

# UC Berkeley

## The CATESOL Journal

### Title

After Proposition 227: Crises, Challenges, and Concerns

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1379n3fs>

### Journal

The CATESOL Journal, 11(1)

### ISSN

1535-0517

### Author

Fields, Sara

### Publication Date

1999

### DOI

10.5070/B5.36491

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

## **After Proposition 227: Crises, Challenges, and Concerns**

Proponents of California Ballot Proposition 227 claimed that it would end bilingual education and facilitate the effective teaching of English to all California school children (English for the Children, 1998a). Opponents argued that the enactment of this proposition would hurt students, slow down their progress, and destroy existing and effective programs. As the first school year following the passage of Proposition 227 came to a close, what impact had been made by the passage of this proposition in California schools?

A colloquium held at CATESOL's state conference in Reno in April 1999 addressed this question. Panelists and conference attendees representing urban, suburban and rural districts discussed the current situation in the field, the recommendations of the California Department of Education (CDE) Proposition 227 task force that was appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the ways in which schools and districts have implemented this new law. This article will highlight the range of practices and responses.

### **Background**

As of March 1, 1998, there were 1,406,166 K-12 students designated as Limited English Proficient (LEP) in California public schools (California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit [CDE/EDU], 1998). LEP students come from homes where a language other than English is spoken. When assessed at school entry, they are designated as deficient in the oral and literacy skills in English needed to succeed in the mainstream curriculum without special support. LEP students are monitored as they progress toward redesignation as Fluent English Proficient (FEP). In order to be redesignated as FEP, students must score at the fluent level on a state approved oral English proficiency test and meet district criteria of achievement in English, demonstrated through standardized tests and classroom

performance. Once redesignated, students no longer receive specialized language support services (Dunlap & Fields, 1997).

Prior to the passage of Proposition 227, schools were required to offer appropriate services to LEP students (California Department of Education [CDE], 1993). In order to ensure that students learned the core curriculum while they acquired English, students were to receive academic instruction in their home language along with instruction in English Language Development (ELD). This approach of using the student's home language for instruction at least part of the day is familiarly known as bilingual education. However, because of student demographics, a shortage of appropriately prepared teachers, and a lack of district and community support, significant numbers of California's LEP students did not receive any form of bilingual education.

In California in 1998, the schools reported that 29% of all LEP students (409,879 students) were in bilingual education programs incorporating English Language Development and instruction in the students' home language. Another 22% of the LEP students (305,764 students) were in programs with home language support (CDE/EDU, 1998). "Home language support" usually means that the curriculum and course work are in English, but that an instructional aide or teacher who speaks the student's language is available to preview or review the material and to offer additional explanation when necessary. In such programs, students may also have access to textbooks in their own language to supplement the English texts.

Proposition 227 changed the terminology from LEP student to English Learner (EL). The proposition took a different approach to the education of these students. It called for a one-year program of intensive English instruction called Structured English Immersion (SEI) that would bring students to "reasonable fluency" or "a good working knowledge" of English (English for the Children, 1998b). ELs would then be placed in mainstream English classrooms. However, the proposition allows schools to continue to offer bilingual programs when parents of at least 20 students per grade level request it by completing a waiver at the school site.

SEI is not well defined in law. Proposition 227 states:

"Sheltered English immersion" or "structured English immersion" means an English language acquisition process for young children in which nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language. (English for the Children, 1998b)

In discussion, the proponents of the proposition seemed to envision a year-long intensive English class for students, after which ELs would have the fluency necessary to function in mainstream classrooms.

Intensive English instruction is widely used for adults in both military language programs and in Intensive English Programs that prepare foreign students for study in United States colleges and universities. In these situations, adults who already have well-developed first language skills and who have age-appropriate knowledge and abilities choose to dedicate a period of time to mastering an additional language. For children, however, the situation is quite different because they are still developing their command of their first language (L1). These children must also devote time to learning how to read or to improving their knowledge of reading; they must continue learning age- and grade-appropriate mathematics, science, and social studies; and as immigrants or children of immigrants, they must learn how to function in a new culture.

These tasks are different for students depending upon their age, L1 skills, and educational background at the time of their entry into the U. S. educational system. For example, the needs and progress of a kindergarten student will be different from the needs of a student transferring from a high school in Mexico City, even though both are monolingual Spanish speakers. The high school student has a well-developed base of L1 literacy and content knowledge as well as a good sense of what schooling entails; the kindergartner, in contrast, is still developing oral language and literacy.

A provision of Proposition 227 that raised concerns during the campaign for its passage was the provision specifically stating that districts are encouraged to place in the same classroom students of different grades and from different language backgrounds, but with similar levels of English proficiency. During the campaign, opponents charged that this would require schools to place newly arrived fourth and fifth graders from various countries in the same classrooms with kindergartners.

CDE collects data from school districts about the numbers of ELs and the forms of instruction they receive. In March of each year, districts fill out the R-30 Language Census that is reported to the CDE. The report includes the numbers of EL and FEP students at each grade level and segregated by home language; the instructional program of each EL student; and the number of qualified teachers and instructional aides providing services to EL students.

The report places students receiving services into four categories: ELD only; ELD and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)<sup>1</sup>; ELD and SDAIE with home language support; and ELD and academic subjects through the home language. The latter two categories are forms of bilingual education. Schools must also report on the number of students not receiving any of the above services. For 1999, the CDE asked schools not only to report on the number of students enrolled in programs in each of the above categories but also to report the number of students in

SEI, the number with reasonable fluency in mainstream classes, and the number of students not receiving ELD services.

Within the categories prescribed by CDE, instruction to students is actually delivered in several ways. Some students may be in a classroom with only EL students; others may be mixed with students from English speaking families. Students may receive special instruction from their own classroom teacher, from another teacher through a team-teaching approach, or they may leave the classroom for part of the day to work with a special teacher in an approach called “pull-out”. Secondary students are usually in departmentalized classes with other ELs for varying parts of the school day. The Language Census does not collect any data on the ways in which instruction is actually delivered to these students.

The 1999 CDE Language Census data was released in Fall 1999. As of March 1, 1999, there were 1,442,692 EL students in California schools K-12. Only 12% of this population (169,440 students), however, were in bilingual education programs incorporating instruction in the students’ first language (CDE/EDU, 1999). Another 33% of the LEP students (472,893 students) were in programs with home language support, as permitted within Structured English Immersion under Proposition 227. These data indicate a significant drop of 17% in the number of students receiving direct instruction in their home language since the passage of the proposition, and a smaller drop of 6% in the total number receiving some form of assistance in their home language. The comparison between the 1999 and 1998 data is shown in the following table.

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of 1998 and 1999 Data on Bilingual Education in California**

<b>Educational settings for English Learners in California</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>
Total number of English Learners	1,406,166	1,442,692
Number receiving academic instruction in home language	409,879	169,440
Percentage receiving academic instruction in home language	29%	12%
Number receiving support in home language	305,764	472,893
Percentage receiving support in home language	22%	33%
Total receiving some form of bilingual education	715,643	642,333
Percentage receiving some form of bilingual education	51%	45%

*(Source: California Department of Education Language Census)*

These data are highly significant in light of previous research indicating that programs that develop the students' primary language to a high degree are the most likely to lead to long-term academic success (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Teachers' answers to a questionnaire distributed at the 1999 CATESOL convention (Appendix) indicates that most of the organization's K-12 members work in districts or schools that offered little or no bilingual education prior to the passage of Proposition 227. Given this fact, the discussion in this article will center on the consequences of the implementation of this proposition rather than address the reduction of home language development programs. This is by no means intended to minimize the short and long-term consequences of failure to support students' ongoing language and literacy development in the languages of their homes.

### **The Colloquium**

For the colloquium of the 1999 CATESOL Conference, panelists were selected representing urban, rural, and suburban districts in Northern, Southern, and Central California. The panelists included Lydia Stack, Administrator of the San Francisco Unified School District (USD); Bruce Berryhill, Director of State and Federal Projects at Dinuba USD; and Sara Fields, English Language Development/Bilingual Specialist for the Culver City USD. A questionnaire (Appendix) was developed and sent in advance to the panelists; the questionnaire was also distributed to audience members, who were encouraged to complete it. The next section of this article will summarize the responses of the panelists and audience members to each of the questions.

#### ***Effect of Proposition 227 on bilingual education***

San Francisco USD, with 19,099 ELs comprising 31% of total its enrollment, now has slightly more students enrolled in bilingual programs than it did prior to the passage of 227. This may be the result of a high level of parent and community support for multilingual abilities, as well as a result of the district's demonstration of high student achievement within the variety of bilingual programs offered. San Francisco Unified is in an unusual situation because the district is under court order to continue specific language development programs, including bilingual programs, as they existed before Proposition 227 passed.

Culver City USD has 5951 students, with 1215 ELs comprising 20% of its enrollment. Prior to 227, the district enrolled 203 ELs in bilingual education at two of its five elementary schools. After 227, not enough optional waivers to the requirements of the proposition were completed by

parents to offer bilingual programs at any grade level in either school. Prior to 227, a third school—El Marino Language School—offered two-way Spanish and Japanese Immersion classes.

These two-way immersion classes<sup>2</sup> served native English speakers and English learners, with the curriculum taught primarily in the target language (Spanish or Japanese) but with increasing amounts of English, and a goal of total biliteracy by fifth grade. In 1998, 72 ELs participated in this program. The district was able to preserve this magnet program using parental waivers.

Finally, Dinuba USD, in the San Joaquin Valley, had an enrollment of 4896 with 1051 (21%) K-12 LEP students prior to the passage of Proposition 227. At that time, Dinuba offered no formal bilingual programs, but provided home language assistance for literate students. After the passage of 227, Dinuba restructured its ELD program to provide intensive SEI for students during the first year, with ongoing support in later years.

### *Definition and implementation of elementary SEI*

Culver City has placed students at the two lowest proficiency levels in English, as determined by a state-approved language proficiency instrument in the SEI program. These students are assigned to mainstream classrooms and receive supplemental ELD services from an ELD specialist through a pull-out model. When possible, these students are assigned to a classroom taught by a teacher with a Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) credential; holders of these credentials have preparation in adapting instruction to meet the needs of ELs.

Dinuba has established that the goal for Structured English Immersion is for students “to teach/learn/acquire as much English as possible within a one-year time frame” (B. Berryhill, personal communication). Instructional components of SEI include guided practice in listening and speaking; explicit literacy instruction; comprehensible experiential reading; thematic instruction through comprehensible English with grade level content; and primary language support. Students may be served within a self-contained classroom or within the mainstream classroom, depending on school demographics.

### *Effects of Proposition 227 on secondary schools*

In contrast to elementary schools, relatively little bilingual instruction was offered in secondary schools before the passage of Proposition 227. However, secondary students typically participated in departmentalized courses that could last three to four years or more (e.g., ELD 1, ELD 2, ELD 3, etc.). Proposition 227 mandated SEI “not normally to exceed one year”—however, the law also requires “additional and appropriate support” and many districts

are struggling to define what that support might be (CDE, 1999a). In many cases, it seems to be simply that the mainstream subject matter teacher has had some kind of training to work with English learners.

San Francisco continues to require two periods of ELD for students at all levels, one of which consists of grade-level content. Culver City Middle School was to begin a new program in 1999-2000: Students formerly placed in ELD 3 classes were to be assigned to mainstream classes taught by CLAD-credentialed teachers, with a coordinator to monitor their progress. Dinuba restructured its secondary education, placing beginners and intermediate learners in grades 7 and 8 in self-contained ELD classes for one school year, with SDAIE.

In this program, advanced students are placed in mainstream classrooms with SDAIE as needed. High school students have a self-contained program, three classes per term for two terms. This program includes intensive ELD, SDAIE, and home language support. Thereafter, students take mainstream classes but with an extra English acquisition/tutorial class. Moreover, Dinuba is working to provide additional and appropriate services after the initial year to enable students to succeed. By contrast, a CATESOL member reports that, in one extreme case, a middle school in Los Angeles Unified simply eliminated all its ELD 2, 3, and 4 courses and reassigned the students to mainstream classes.

Many other schools seem to be offering far less ELD after the first year. While in the past, the approach was to keep the students in special classes with specially trained teachers until they were judged able to succeed in mainstream classes, the trend seems to be to get them into the mainstream faster. One respondent reported that secondary English learners now receive no more than one year of ESL, as opposed to the maximum of three years before 227.

### *Materials for SEI*

In 1991 and again in 1996, the state of California adopted ELD materials for K-8 that are still widely used (CDE, 1997). However, these materials were designed for use during the ELD period, not to cover the core curriculum in a comprehensive manner. In other words, these materials were designed to develop students' English listening and speaking vocabulary and to develop some reading and writing skills but not to deliver the appropriate literature, mathematics, science, and social studies concepts for the students' grade level. The 1996 materials, in particular, incorporate some key age-appropriate science and social studies topics and a little mathematics. For the rest of the day, mainstream science, social studies, math, and reading texts are being used, with instructional adapta-



tions. Guidelines are under consideration for the development of new English Language Arts and English Language Development materials, to be available for adoption by districts in 2002.

San Francisco USD has developed a new curriculum guide and has adopted materials from the state approved ELD list (CDE, 1997). Culver City USD and Dinuba USD also use materials from this list. Dinuba also uses leveled trade books and library books in English and Spanish, in addition to supplemental ELD materials.

One audience member mentioned using the district adopted Houghton Mifflin Language Arts materials that have good support strategies included in the supplemental handbooks devoted to the needs of ELs. This raises the question of whether students are receiving any differentiated, targeted ELD or whether they are only receiving the mainstream English Language Arts curriculum with adaptations for second language learners.

Many respondents mentioned Hampton Brown, one of the series on the 1996 ELD adoption list (CDE, 1997). Others are still using older programs such as Santillana's *Bridge to Communication*, from the 1991 ELD list, and even *IDEA*, a program widely used about fifteen years ago. Responding to the question "Do you have materials?" one respondent said, "Yes, personally; no, districtwide." Reflecting a common practice in the field, another respondent uses "various things I make up and receive free at conventions".

The Division of Instruction of Los Angeles USD studied available materials and developed a list of additional structured English immersion instructional materials not already recommended by the state (Deputy Superintendent, Instruction and Curriculum, Los Angeles Unified School District, 1999). These materials are "appropriate for English-as-a-Second-Language instruction and academic instruction in health, history-social science, mathematics and science. The materials support English language proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing and assist students in achieving academic standards and content instruction" (p. 1).

In a section entitled "Adapting existing instructional materials to the needs of structured English immersion", the memorandum issued by the Deputy Superintendent detailing the results of this study noted:

Textbooks and instructional materials are tools that must be adapted by teachers to meet the needs of students in structured English immersion Models A and B. As teachers plan lessons that prepare students for English literacy and achievement in the core curriculum, they must consider two aspects of student development: (1) the students' linguistic readiness to learn a new concept or skill in English, and (2) the students' prior knowledge of the concept or skill in English or in the primary language.

When it is linguistically appropriate, teachers should plan instruction and activities that will prepare students to use current textbooks and materials successfully. Materials designed for mainstream English speakers may be adapted for use by English learners at appropriate levels of English proficiency by selecting segments of text for discussion, by using photographs, graphs and other visuals to build context for understanding text, and by focusing on one idea or skill, rather than several at one time. (p. 3)

### *Teacher training after Proposition 227*

With growing numbers of ELs, and with many more of these students in mainstream classes, there is an increased need for teacher training. In California, teachers providing ELD or core curriculum such as math, science, or social studies through SDAIE are required to have certification that authorizes these types of instruction. This has not changed since the passage of Proposition 227. Options include the CLAD or BCLAD credential.<sup>3</sup> Most teachers entering the profession in the past few years, and some veteran teachers, hold these credentials. However, because many veteran teachers had increasing numbers of ELs in their classrooms and did not wish to enroll in university programs or take the examinations to get these additional credentials, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill (S.B.) 1969 (Teacher Credentialing Act, 1999).

S.B. 1969 inserted language into the state Education Code Section 44253 and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 80680 through 80690, to provide certification options for teachers who were permanent employees of a school district, county office of education, or a school administered under the authority of the Superintendent of Public Instruction as of January 1, 1995. This certification attaches to the teacher's base credential. It authorizes a teacher with a multiple subject credential, teaching in a self-contained classroom, to provide ELD and SDAIE core curriculum. A teacher holding a single subject credential is authorized to provide that subject area through SDAIE for ELs.

Under S.B. 1969, school districts can provide their own training and certify their own teachers using a program that requires fewer hours of study than the regular B/CLAD credential. The training content, instructors, and assessment measures must meet the guidelines in the California Code of Regulations. Unlike all other California teaching certificates and credentials, this certificate can only be issued by a school district or a county office of education, not an institution of higher education.

Colloquium participants cited several sources of training. San Francisco USD offers extensive teacher training, coordinated by the District Language

Academy. Teachers and schools can choose from a menu of opportunities including B/CLAD and S.B.1969 training. Special workshops are also offered to teachers in the areas of ELD, SDAIE, teaching in the home language, teaching of reading, content areas, and general literacy and language development. Many audience members at the colloquium indicated that their districts have trained all teachers through S.B. 1969. Other audience members mentioned CLAD training offered through universities, school districts, and county offices of education, professional conferences, and workshops.

Teachers in K-12 education normally work with students from early morning to mid-afternoon, five days a week, 36 to 40 weeks per year. Ongoing professional development such as collaborative work and training in working with special needs populations such as ELs has traditionally been done on "in-service" days throughout the year. On these days, teachers come to work and are paid, but students do not come to school. Because of public and legislative concerns with increasing student achievement, recent legislative action has limited the number of these days that can be scheduled, leaving even less "in-service" time to address the needs of English learners.

### *Positive and Negative Outcomes of Proposition 227*

Many participants mentioned positive outcomes as a result of the implementation of Proposition 227. Some participants reported that because of the proposition, there is greater parent awareness and support for language programs. Another positive outcome cited was that there is now greater administrator and teacher awareness of ELs and their needs. One audience member commented, "Greater district wide awareness of the necessity to improve EL student performance. Mainstream core curriculum teachers have been more aware of the topic and instead of nodding heads politely when I talk, they listen, discuss and debate the issue...the principal is way more responsive to EL student needs."

A few participants reported increased student achievement in English. Comments included: "Growth in learning English by students; community support." "Students in grades two through five are getting better structured instruction in English spelling and writing mechanics. Our previous transition program was a bit haphazard."

Negative outcomes for parents were also cited by the panelists and audience members. In San Francisco, the campaign for the proposition caused some parents to doubt the value of bilingualism and the bilingual program, thus creating a need for additional parent education. Other negative outcomes included a potential decrease in self-esteem due to the lack of seeing the home language supported at school; a transition from Spanish to English that was too abrupt for many students; and parent/family backlash

against bilingual instruction and bilingualism. An audience member commented, "Parents feel frustrated—they have difficulty helping their children with all the work in English."

For teachers, negative outcomes included frustration; confusing directives from administrators; "hyperimplementation" of the proposition (e.g., teachers being directed to stop using the home language to clarify and support instruction); and resistance among mainstream teachers towards assuming an increased responsibility for EL students.

Perhaps the most serious negative outcomes cited were those for students. Audience members expressed doubts that ELD instruction can be accelerated to the degree assumed by Proposition 227. Comments included: "Move all the kids through ESL in two years?" "Less prepared students are being mainstreamed. Students are slipping through the cracks" and "Students who are not really ready for mainstreamed classes because they lack academic language and cognitive abilities can get into those classes now, and we as a school are in no way prepared to help them should their test scores and grades fail. We currently lack staff to even do the required follow-up." As one audience member summarized, "Districts, teachers and parents are really confused and frustrated and afraid of the unknown."

### **Conclusion**

The responses cited in the previous section reflect the perspective of the three panelists and of the individual teachers and administrators who attended CATESOL's colloquium in Reno, representing a reasonable cross-section of districts in terms of size and location within California.

CDE conducted a survey of school districts on the implementation of Proposition 227. Responses were gathered from September 1998 to March 1999, with a report issued to district and county superintendents and other interested parties in May 1999. Survey results were consistent with the responses of the colloquium participants in that a need for greater professional preparation was cited as well as a tremendous range of practices in implementation.

On September 3, 1998, Delaine Eastin, Superintendent of Public Instruction for California, convened a 35 member Proposition 227 Task Force. The charge of the task force was to develop recommendations to guide school districts in providing high quality programs for English learners within the parameters of Proposition 227. The co-chairs of the task force were Vera Vignes, Superintendent, Pasadena USD, and Roberto Moreno, Superintendent, Calexico USD. Members included classroom teachers, principals, superintendents, university professors, school board members, parents, community members, business representatives, and rep-

representatives of professional organizations. The report of the task force was released to the public in February 2000 (CDE, 1999a).

The task force report addressed the issues of home language support, timing for SEI, materials, and teacher training. The report stressed that EL students need to achieve high content standards in the core subjects in addition to advanced levels of English language proficiency. Students need qualified teachers, ideally with CLAD certification, and current materials. In addition, the report stressed that students must have appropriate support for as long as they need it beyond the one year targeted in the language of the proposition.

It is obvious from the discussion above that the situation in the field is far from ideal. After the first year of implementation of Proposition 227, there is a wide range of instructional practices, with key elements still being developed and disseminated. Teachers with preparation ranging from none to extensive are grappling with a new system for the education of ELs at a time of other significant changes in public education. There is a lack of appropriate materials to deliver the entire range of the curriculum, and a limited use of the materials that already exist.

As of the time of this writing, during the second year of implementation, little had changed. No additional guidelines for implementation have been developed or disseminated. The Task Force report, completed in 1999, was only beginning to be distributed to the public in the spring of 2000. No new materials were in evidence, and new ELD materials will not be available until the 2002 adoption year.

However, ELD Standards have now been developed and adopted by the California State Board of Education, and teachers and administrators are being trained to use these standards (CDE, 1999b). Additionally, a new test designed to measure students' growth in proficiency in English and in the core curriculum is under development. This test is tied to the ELD standards.

It is impossible to separate the implementation of Proposition 227 from the other changes going on in public K-12 education in California. Class size reduction has offered most students in grades K-3 the opportunity to be in a class with only 20 students and one teacher, instead of 30 to 35; however, in the urban districts where many ELs attend school, that teacher might have little or no training in basic teaching methods, let alone the special methods needed to instruct ELs.

For the first time in many years, as a result of the booming economy, money is flowing into the schools—money for building and renovating schools, buying new library books and textbooks, extending the school day, and offering summer and intersession classes to help struggling students. These efforts cannot fail to help ELs, although urban districts in overcrowded areas are not always able to take advantage of these new funds; for

example, in schools already at full capacity, class size reduction funds are often used to put two teachers in a classroom with 40 students instead of having two classes of 20.

A further complicating factor is the admirable tendency of teachers to make the best of whatever conditions they encounter. Given the provisions of Proposition 227, teachers and administrators have struggled to create programs that use appropriate methodology. An example is the creation of SEI programs in which students spend part of the day studying core subjects in a mainstream classroom, with another part of the day devoted to intensive ELD.

It is possible that some of the positive outcomes, along with other positive changes in education such as smaller classes, better facilities, and more learning time, will counteract the negative effects of Proposition 227. Perhaps, in years to come, we will see increased numbers of students redesignated and higher achievement in the core curriculum for our ELs. Perhaps we will also see better high school graduation rates and increased enrollment in institutions of higher education for ELs. However, in order to achieve these goals, professional organizations such as CATESOL must disseminate best practices and help teachers and administrators create programs to help our students learn English and achieve in school.

## Author

*Sara Fields is the English Language Development/Bilingual Specialist at Linwood E. Howe Elementary School in Culver City, California. The school has an enrollment of 540 students, of whom 200 are English Learners. She is Past President of CATESOL.*

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) is a teaching approach used to make content comprehensible to ELs with intermediate fluency (California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1992).
- <sup>2</sup> In two-way immersion classes, first language (L1) speakers begin by receiving the majority of their instruction in the second language (L2); the L1 is gradually introduced into the curriculum until it comprises approximately 50% of the instruction. Also enrolled in the program are LEP students who come from the L2 background. For the LEP students, who provide a native-speaker model for the other students, the program provides bilingual instruction (Genessee, 1997).

Thus, the language majority students begin with immersion in their L2 while the language majority students first build a foundation in their native language before encountering the majority language (Brisk, 1998). Two-way immersion programs have as a secondary goal a lessening of social distance between language majority and language minority students (Samway & McKeon, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> The Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) and the Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) certificates are credentials that authorize teachers to provide certain types of instruction to EL students. For teachers who already have a basic credential, the CLAD and BCLAD are additional certificates that attach to that credential.

## References

- Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- California Department of Education. (1993). *Coordinated compliance review manual*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California Department of Education. (1997). *Reading/language arts and English as a second language: Adoption report*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California Department of Education. (1999a). *Educating English learners for the twenty-first century: The report of the Proposition 227 Task Force*. Retrieved February 4, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/news/2000releases/00-08rel.asp>.
- California Department of Education. (1999b). *English language development standards*. Retrieved February 19, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/cilbranch/sca/eld/eld.html>.
- California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (1998). *Language census summary statistics, 1997-98*. Retrieved February 19, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports/statewide/lcsum98.htm>.

- California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (1999). *Language census summary statistics, 1998-99*. Retrieved February 19, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/demographics/reports/statewide/lcsum99.htm>.
- California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1992). *CATESOL position statement on specially designed academic instruction in English (sheltered instruction)*. Retrieved May 1, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.catesol.org/shelter.html>.
- Deputy Superintendent, Instruction and Curriculum, Los Angeles Unified School District. (1999, April 21). *Additional elementary instructional materials to support Structured English Immersion (Memorandum No. M-228)*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Dunlap, S., & Fields, S. (1997). Issues in articulation: The transition from elementary to secondary school. *The CATESOL Journal*, 9, 47-59.
- English for the Children. (1998a). *Proposition 227 campaign website*. Retrieved February 19, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.englishforthechildren.org>.
- English for the Children. (1998b). *Text of Proposition 227*. Retrieved February 19, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.english-forthechildren.org/fulltext.html>.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Samway, K., & McKeon, D. (1999). *Myths and realities: Best practices for language minority students*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Teacher Credentialing Act (S.B. 1969), California Education Code § 44253 (1999).
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.



## Appendix

### Questionnaire Presented to Attendees at 1999 CATESOL Conference

1. What is the percentage of EL students in your district?  
What languages are represented?

How much bilingual education existed in your district before 227?  
(Percentage of eligible students, number of schools w/bilingual programs  
vs. non-bilingual programs)

How much bilingual education remains after 227? (Same measure)

What factors influenced that?

Is your district's experience typical of districts in your area with similar demographics?

2. How have you defined Structured English Immersion?

Are you providing SEI self-contained classrooms? Teaming/regrouping?  
Pull-out? Delivery of services in the regular classroom? Some other  
model?

3. What is going on in the secondary schools in your district? Have course assignments or program changed due to 227?
4. Do you have materials? What materials are being used?
5. What teacher training are you providing?
6. What positive outcomes have you seen?
7. What challenges or negative outcomes?
8. If asked to respond in a few words to the question, "What's really going on in California since Proposition 227 passed?" what would you say?