture. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(2), 155-178.

McField, G., & McField, D. (2014). The consistent outcome of bilingual education programs: A meta-analysis of meta-analyses. In G. McField (Ed.), *The Miseducation of English Learners* (pp. 267-299). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

McKay, S. L., & Wong, S. L. C. (Eds.). (1996). *New immigrants in the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Menken, K., & Antuñez, B. (2001). *An overview of the preparation and certification of teachers working with limited English proficient (LEP) students* (ED455231). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Mitchell, A. (1998). African American teachers: Unique roles and universal lessons. *Education and Urban Society*, 31(1) 104–122.

Moll, L., & Greenberg, J. B. (2005). Creating zones of possibilities: Combining social contexts for instruction. In *Vygotsky and Education: Instructional Implications and Applications of Sociohistorical Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L. C., & Diaz, R. (1987) Changes as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 300-311.

Mouavangsou, K. (2018). Because I am a daughter: A Hmong woman's educational journey. *Journal of Southeast Asian American Education and Advancement*, 13(1), 1-11.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2017). *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17226/24677>

Nero, S., & Ahmad, N. (2014). *Vernaculars in the classroom: Paradoxes, pedagogy, possibilities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Nguyen, A., Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (2001). Development of the first language is not a barrier to second-language acquisition: Evidence from Vietnamese immigrants to the United States. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(3), 159-164.

Nguyen, D. H. (1972). *Some aspects of Vietnamese culture*. Carbondale, IL: Center for Vietnamese Studies, University of Southern Illinois.

Nguyen, H. T. (2007). Educating Vietnamese American Students. *Multicultural Education*, 15(1), 23-26.

Nguyen, H. T. (2008a). Conceptions of teaching by five Vietnamese American preservice teachers. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(2), 113 -136.

Nguyen, M. H., & Haines, D. W. (1996). Vietnamese. In: D. W. Haines (Ed.), *Refugees in America in the 1990s: A reference handbook* (pp. 305–330). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 180-187.

Nieto, S. (2017). Becoming sociocultural mediators: What all educators can learn from bilingual and ESL teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 26(2), 129-141.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. (2002, July 11). *Summary and overview*. Retrieved March 25, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/summary.html>

Olivios, E. (2006). *The power of parents*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2014). *Racial formation in the United States*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual research journal*, 27(1), 1-24.
- Palmer, D. K. (2018). *Teacher leadership for social change in bilingual and bicultural education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2014). What are we seeking to sustain through culturally sustaining pedagogy? A loving critique forward. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 85-100.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Parrish, T., Merickel, M., Pérez, M., Linqianti, R., Socias, M., Spain, M., Speroni, C., Esra, P., Brock, L., & Delancy, D. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of Proposition 227 on the education of English Learners: K–12 findings from a five-year evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: American Institute of Research and WestEd.
- Petitto, L. A. (2005). How the brain begets language: On the neural tissue underlying human language acquisition. In J. McGilvray (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Chomsky* (pp. 84-101). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramírez, M. (2017). A bicognitive-multicultural model for a pluralistic education. In O. N. Saracho (Ed.), *Cognitive Style in Early Education* (pp. 151-158). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ramirez, M., & Castaneda, A. (1974). *Cultural democracy: Bicognitive development and education*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Ramírez, P. C., Vickery, A. E., Salinas, C. S., & Ross, L. (2016). Advocating for language rights: Critical Latina bilingual teachers creating bilingual space in Arizona. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3–4), 296–308.
- Ramos, F., & Krashen, S. (2013). Arnold’s advantages: How Governor Schwarzenegger acquired English through de facto bilingual education. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 7(3), 220-229.
- Ramos-Harris, V., & Sandoval-Gonzalez, A. (2017). *Unveiling California’s growing bilingual teacher shortage: Addressing the urgent shortage and aligning the workforce to advances in pedagogy and practice in bilingual education*. Long Beach, CA: Californians Together.
- Reyes, R. (2008). “Cheating” as good pedagogy: Bilingual teachers defying English-only to foster student achievement. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 10(4), 209-213. DOI: 10.1080/15210960802526136
- Rodríguez, R. G., & Villarreal, A. (2005). Effective bilingual teacher preparation: An action agenda. *IDRA Newsletter*, 32(5), 8-10.
- Rodriguez-Mojica, C., Briceno, A., & Munoz-Munoz, E. R. (2019). Combatting linguistic hegemony: Preparing and sustaining bilingual teacher educators in the United States. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 57-78.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rong, X. L., & Preissle, J. (1997). The continuing decline in Asian American teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(2), 267–293.

Rosa, J. (2018). *Looking like a language, sounding like a race: Raciolinguistic ideologies and the learning of Latinidad*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621-647.

Rueda, R., & Stillman, J. (2012). The 21st century teacher: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(4), 245-253.

Rumberger, R. W., & Gandara, P. (2004). Seeking equity in the education of California's English learners. *Teachers College Record*, 106(10), 2032–2056. New York, NY: Columbia University.

Santa Ana, O. (1993). Chicano English and the nature of the Chicano language setting. *The Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.

Santibañez, L., & Gándara, P. (2018). *Teachers of English language learners in secondary schools: Gaps in preparation and support*. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project.

Santibañez, L., & Snyder, C. (2018). *Teaching English learners in California: How teacher credential requirements in California address their needs*. Retrieved from http://gettingdowntofacts.com/sites/default/files/2018-09/GDTFII_Report_Santibanez.pdf

Scalafani, C. (2017). Strategies for educators of bilingual students: A critical literature review of literature. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 5(2), 1-8.

Schall-Leckrone, L. (2018). Coursework to classroom: Learning to scaffold instruction for bilingual learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 45(1), 31-56.

Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Seperson, M. A., & Joyce, B. R. (1973). Teaching styles of student teachers as related to those of cooperating teachers. *Educational Leadership Research Supplement* 146–151.

Shin, F., & Krashen, S. (1998). Do people appreciate the benefits of advanced first language development? Attitudes toward continuing first language development after “transition.” In S. Krashen, L. Tse, & J. McQuillan (Eds.), *Heritage Language Development* (pp. 89-94). Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.

Shoris, E. (2001). *Latinos: A Biography of the people* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & McCarty, T. (2008). Key concepts in bilingual education: Ideological, historical, epistemological and empirical foundations. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., pp. 3-17). New York, NY: Springer.

- Soltero, S. W. (2004). *Dual Language: Teaching and learning in two languages*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Spring, J. (2002). *Political agendas for education: From the religious right to the green party* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. *American Educator*, 39(4), 29-33, 43.
- Su, Z. (1996). Why Teach: Profiles and entry perspectives of minority students as becoming teachers. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29(3), 117–133.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suárez- Orozco, M. (2010). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long term academic achievement. Final Report*. Washington, DC: Center for Research on Education Diversity & Excellence.
- Tierney, W. G. (2002). Parents and families in precollege preparation: The lack of connection between research and practice. *Educational Policy*, 16, 588-606.
- Tintiango-Cubales, A., Kohli, R., Sacramento, J., Henning, N., Agarwal-Rangnath, R., & Sleeter, C. (2015). Toward an ethnic studies pedagogy: Implications for K-12 schools from the research. *The Urban Review*, 47(1), 104-125.
- Tollefson, J.W. (2002). *Language policies in education: Critical issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tse, L. (2001). Resisting and reversing language shift: Heritage-language resilience among U.S. native biliterates. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(4), 676-706.
- Turner, C. (2017). *Improving diverse and inclusive teacher pipelines with a focus on Latinas/Latinos/Hispanics*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, White House Initiative of Educational Excellence for Hispanics.
- Ulloa, J. (2016, October 16). Bilingual education has been absent from California public schools for almost 20 years. But that may soon change. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-pol-ca-proposition-58-bilingual-education-20161012-snap-story.html>
- Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: a Special Case of Bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Valdés, G. (1988). The language situation of Mexican-Americans. In S. McKay & S. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Valdés, G. (2018). Analyzing the curricularization of language in two-way immersion education: Restating two cautionary notes. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 41(4), 388-412. Doi 10.1080/15235882.2018.1539886.
- Valenzuela, A. (Ed.) (2016). *Growing critically conscious teachers: A social justice curriculum for educators of Latino/a youth*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143–178.
- Villegas, A. M. (1996). Increasing the racial and ethnic diversity in the U.S. teaching force. In B. Biddle, T. Good, & I. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook on teachers and teaching*. The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T., & O’Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 52–65.
- Wollenberg, C. (1975). *All deliberate speed: Segregation and exclusion in California schools, 1855–1975*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Yee, A. H. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, LX, 327.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education*, 8(1), 69-91.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, M. J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Zentella, A. (2005). *Latinos and language socialization in families, communities, and schools: Anthropological perspectives*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Zentella, A. C. (1988). The language situation of Puerto Ricans. In S. McKay & S. Wong (Eds.), *Language diversity: Problem or resource?* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, Inc.
- Zinn, H. (2003). *A people's history of the United States*. New York, NY: Perennial Classics.
- Zúñiga, C. E., Henderson, K. I., & Palmer, D. K. (2017). Language policy toward equity: How bilingual teachers use policy mandates to their own ends. *Language and Education*, 32(1), 60-76.

**APPENDIX A:
Analysis Tables for Each Standard**

Table A1: Standard 1-Program Design

Key elements (Quoted directly from the standard)	Recommended revisions	Assessment, policy, & practice PPQ = Program planning questions
<p>The design of the professional bilingual teacher preparation program follows from an explicit statement of program philosophy and purpose and is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale. The program philosophy articulates a clear understanding of the instructional needs of learners in bilingual settings.</p>	<p>PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY</p> <p>Include equity-orientation in program philosophy.</p> <p>Include reference/alignment to TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● assets-based approach, and ● expanded version of typologies of learners in multilingual settings. <p>Include information about socioemotional, sociolinguistics, and socio-political needs of ELs in multilingual settings.</p> <p>Align to Standard 5.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How does the program philosophy communicate an equity orientation responsive to socio-linguistic, socio-emotional, and socio-political factors for diverse learners in multilingual settings?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders to inform program design?</p> <p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p>
<p>The sponsoring institution shows a high priority to the program by providing appropriate support for the program and a demonstrated commitment to teacher preparation and to bilingual education. The program has a leadership team whose members are qualified in the areas of teacher preparation and bilingual instruction.</p>	<p>LEADERSHIP TEAM</p> <p>Include reference to program infrastructure that demonstrates high priority for bilingual teacher education: resources, personnel, recruitment.</p> <p>Include criteria for leadership qualifications and characteristics in socioemotional, sociolinguistics, and socio-political expertise, in addition to teacher preparation and bilingual/biliteracy instruction.</p> <p>Align to Standards 2-6.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How does the program identify and use criteria for bilingual program leadership team members? How does the program provide ongoing professional learning and development for leaders and staff?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders to inform program infrastructure and resource prioritization?</p>

		<p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p>
<p>The program demonstrates initial and ongoing collaboration with local school districts in order to reflect the needs of teachers serving in bilingual programs at the local and state level. This on-going coordination between the bilingual program and other teacher development programs is designed to strengthen the learning-to-teach continuum for teachers of learners in bilingual classrooms.</p>	<p>COLLABORATION WITH LOCAL DISTRICTS</p> <p>Expand definition of collaboration to include other opportunities (e.g., varied clinical experiences, school-based clinical faculty).</p> <p>Include criteria for local district partners that have culturally and linguistically diverse contexts, with high numbers of ELs (wherever possible) and have research-based dual language/bilingual//biliteracy programs.</p> <p>Include language about expectations to work with local districts to assure support and preparation of receiving teachers, mentors, and leaders.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How does the program identify and operationalize criteria for collaboration with partner districts?</p> <p>How does the program collaborate with local districts to provide ongoing professional learning and development for receiving teachers, mentors, and leaders?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders to inform development of clinical and practicum experiences?</p> <p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p>
<p>The curriculum is designed around the Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) for Bilingual Methodology and Culture.</p>	<p>CURRICULUM DESIGN</p> <p>Include reference/alignment to TK-12 CA English Learner Roadmap Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● assets-based approach, and ● expanded version of typologies of learners. <p>Include language across KSAs to establish socioemotional, sociolinguistics, sociopolitical, and sociocultural elements as critical knowledge base.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How are the program’s signature assignments aligned to KSAs? What dimensions of the signature assignments demonstrate candidates’ development of socioemotional, sociolinguistic, sociopolitical, and sociocultural awareness and application in biliteracy</p>

	<p>Align to Standards 2-6.</p>	<p>teaching and learning?</p> <p>What research-based practices for bilingual teacher preparation and adult learning, including reflective practices, are evident in the program’s curriculum design?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders in designing curriculum?</p> <p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p>
<p>It provides candidates with a depth of knowledge regarding current research-based theories and research in academic and content literacy in two languages, building upon both SB 2042 and California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Competencies.</p>	<p>CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE OF BILITERACY RESEARCH</p> <p>Reframe language around multiliteracy, research-based theories.</p> <p>Include reference to bicognition and translanguaging.</p> <p>Include considerations for third language, including indigenous languages, SELs, varieties of language.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: What dimensions of the signature assignments demonstrate candidates’ development of depth of knowledge regarding research-based theories for instruction in multilingual settings?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders in designing curriculum?</p> <p>Reference PPQs for Standard 4-Bilingual Methodology.</p>

<p>The program shows candidates how to help learners to access the K-12 grade level content instruction and how to provide benchmarks of English Learners’ progress toward meeting standards as defined in the California Curriculum Frameworks (2006).</p>	<p>CANDIDATE KNOWLEDGE OF ACCESS TO CONTENT AND PROGRESS BENCHMARKS</p> <p>Include reference to providing access to content in multilingual settings and monitoring progress in multiple languages.</p> <p>Include current research-based practice in bilingual settings.</p> <p>Include considerations for benchmarks and assessments based on recommendations in the CA ELA/ELD Framework.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs:</p> <p>What dimensions of the signature assignments demonstrate candidates’ development of depth of knowledge regarding approaches to helping all learners access grade level content in multilingual settings?</p> <p>How does the program provide varied experiences for candidates to observe, document, analyze, and describe ELs’ progress in two or more languages?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders to inform the development of coursework coupled with clinical and practicum experiences to model, co-teach, and debrief approaches?</p> <p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p> <p>Reference PPQs for Standard 4: Bilingual Methodology metrics.</p>
---	---	--

<p>The design of the program clearly indicates the options for completion of the program in a concurrent model and/or as a post-credential Model.</p>	<p>PROGRAM COMPLETION OPTIONS</p> <p>Need to identify/re-define options for each pathway (see Standard 2 recommendations).</p> <p>Include language about expectations for clinical/fieldwork experiences, including for test completers (see Standard 2 recommendations).</p> <p>Include established criteria for designing Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and/or Online Program Options.</p> <p>Include established criteria for monitoring quality of Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and/or Online Program Options.</p>	<p>Standard 1 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How are program options defined for each pathway? What criteria are used to ensure all options provide substantive clinical/fieldwork experiences?</p> <p>How does the program engage diverse stakeholders to inform the development of program options?</p> <p>How do program metrics inform continuous improvement?</p>
--	--	--

Table A2: Standard 2-The Assessment of Candidate Competence

<p>Key elements (Quoted directly from the standard)</p>	<p>Recommended revisions</p>	<p>Assessment, policy, & practice PPQ = Program Planning Questions</p>
<p>Prior to recommending each candidate for a bilingual authorization, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of program standards including language proficiency as they apply to bilingual authorization.</p>	<p>Clearly define what research-aligned elements of multilingual education are critical to hold programs accountable for documenting evidence for “satisfactory performance.” This should be in alignment with elements specified in Standard 1 and Standards 3-6.</p> <p>Create and release new Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BMTPEs). These should be above and beyond the base TPEs to address the competencies of specialized knowledge for bilingual teachers.</p> <p>Create and release updated KSAs for bilingual educators prepared to serve in multilingual settings.</p>	<p>Standard 2 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How does the program document evidence for satisfactory performance, inclusive of knowledge, skills, and abilities, on the context of bilingual and/or dual language education?</p> <p>How does the program document evidence for satisfactory performance of bilingual methodology inclusive of evidence from clinical and field experiences?</p>

	<p>Based on the release of new Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BMTPEs), we are proposing the following recommendations:</p> <p>Recommendation 1: Program documents evidence on candidate’s BMTPE Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSAs) in bilingual learning programs in the context of Bilingual and/or Dual Language Education.</p> <p>Recommendation 2: Program documents evidence on satisfactory candidate performance in BMTPEs Field Experiences demonstrating Bilingual Methodology in Bilingual and/or Dual Language Programs.</p> <p>Recommendation 3: Program documents evidence on satisfactory candidate performance in BMTPEs Clinical Practice demonstrating Bilingual Methodology in Bilingual and/or Dual Language Programs.</p> <p>Recommendation 4: Program documents evidence on satisfactory levels of candidate language proficiency in the target language (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) to be used in either language instruction, support, or translanguaging.</p>	<p>What processes has the program established to document evidence of candidate’s language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing?</p>
--	--	--

<p>During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in bilingual instruction using formative assessment processes.</p>	<p>Broaden the interpretation of what a bilingual teacher does and add full range of competencies a bilingual teacher engages in.</p> <p>The concept of “bilingual instruction” is too narrow and focuses on its technical competencies. It doesn’t capture the full range of what teachers do as it only refers to instruction.</p> <p>Clarify what is meant by “formative assessment processes.” Add more description of this, either in the body of the standard or add Program Planning Questions to Standard 2 to help guide decisions on what qualifies as “formative assessment processes.”</p> <p>Expand the concept of assessment to include diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment processes.</p> <p>Align assessment processes for Bilingual Authorization Candidates to show demonstration of a full range of professional competencies as defined in Bilingual/Multilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) via multiple, authentic, and performance-based assessments that are developmentally appropriate (i.e., diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments) for candidates.</p> <p>Consider alignment to SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT(CA TPA 2.0) - Create clear criteria for requirements, document submission, and assessment, including processes for calibrated bilingual assessors.</p>	<p>Standard 2 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: How does the program define and use a comprehensive assessment plan (i.e., diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment processes) to guide and coach candidate performance?</p> <p>How do program assessments align to and support candidates’ performance on state-required summative assessments?</p>
---	---	--

<p>Verification of candidate’s performance is provided by both institutional and field-based individuals with bilingual expertise and/or possessing bilingual authorization.</p>	<p>Be more specific on who verifies a candidate’s performance to include consideration for type of credential and specialist credentials as well as expectations for an individual’s current knowledge base on bilingual/biliteracy teaching and learning.</p> <p>Ensure that criteria for institutional and field-based evaluators/assessors corresponds to individuals in multiple pathways (e.g., sequential, simultaneous, residency, interns, student teaching).</p> <p>Add element: Verification of candidate’s competence for test-only option completers. Include field-based evidence of demonstrating expertise in bilingual methodology in bilingual/dual language programs.</p>	<p>Standard 2 does not currently include PPQs.</p> <p>Add PPQs: What criteria are established for institutional and field-based individuals responsible for monitoring, supporting, and assessing bilingual teacher candidate’s performance?</p> <p>How does the program establish processes to collect field-based evidence of candidate’s expertise to substantiate verification of competence for test-only completers?</p>
---	---	--

Table A3: Standard 3-The Context for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism

Key elements (Quoted directly from the standard)	Recommended revisions	Assessment, policy, & practice PPQ = Program planning questions
<p>The professional bilingual teacher preparation program provides candidates with knowledge of history, policies, programs and research on effectiveness of bilingual education and bilingualism in the U.S.</p>	<p>Change “bilingualism” to language policy (this includes bilingualism).</p> <p>Expand “bilingual” throughout the standard to read “bilingual/multilingual.”</p> <p>Include language policy in a global context, not just the U.S.</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 3.1, 3.2, 3.6, 3.8.</p> <p>Some suggestions for additions or shifts in PPQs: What are examples of education policies in other global contexts?</p> <p>How do assessment practices and results inform educational policy in the U.S. and abroad?</p>
<p>The program develops candidates who demonstrate understanding of the philosophical, theoretical,</p>	<p>Change wording to read “demonstrate and apply” to include application.</p> <p>PPQ 4.1 should be moved to Standard 3.</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 3.1-3.4, 3.10.</p> <p>Add PPQs: What components of the program prepare candidates</p>

<p>legal and legislative foundations of bilingual education and their effects on program design and educational achievement.</p>		<p>to understand and apply <i>philosophical and theoretical foundations</i> of bilingual education and their impact on program design and academic achievement?</p> <p>What components of the program prepare candidates to understand and apply <i>legal and legislative foundations</i> of bilingual education and their impact on program design and academic achievement?</p>
<p>Candidates apply knowledge of the research on the cognitive effects of bilingualism and biliteracy as developmental processes in instructional practice.</p> <p>The program prepares candidates’ knowledge of the transferability between primary and target language with the understanding that the level of transferability is affected by the level of compatibility and may vary among languages.</p>	<p>Change wording to read “cognitive, bi-cognitive and metacognitive.”</p> <p>Restructure the standard to maintain topical/thematic congruency; for example, change the order of the sentences as presented here.</p> <p>Understanding the principle of transfer requires that candidates have working knowledge of contrastive analysis between L1 and L2.</p> <p>Add a statement or PPQ that includes understanding of interlanguage and/or translanguaging as it relates to language achievement of bilingual learners.</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8.</p> <p>Change PPQ 3.6: What components of the program support teachers to understand brain research on the developmental processes of bilingualism and biliteracy to include cognitive, bicognitive, and metacognitive processes?</p> <p>Add PPQ: What components of the program support teachers to acknowledge, welcome, and/or leverage translanguaging for multilingual learners as cultural capital?</p>
<p>Candidates understand and apply research and its effects on the dimensions of learning in bilingual education program models.</p>	<p>Change wording to read “dimensions of learning” to “learning in bilingual/multilingual education program models.”</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 3.5, 3.6, 3.8.</p>
<p>The program prepares candidates to actively</p>	<p>Authentic parental participation needs to be explained within the context of</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 3.9, 3.10, 3.11.</p>

<p>promote authentic parental participation that includes learning about school systems, assuming leadership roles and affecting policy.</p>	<p>social class, race, ethnicity, immigration status, poverty, migrant labor, psychological distance and culturally informed world views and political representation to affect policy.</p> <p>Create an additional sentence or statement which addresses the above concern. For example, “The program provides candidates with knowledge of the history, policies and research on parent involvement in schools, and supports them in understanding how to effectively include all parent groups, addressing the concepts of language majority and language minority.”</p>	<p>Add PPQ: How does the program ensure that candidates can analyze the effects of federal, state, and local policies on the level of parental engagement at the school site?</p>
<p>The program promotes candidates’ understanding of the family as a primary language and cultural resource.</p>	<p>This standard needs more explicit wording.</p> <p>There is no reference to asset-based thinking or asset- based pedagogy regarding the value of multiple primary languages and/ or multiple cultural funds of knowledge derived from the families and community schools serve.</p> <p>Change the wording to read, “The program promotes candidates’ understanding of how families share and position language and culture as assets, and how parents are essential contributing members of the school community.”</p>	<p>Change PPQ 3.9: How does the program prepare candidates to promote school-home partnerships, acknowledging parents as stakeholders who bring diverse cultural capital to inform and enhance the schooling experience of their children?</p>
<p>Candidates are cognizant that students’ motivation, participation and achievement are influenced by an intercultural classroom climate and school community.</p>	<p>School and community communication and collaboration both need to be more explicitly defined for the purpose of promoting social-emotional thriving, academic achievement and cross-cultural understanding.</p> <p>The purpose of this sentence in Standard 3 is unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What constitutes an intercultural classroom climate 	<p>Related PPQs: 3.10, 3.11.</p>

	<p>and school community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is this about preparing candidates to communicate to parents? ● Is it about motivating students? ● Is it about building positive multicultural communities in schools and classrooms? 	
--	--	--

Table A4: Standard 4-Bilingual Methodology

Key elements (Quoted directly from the standard)	Recommended revisions	Assessment, policy, & practice PPQ = Program planning questions
<p>Interrelatedness among the four domains of language (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and to know language forms and functions.</p>	<p>Include relevant sections from CA ELA/ELD Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Integrated language development ● Connect to Biliteracy Chapter from Framework ● Assessment Chapter in the framework (Ch.8) <p>Add the need to include bilingual assessment.</p>	<p>Revise PPQ 4.2: How does the program provide candidates the understanding of ways in which variations in students’ primary languages (e.g., dialectal and/or tonal differences, use of vernacular forms) can be used to facilitate the development of social and academic language? What does this mean for instruction and what role does translanguaging play?</p> <p>Add PPQ:</p> <p>Consider target language-specific standards, resources, and tools and to develop students’ metalinguistic abilities across two or more languages.</p> <p>Revise PPQ 4.5:</p> <p>How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate understanding of the roles, purposes, and uses of standardized and formative</p>

		<p>assessments primary and target language in bilingual education settings in order to interpret the results to plan, organize, modify, and differentiate instruction in the appropriate language(s) in bilingual education settings?</p>
<p>The program also prepares candidates to plan, develop, implement and assess standards-aligned content instruction in the primary and target language.</p>	<p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Translanguaging ● Terminology about students (e.g., “emergent bilingual”) ● Citations/references: Garcia, CUNY resources on translanguaging ● Reference to current California academic content standards and frameworks <p>Include signature assignments to ensure fidelity in planning, developing, implementing and assessing standard-aligned content instruction in the primary and target language across the program.</p>	<p>Add PPQ: How does the program ensure that candidates demonstrate an understanding of translanguaging practices?</p> <p>Revise PPQ 4.2: How does the program provide candidates the understanding of ways in which variations in students’ primary languages (e.g., dialectal and/or tonal differences, use of vernacular forms) can be used to facilitate the development of social and academic language? What does this mean for instruction and what role does translanguaging play?</p>
<p>Candidates are prepared to employ a variety of instructional and assessment strategies, appropriate to student language proficiency levels, that foster higher-order thinking skills.</p>	<p>Include translanguaging practices, approaches, and assessments.</p> <p>Incorporate clinical experiences to allow for opportunities to employ various instructional and assessment strategies, appropriate to student language proficiency levels and that foster high-order thinking skills.</p> <p>Design signature assignments to ensure fidelity across the program in regard to developing these skills.</p>	

<p>The program ensures that bilingual candidates have knowledge of bilingual instructional models, instructional strategies and materials to appropriately apply them to their instructional and assessment practices. In addition, programs develop bilingual candidates' understanding of knowledge of intercultural communication and interaction that is linguistically and culturally responsive.</p>	<p>Include translanguaging.</p> <p>Need defining bilingual models and research- based practices in bilingual/dual language.</p> <p>Incorporate clinical practices that provide teacher candidates with experience across a variety of models.</p> <p>Incorporate the idea of linguistically/culturally sustaining pedagogy.</p>	
<p>The bilingual teacher preparation program further prepares candidates to evaluate, select, use and adapt state-board adopted and state-board approved materials, as well as other supplemental instructional materials.</p>	<p>Recommend eliminating to avoid redundancy.</p> <p>Provide reference to CA content standards frameworks.</p>	
<p>The program provides opportunities for teacher candidates to demonstrate the ability to use a variety of criteria for selection of instructional materials, to assess the suitability and appropriateness for local context and to augment resources when they are not suitable or available.</p>	<p>Include a reference to state-adopted materials.</p> <p>Incorporate the use of international/global instructional materials (authentic materials).</p>	

Table A5: Standard 5-Culture of Emphasis

Key elements (Quoted directly from the standard)	Recommended revisions	Assessment, policy, & practice PPQ = Program planning questions
Analysis of Existing Standard Language & Program Planning Questions		
Title of Standard: “Culture of Emphasis”	Revise the title of “Culture of Emphasis” to “Ethnic Group.”	Add PPQ: How does the program assess students own cultural competence when working with diverse student population inclusive of the target ethnic group?
The professional bilingual teacher preparation program develops candidates’ knowledge of the traditions, roles, status, and communication patterns of the culture of emphasis as experienced in the country or countries of origin and in the United States.	All language stating “Culture of Emphasis” should say “Ethnic Group” or some other alternative, as culture of origin present barriers in understanding the cultural diversity of various ethnic groups with a shared language. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Should also include shared cultural beliefs, values, and traditions of the target ethnic group. ● Should also understand the cultural diversity of the target ethnic group. ● Advisory may also want to include “experience of the target ethnic group utilizing a transnational lens” as several communities live in transnational family structures. 	Related PPQ: 5.6. Additional PPQ needed (possibly 5.12 & 13): How does the program develop candidates’ knowledge of the cultural beliefs, values, traditions, roles, status, and communication patterns of the target ethnic group as experienced in the country or countries of origin and in the United States? How does the program develop candidates of the experiences and cultural diversity of the target ethnic group?
Included in that knowledge is the understanding of cross-cultural, intercultural and intracultural relationships and interactions, as well as contributions of the culture of emphasis in California and the United States.	All language stating “Culture of Emphasis” should say” Ethnic Group.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Should also include “to foster culturally sustaining relationships among students.” 	Related PPQ: 5.6. Add PPQ: How does the program build upon candidates’ knowledge of cross-cultural, intercultural, and intracultural relationships and interactions, to foster culturally sustaining relationships between members of the target ethnic group

		and community at large in California and the United States?
Also included is the knowledge of major historical events, political, economic, religious, and educational factors that influence the socialization and acculturation experiences of the target groups in the California and the U.S.	Need to include, “of the target groups in California, the U.S., and the global community. ”	Related PPQs: 5.3, 5.5.
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of the country/countries of origin, including geographic barriers, demographic and linguistic patterns, and the ways in which these affect trends of migration, immigration and settlement in the United States.	<p>Addition of language to fulfill standard PPQ 5.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ... “structural and systemic barriers that affect trends of migration” ● “contribution of the target ethnic group to the U.S. and American history.” ● Experience of the target language group/target ethnic group growing in the U.S. 	<p>Related PPQs: 5.1, 5.2, 5.5.</p> <p>Add PPQ: How does the program’s curriculum account for the structural and systemic barriers that affect trends of migration and lived experiences of the target ethnic group in the United States?</p>
Additional Key Element Standard Language & Program Planning Questions to be Considered		
Candidates demonstrate and awareness of linguistic colonization, segregation, and marginalization in the classroom and advocate for culturally sustaining classroom experiences of students of diverse students inclusive of students representing the target ethnic group.	Addition of language needed to align with PPQ 5.5 and potential 5.8.	<p>Related PPQs: 5.5, 5.8.</p> <p>Add PPQ 5.8: How does the program build awareness and advocacy in candidates to stop and prevent linguistic colonization, segregation, and marginalization in the classroom?</p>
The professional bilingual teacher education program also equips candidates with the skills and tools needed to develop equitable, inclusive, and just practices across the languages,		<p>Related PPQ: 5.9.</p> <p>Add PPQ 5.9: How does the program equip candidates with the skills and tools needed to develop just, equitable, and inclusive practices across the</p>

<p>registers, dialects, and idiolects that students and their families bring to compulsory educational settings.</p>		<p>languages, registers, dialects, and idiolects students and their families bring to compulsory educational settings?</p>
<p>The professional bilingual teacher education program prepares teachers to develop an equity oriented lens to engage in structural analysis of the educational system/systems and systemic barriers of the country/countries of origin and the United States that affect the communities of the target ethnic group.</p>	<p>Additional language needed in description to align with 5.4.</p> <p>Also, recommend to the added information related to structural analysis and equity oriented lens.</p>	<p>Related PPQs: 5.4, 5.7, and 5.10.</p> <p>Add PPQ 5.10: How does the program prepare teachers to develop an equity oriented lens to engage in structural analysis of the educational system/systems and systemic barriers of the country/countries of origin and the United States that affect the communities of the target ethnic group?</p>
<p>The professional bilingual teacher education program develop teacher understanding of cultural competency and social justice education in relationship to lived experiences communities of the target ethnic group.</p>		<p>Related PPQ: 5.11.</p> <p>Add PPQ 5.11: How does the program develop teacher understanding of cultural competency and social justice education in relationship to lived experiences communities of the target ethnic group?</p>

APPENDIX B:**Bilingual Standards Refresh Work Group Proposed Glossary of Terms**

Acculturation
Advocacy orientation
Agency
Asset-oriented pedagogy
Bicognition
Bilingual
Bilingual education models (e.g., one-way immersion, two-way immersion, dual language)
Biliteracy
Communication patterns of the culture of emphasis
Cross linguistic resource sharing
Cross-cultural
Culturally and linguistically sustaining teaching
Culturally responsive teaching
Culture
Demographic and linguistic patterns
Dual language learners
Educational achievement
Emerging bilinguals or
Equity
Ethnic group
Ethnicity
Formative assessment (or formative assessment processes)
Immigration
Intercultural
Intra-cultural relationships
Language policy
Linguistic colonization
Migration
Multicultural
Multiethnic
Multilingual learners
Psychological distance
Raciolinguistics
Social justice
Socialization
Sociocultural
Sociocultural competence

Socioemotional learning
Sociolinguistics
Sociopolitical
Status
Structural barriers
Translanguaging
Unconscious/implicit bias