

# **CCTC and the Process for Reauthorization of Bilingual Teacher Preparation Standards:**

## **A Critical-Historical Perspective**

*Dr. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan, San Diego State University  
Dr. Margarita Berta-Avila, Sacramento State University  
Dr. Juan Flores, California State University Stanislaus*

### **Introduction and Background**

California and the rest of the United States are undergoing significant challenges in providing educational opportunities for an increasingly diverse population. These challenges include inadequate literacy and numeracy skills among large segments of our student and adult populations; an ongoing shift in the demographic profile of our population, powered by the highest immigration rates in nearly a century, and the continuing evolution of the economy and the nation's job structure, requiring higher levels of skills from an increasing proportion of workers (Irwin Kirsch ETS, 2007). In the 1990's the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) responded to these challenges in a forward thinking manner in, through the development of the Cross-culture, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) and the Bilingual CLAD emphasis certificates. The purpose of these certifications was to ensure that every graduate of a credential/licensure program in California was prepared to provide for the educational needs of English learners, whether in an English language development program (via CLAD) or in a bilingual program (via BCLAD).

The CLAD and BCLAD authorizations changed in 1998 when the state of California passed Senate Bill

2042 (SB 2042). This bill required CCTC to restructure the CLAD emphasis certification that authorized teachers to provide instruction to English learners. The passage of SB 2042 led to greater emphasis on English acquisition and less on biliteracy and bilingual development. Though not intentional, the passage of SB 2042 coincided with the passage of Proposition 227, which required that English learners be taught in English unless families specifically requested that their children be in a bilingual program. Proposition 227 aimed to teach children English in one year and led to the dismantling of many bilingual programs in K-12 schools. Proposition 227 "is based on an English-only ideology that denounces the use of any language other than English as a medium of instruction in the public schools and includes a provision that allows parents to sue teachers and school administrators for using Spanish as a means of instruction" (Montaño, Ulanoff, Quintanar-Sarellana & Aoki, 2005, pg. 103). As a result, since programs were beginning to disappear, one underlying current with the reauthorization of CLAD and SB 2042 was that there would be less demand for bilingual teachers. It is clear that since Proposition 227 implied English only instruction as the norm, and bilingual education as an alternative model the

perception of the general public and policy makers was that there would be a decrease in bilingual programs. This further led to the assumption that there would be less demand or need for bilingually certified teachers. In reality, however, the demand for bilingual teachers did not change; in fact BCLAD certified teachers remain in high demand to teach in classrooms and schools with high English learner populations (Montaño, et al 2005).

Concurrently, Senate Bill 2042 was approved by the legislature with a comprehensive plan to revamp teacher credentialing in California. This bill was the product of an analysis of the preparation of teachers by a blue ribbon panel of educators. In 1998 the CCTC reauthorized K-12 credentials under Senate Bill (SB) 2042. One major component addressed in SB 2042 was how teacher candidates would be prepared to meet the language and academic needs of English learners. CCTC authorized that all teacher candidates would receive the English Language Authorization (ELA) previously known as the Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certificate. When CLAD was aligned with SB 2042, there were certain assumptions operating. The first occurred in the context of Proposition 227, that all bilingual programs would be eliminated. This was incorrect because Proposition 227 did not address teacher preparation and in fact permitted for parent selection of alternative options that included primary language instruction. The next assumption was that teacher certification in the era of Proposition 227 would emphasize mainstream and Structured English Immersion (SEI) for English Learners

(EL's), and that the need to address specific bilingual programs would decrease. As such, the final assumption would be that EL student needs would now be addressed solely through this new certification. Many of these assumptions have been proven wrong as our bilingual professionals and our bilingual communities worked with our schools in requesting alternatives to the one-size-fits-all Unz plan.

At the time of reauthorization of the CLAD under SB 2042, there was no mention of the BCLAD, or what the new requirements would be under SB-2042 for the preparation of bilingual teachers. Since 2002 the CCTC has maintained the BCLAD under the standards for the CLAD and bilingual competencies. But as Montaño et al. (2005) point out in their study of BCLAD University programs, even though 98% of BCLAD program leaders surveyed had a BCLAD program before and after SB2042, 56% reported removal or restructuring of courses and 44% saw a decrease in student enrollment. Alarmed by the change in perceived and actual status of bilingual teacher preparation, bilingual educators and community members voiced their concerns and reminded CCTC of the need to provide highly trained bilingual educators to work in primary language programs that were still allowed under the restrictions of Proposition 227 initiative.

In order to address the inequity of teacher preparation for bilingual candidates, the CCTC convened a Bilingual Work Group beginning in late 2005. The group was composed of 15 experts in the area of English language development and biliteracy. They represented K-12 public education,

higher education, and professional development organizations. The first author of this article was a member of this group. The Bilingual Work Group's task was to address four key policy questions that were designed to determine the need and processes for reauthorizing bilingual certification under 2042's guidelines.

The proposals were developed based on public input gathered via three sources:

- focus groups held across the state,
- an online bilingual survey sent to

- teachers and administrators, and
- online forum questionnaires made available to those who could not attend public forums.

Input was gathered from more than 900 people from across the state. On the basis of the data gathered, the work group made specific recommendations that addressed each policy question. The details related to the policy questions and resulting recommendations will be considered later in this paper.

### Theoretical Frame

As teacher educators in bilingual teacher preparation programs we see that our future teachers enter our programs with ability to communicate socially and academically in English and Spanish, and sometimes three or more languages. When they exit our programs they have the knowledge, skills and abilities to teach children language and academics in two languages. Further, these young professionals are best able to communicate with parents and community members who do not speak English. Once hired, bilingual teachers become the cultural brokers for their colleagues and peers, who are limited by only speaking English. It would seem that such skills will be highly valued and desired by policy makers. However, present policy not only makes it more difficult for these young men and women to enter the field of bilingual education, it sends the message often times that their language and community are not valued based on racist and white supremacist ideologies (hooks, 2003). Many of these individuals are first generation Latino college students, and they have a desire to return to their home

communities to teach. This is most critical when 85.4% (1,342,389) of the English learner population is Latino (California Department of Education, 2007). It is no coincidence then that we see a standardization movement within teacher education through NCLB with a focus of preparing teachers to meet the needs of English language learners, but this movement makes no statement or mention of the need for bilingual educators.

Macedo, Dendrinos, and Gounari (2003) believe that it is this conservative agenda towards bilingualism/bilingual education/bilingual teacher preparation that has promoted "the hegemony of English" as a way to maintain position of power. Thus, education has become one entity, among many, used to enforce this hegemony of language through a particular instructional delivery system in which the ultimate goal is to, as Macedo, Dendrinos, and Gounari describe, "...deny effective education to millions of immigrant children in their native language" (p. 9). This theoretical stance is hard to dispute, when the 2005-

2006 California state language census reports that there are only 181,006 teachers providing SDAIE, ELD, or primary language instruction to the total English learner population (1,570,424) and of these 181,006 teachers providing such services, only 6,767 are doing so through primary language instruction (CDE, 2007). According to Macedo et al. (2003), ultimately, the system is perpetuating “linguistic racism” (p. 12) in imposing the idea that the learning of English, in and of itself is education. This type of imposition is a form of neocolonialism that strips children of various ethnicities from their own identity, language, and culture (Macedo, et al 2003).

The current neoconservative agenda regarding bilingual education is an example of such a correlation. As Macedo, Dendrinis, and Gounari explain:

*The real meaning of a language has to be understood through the assumptions that govern it and the social, political, and ideological relations to which it points. Generally speaking, the issues of effectiveness and validity often hide the true role of language in the maintenance of the values and interests of the dominant class. In other words, the issues of the effectiveness and validity of a subordinate language become a mask that obfuscates questions about the social, political, and ideological order within which the subordinate language exists (2003, p. 13).*

The issue has never truly been the effectiveness of bilingual education or even the preparation of future bilingual

educators. That argument has been used as a “mask” to hide the “fear” and “threat of the other” felt by the hegemonic bloc. Bilingual education and bilingual teacher preparation programs are viewed as a threat to that romanticized yesteryear that excluded marginalized communities from equitable access.

What is evident now is that there exist two prevailing political views of bilingual education, which have a direct impact on how students are taught and how bilingual teachers are prepared. Brisk (1998) defines bilingual education as either "compensatory education" or "quality education". For many bilingual advocates the goal is for students to not just learn English but become bilingual/biliterate through a rigorous academic program, thus emphasizing a quality education. A *quality education* policy focuses on a student's right to a good education with the goal being “to educate students to their highest potential” where English is only a part of the educational goal. In a quality model, “bilingual learners access knowledge not only through English but through their native languages” (Brisk, 1998, p. xix); there is a recognition and value for their cultural experiences and knowledge. As a result, the teachers best prepared to meet the needs of students under a quality model are bilingual and most often from the same cultural or language group as the students for whom they are being prepared to teach.

For neoconservatives, the notion of providing a quality education let alone a “quality bilingual education program” is not the goal. A quality education model poses a threat at many levels, not only language, as previously mentioned.

What is advocated, according to Brisk, is a *compensatory education* policy that focuses on the choice of language, where the policy makers determine which language of instruction will be utilized. Within this model the overriding goal of education is to “teach students English as quickly as possible.” Since “English is viewed as the only means for acquisition of knowledge, students’ fluency in English is the essential condition to receiving an education” (Brisk, 1998, p. xviii). The irony that exists in this latter quote is the connection between English and success, for it does not take into account the English only speaking students who are not succeeding in school. In particular, African-American students who have had English as their primary language yet are still subjected to systemic inequities that eventually lead them to be “pushed out” of their education (Macedo, Denderinos, & Gounari, 2003).

The danger that lies with this compensatory view of bilingual education programs is that they are seen as the vehicle to assimilate students. Even in the context of bilingual education there has to be a word of caution, because compensatory programs promote an agenda of losing one’s language. Many who are advocates of bilingual education often fall into this belief system that they need to save their students from being identified as English language learners, therefore perpetuating the power status of English and devaluing the fact that these students are bilingual (Macedo, Denderinos, & Gounari, 2003). When considering the reauthorization of the BCLAD, it is imperative that future teachers be highly trained pedagogically but also politically critical with respect to their role and positionality in a bilingual classroom.

### **Reauthorization of the BCLAD**

Starting in 2003, several educational organizations including California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), California Association for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL) and Californians Together, became concerned about the preparation of bilingual teachers and began to collaboratively examine policy and work with both the staff and state commissioners of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The purpose of this coalition was to make certain that CCTC adhered to the law and continued to support the issuance and authorization for bilingual instruction via the Bilingual, Cross-

cultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Certificate.

In the fall of 2005 and spring 2006, the CCTC initiated a series of community stakeholder hearings on B/CLAD with the purpose of realigning the credential with SB 2042. Stakeholders were asked to address four policy questions:

- 1) Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already-credentialed teachers?
- 2) How shall the commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?

- 3) Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?
- 4) How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification? The gathered responses would be forwarded to a bilingual workgroup organized by CCTC to address the BCLAD.

The CCTC authorized staff to establish a bilingual workgroup of selected stakeholder committee members representing, and in consultation with, a variety of professional educational organizations including the Association of California School Administrators, the California Teachers Association, California Association for Bilingual Education, California Association for Teachers of Speakers of other Languages, as well as elementary and secondary public school educators. The charge of the workgroup was to analyze the stakeholder responses to the four policy questions, and come forth with recommendations that would serve as a foundation towards the reauthorization of the bilingual credential.

Through the initial process outlined above, the coalition stayed diligent in overseeing and informing the CCTC workgroup process. Moreover, they worked to assure that there was substantial interaction with the field and community groups at the field focus sessions that the Commission was scheduling in various parts of California to gather community input. The workgroup and coalition worked together to get the word out regarding the public stakeholder field sessions in order to assure that there was substantial input from community stakeholders. Substantial input was gathered from these sessions to reflect the preferences and opinions of the bilingual community and professional constituents.

In addition to the various stakeholder field focus sessions, the bilingual workgroup via CCTC posted an online survey questionnaire to canvas the professional opinions of educators regarding the bilingual reauthorizations who were unable to attend a public meeting. This survey was disseminated with the assistance of CAFE and CATESOL. The existence of this survey was announced at various professional meetings and conferences and the attending professionals were encouraged to respond to the questionnaire and share this information with their colleagues.

### **Results and Recommendations from Bilingual Workgroup**

The following text is taken from the CCTC Agenda item (pages PSC 4E-12 –18). This public document was presented by CCTC Staff to the Commissioners at the May 31/June 1, 2006 Commission Meeting. The policy questions and recommendations listed

below were all approved unanimously at this meeting. To see the agenda document, that includes data from stakeholder meetings and on-line surveys, go to <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agen-das-2006.html>.

**Policy Question 1: Should the Commission explore alternatives to the current route to bilingual certification for already credentialed teachers?**

Teachers who hold a credential that does not authorize them to teach in a bilingual classroom may add a bilingual teaching authorization by passing the Bilingual Cross-cultural and Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Examination. The work group considered whether an examination route should be the only route to earn a bilingual authorization for those teachers already credentialed (as is the current policy) or whether there should be additional routes to bilingual certification, such as completion of a program of coursework, or a combination of both coursework and passage of an examination.

Policy Question 1: Work Group Recommendations:

A: For currently credentialed teachers, BCAWG recommends that the current prerequisites to earning bilingual authorizations should continue for future bilingual authorizations issued by CCTC:

1. Candidates must possess a valid credential or permit as authorized in Title 5 Regulations, Section 80015.2(a)
2. Candidates must hold an English learner authorization (CLAD authorization or equivalent) as authorized in Title 5 Regulations, Section 80015.1.

B: The BCAWG recommends that a Certificate of Staff Development, as outlined in Education Code § 44253.10, should also be considered for partial fulfillment of the English learner authorization prerequisite outlined in A-2, above.\*

C: The BCAWG recommends that the Commission revalidate the six domains currently specified in the Bilingual, Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development examinations and authorizations as outlined in Education Code §44253.5(c). It should be noted that Domains 1 – 3 have been already revalidated through establishment of the

California Teachers of English Learners Examination (CTEL):

1. First- and second-language development and the structure of language,
  2. Methodology of English language development and specially designed content instruction in English.
  3. Culture and cultural diversity
  4. Methodology of content instruction in the pupil’s primary language
  5. Knowledge of the culture associated with a specific language group
  6. Competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited-English proficient pupils in California.
- All candidates wishing to pursue bilingual certification in California would satisfy these domains, once revalidated.

D: Requirements for Domain 4, “methodology of content instruction in the pupil’s primary language”, could be met through examination, CCTC-accepted IHE coursework, or CCTC approved professional development.

1. It is recommended that the Commission review and revalidate the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) of the current methodology component.

E: The requirements for Domain 5, “culture associated with a specific language group” could be met through examination, Commission-accepted IHE coursework, or Commission approved professional development:

1. It is recommended that the Commission review and revalidate the knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) of the current cultural component of the BCLAD Examination.

F: The requirements for Domain 6, “competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited-English-proficient pupils in California” could be met in any of the following ways:

1. The candidate passes a CCTC-

approved examination (example, Test 6 of the current BCLAD Examination). This is currently authorized in Education Code Section 44253.6.

2. The candidate holds a California Single Subject or Standard Secondary Teaching Credential with a major in the language to be authorized. This is currently authorized in Title 5, Section 80015.1(4)(B).

3. The candidate has earned a higher education degree from a foreign institution in which the instruction is delivered in the language to be authorized. This is currently authorized in Title 5, Section 80015.1 (4)(A).

4. The candidate has passed the language portion of the CSET Language Other Than English (LOTE) examination.\*

**Policy Question 2: How shall the Commission maintain a structure for bilingual certification for those candidates who are in the process of earning a credential?**

Under the Ryan Credential structure, program standards were developed specifically for BCLAD Emphasis programs so that teacher candidates could earn a bilingual authorization in addition to their Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credential. The work group considered whether teacher candidates should be able to continue to earn a bilingual authorization as part of their

credential program requirements within the SB 2042 credential structure, or whether candidates should earn bilingual authorization through a concurrent program. The Commission currently issues Multiple and Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis SB 2042 Credentials pending the update of bilingual certification pathways for new and experienced teachers.

Policy Question 2: Work Group Recommendations

A: The BCAWG recommends that the Commission develop bilingual teacher preparation program standards that align with SB 2042 Standards and include the following knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs):

1. Current research and best practices related to pedagogy, first and second language development, linguistics, and

biliteracy.

2. Current legislation and policies pertaining to second language learners and teacher preparation.

3. Bilingual program models, (e.g., transitional, two-way/dual language immersion, foreign language, maintenance, etc.).

4. Other instructional program settings



for English Learners, including those that provide specialized English language development instruction for secondary students.

5. Social, economic and cultural contexts of the target community.

6. Student teaching or internship in bilingual instructional settings with English Learners in K-12 public schools.

B: Maintain existing multiple pathways to earn a bilingual credential that include the following:

1. Program coursework (e.g., university programs, blended programs, and internships)

2. CCTC-approved language competency, culture and pedagogy

examinations.

C: Develop a form of the teaching performance assessment (TPA) that is appropriate to measure teaching in a bilingual setting.

D: Develop induction support for bilingual teachers in the following ways:

1. Support will continue from the preliminary credential through induction to the professional clear credential,  
2. Support will include assignment of a bilingual support provider when available,

3. Complete SB 2042 Induction Standard 19 in a bilingual educational context when available.

**Policy Question 3: Given the increased number of languages spoken by students in California classrooms, how can the Commission provide bilingual certification for more languages?**

Currently, there are ten language authorizations available through the BCLAD Examination and a total of fourteen language authorizations available through BCLAD Emphasis programs yet over fifty different languages are spoken in California classrooms. In an attempt to address the regional needs for bilingual teachers to provide instruction in less commonly taught languages, the BCAWG

recommends that the Commission increase the number of authorizations from that currently issued for bilingual credential authorizations. In an attempt to address the needs of all English learners, the BCAWG explored ways that would allow the Commission to expand the number of language authorizations for bilingual certification, yet maintain rigor and flexibility for bilingual certification in Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs).

Policy Question 3: Work Group Recommendations

A: The BCAWG recommends there would not be a limit to the number of languages for which the Commission could provide bilingual authorizations. Additionally, the work group advises that all recommendations outlined in Policy Questions 1 and 2 are also applicable to those candidates wishing to pursue a bilingual authorization in a

LCTL.

B: Candidates for the LCTLs must satisfy the requirements for the six domains currently outlined in Education Code §44253.5(c):

1. First- and second-language development and the structure of language,

2. Methodology of English language development and specially designed content instruction in English,
3. Culture and cultural diversity,
4. Methodology of content instruction in the pupil's primary language,
5. Knowledge of the culture associated with a specific language group, and
6. Competence in a language other than English that is spoken by limited English proficient pupils in California.

C Maintain language competency examinations in those languages that are currently offered in the BCLAD Examinations, maintaining rigor in the target language competency in accordance with CCTC approved standards. The exams should include listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation ability, as well as communicative and academic language skills.

D: Maintain the current KSAs for language competence for the current BCLAD Examinations.

E: Currently, BCLAD examinations are only offered in LCTLs only one time per year. BCAWG recommends that language competency examinations for less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) should be administered at least twice a year.

**Policy Question 4: How should newer models of bilingual instruction be considered in the development of updated requirements for bilingual certification?**

The knowledge, skills, and abilities required for the current BCLAD have not been updated since 1994. Since that time, two-way or dual immersion models of bilingual education instruction have become more predominant in

F: For language examinations not currently available through the CCTC-approved testing contractor and/or not administered at least twice a year: The CCTC could consider the establishment of language panels for the development of assessment criteria and test specifications for the LCT language competencies.\*

G: Outside agencies (e.g., county offices of education, institutions of higher education) may develop one examination per target language, to be approved by CCTC for each of the less commonly taught languages, with the following considerations:  
 1. The CCTC would be responsible for initial and on-going review and revalidation of these examinations, and  
 2. CCTC approved language exams would be accepted by all institutions that offer teacher preparation programs as meeting the language proficiency requirement for bilingual certification.\*

H: Outside agencies (e.g., ACTFL, Defense Language Institute) could develop and administer examinations for each of the less commonly taught languages. Passing scores on these examinations would fulfill Domain 6 requirements and would be accepted by all institutions offering bilingual certification in that target language.\*

California bilingual education classrooms. Some experts report that higher degrees of language proficiency are required for these newer instructional models, and that other knowledge, skills, and abilities are required besides those

needed for traditional bilingual instruction models. The work group members considered whether two-way immersion models of instruction should

require a different kind of authorization and whether a specialist credential would be more appropriate for teaching in two-way immersion classrooms.

#### Policy Question 4: Work Group Recommendations

A: Bilingual certification should continue to authorize teachers to deliver instruction in all bilingual program models.

B: Review and revalidate guidelines and standards for the current Specialist Instruction Credential in Bilingual Cross-cultural Education, as authorized in Education Code §44265, based upon a current job analysis and changes in policies, program models and

methodologies in bilingual education. Guidelines for the new authorization could consider the structures of the Reading Certificate (Education Code §44254) and the Reading Specialist Credential (Education Code §44265).

C: Consider exemplary professional development models and experimental programs in the development of the bilingual specialist credentials.

#### **Current Status of the Bilingual Authorization**

The recommendations above were approved unanimously by the Commissioners and at this time CCTC approved a work plan to begin the next step of forming a Bilingual Design Team. The purpose of this group, which began meeting in October, 2006, is to update the knowledge, skills and abilities sections of the methodology and culture tests for the bilingual exam as well as to develop bilingual standards aligned with 2042 and current bilingual/biliteracy research. The membership of the bilingual workgroup became the new members of the bilingual design team, with the addition of some new members. The Bilingual Design team now has the charge of meeting through September

2007 to craft a set of bilingual standards in alignment with SB 2042. The CCTC staff will present the results of this work to the Commission in October of 2007. It is anticipated that the draft standards will be ready for review by the field prior to the October meeting.

We applaud the Commission for approving the recommendations and the commitment of the staff to work with the Bilingual Design Team. We also appreciate the commitment over the past year to work with academics and school personnel to move forward on this important work and are cautiously optimistic as to the outcomes that will follow.

## **Advocacy Grows:**

### **Birth of the California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education**

In addition to these discussions, professionals in bilingual teacher preparation initiated the establishment of an affiliate group to CAFE, called the California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education (CABTE). They determined that there was a need for a professional organization that would oversee and champion the preparation of highly prepared bilingual educators. They proposed the goals of CABTE as follows:

- To unify the voice of higher education faculty in Bilingual Education and Dual Language Instruction in matters related to the education of minority and language minority children;
- To represent the voice of Bilingual Education and Dual Language Instruction faculty in higher education and other professionals involved in bilingual teacher preparation in

the area of minority and language minority education;

- To advocate on behalf of the education of minority and language minority children;
- To work for the improvement of Bilingual Education and Dual Language teacher preparation.

CABTE has coordinated its meetings to coincide with the CAFE Conference, the National Two-Way CAFE Conference, and the meetings of the California Council for Teacher Education (CCTE) to formalize its membership and is in the process of finalizing its affiliate membership with CAFE and CCTE. CABTE has an interim board that was selected at the spring meeting of CCTE. They will carry on the work of CABTE until the membership is formalized and a new board is elected at the spring 2008 CAFE Conference.

### **Conclusion**

Bilingual education has had a long history in California, with ebbs and flows of support based on the current political environment. Unfortunately, these are times of political retrenchment, with reactionary elements crying out for immigration restrictions and a new iron curtain separating Mexico and the United States. But these are also times for activism and consciousness raising in our communities. These are the times to reactivate the allies for bilingual education and diversity. Ada and Campoy (2004) tell us that we are all oppressed whenever anyone is oppressed. "Any time we witness or

participate silently in the oppression of others, our own sense of humanity is diminished and our joyful, creative voice is silenced." ( p. 15). Ada and Campoy say that whenever we ourselves experience oppression, and do not have any allies to offer us support and affirmation, we also are silenced. Social injustice cannot not be maintained for long if we are not all conditioned in various ways to accept it. We need to educate our partner immigrant communities and assist them in joining us in our struggle. We cannot rest. So to this end we continue to move forward in our advocacy.

## References

Ada, A. F. & Campoy, I. (2004) *Authors in the classroom: A transformative education process*. Boston, Mass: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.

Brisk, M. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Agenda & Minutes Archives (1998-2006).Online:  
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agenda-archives.html>

California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (2007). California public schools – Statewide enrollment reports [Data File]. Available from California Department of Education Services Web site,  
<http://www.cde.ca.us>.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hooks, B. (2003). *Teaching community: A Pedagogy of hope*. New York, NY: Routhledge.

Kirsch, I., Braun, H., Yamamoto, K., & Sum, A. (2007). *America's Perfect Storm: Three Forces Changing Our Nation's Future*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.

Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Montaño, T. Ulanoff, S., Quintanar-Sarellana, R. & Aoki, L. (2005). The Debilingualization of California prospective bilingual teachers. *Social Justice*, 32, 3. pp.103-117. A Journal of Crime, Conflict, and World Order.

---

**Dr. Flores is Professor of Teacher Education and Coordinator of the Multilingual Education Program at California State University, Stanislaus. Email: [jflores@csustan.edu](mailto:jflores@csustan.edu)**

**Dr. Karen Cadiero-Kaplan is Associate Professor and Coordinator of the MA Program at the Center for Policy Studies at San Diego State University. Email: [kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu](mailto:kcadiero@mail.sdsu.edu)**

**Dr. Margarit Berta-Avila is Assistant Professor in the Bilingual/Multicultural Department at CSU Sacramento. Email: [bamargie@skymail.csus.edu](mailto:bamargie@skymail.csus.edu)**

