The CATESOL Journal

CATESOL EXCHANGE

TESOL Teacher Education Programs In the California State Universities

ROBERTA J. CHING
California State University, Sacramento

At CATESOL 1993 in Monterey, the California State University English for Academic Purposes Association (CSU EAP Association) held its third annual meeting (see *The CATESOL Journal,* 3 [1], for background on the creation of this professional association). The theme of the meeting was TESOL teacher education programs in the CSU. As chair of the CSU EAP Association, I presented information gathered in a survey of CSU TESOL programs, and we formed breakout groups to discuss some of the major issues facing our programs: curriculum, international students, the politics of TESOL in our universities, and our graduates and the job market. The issues raised by the survey are relevant to not only faculty working in CSU TESOL programs, but everyone interested in the preparation of teachers to serve California's rapidly expanding ESL population.

The CSU system has always played a major role in the education of teachers for the state of California. TESOL programs prepare teachers to teach in a variety of settings including community colleges, adult schools, language institutes, community centers, and schools overseas. They also contribute to the preparation of teachers who will work with language minority students in elementary and secondary schools. Significant numbers of TESOL graduates go on to pursue PhDs. Over the years faculty on each campus have done work without many opportunities to interact with colleagues on the other 19 campuses of the CSU system. The English for Academic Purposes Association has now given us a forum, however, where we can share what we are doing, learn from other programs, and perhaps receive inspiration to move in some new directions.

In January, 1993 I mailed a survey to faculty on the 19 CSU campuses involved in TESOL teacher education. The survey asked for information

about the type of programs offered, the numbers of faculty and their positions, the kinds of courses offered, and the culminating requirements for the programs. It also asked open-ended questions about the relationships between TESOL and ESL programs, perceived strengths and problems, and new directions being contemplated. Fourteen campuses responded to the survey. This article reports the outcome.

The survey highlighted the remarkable diversity of our programs. We have set a variety of tasks for ourselves and are accomplishing them in a variety of ways. Of the 14 campuses responding, 11 have programs leading to an MA. These programs are housed in several different departments. For example, the English Department is home to TESOL at Dominguez Hills, Sacramento, San Bernardino, and San Francisco. At Fresno and Long Beach the program is in Linguistics while at San Jose it is in Linguistics and Language Development. At Los Angeles TESOL is in Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies. Many campuses share responsibility with other departments and schools, but only San Diego submitted two responses, one from Policy Studies in Language and Cross-Cultural Education and one from the Department of Linguistics and Oriental Languages.

Most programs require 30 semester units of coursework for the MA; Los Angeles requires 45 quarter units and San Bernardino 48. The size and composition of the programs also vary. Stanislaus reports eight students while San Francisco, the flagship program in the state, has 193. Fifty percent of the students at Fresno, 36% at San Jose, and 38% at Dominguez Hills are international students; these large numbers of nonnative speakers mean these programs must consider the English skills of the students they are training (see *The CATESOL Journal,* 3 [1] for a discussion of this issue). Other campuses have smaller numbers: At San Francisco international students are 10% of the MA students and at Sacramento only 6%, but even on these campuses international students both enrich and challenge the programs.

Although MA programs are at the center of most TESOL teacher education programs, campuses offer other educational options as well. Nine campuses reported having certificate programs requiring from 12 semester units to 32 quarter units. Northridge, San Diego, and San Jose offer undergraduate certificates. Fresno has a certificate program so new that it has no students, while Bakersfield's program is currently going through the approval process. These programs may be adversely affected in the future because of legislation requiring the university to charge substantially higher tuition to students returning for a second degree. Since many certificate students already have a bachelor's degree and are not matriculated graduate students, they will be forced to pay the higher tuition. Nevertheless, at the time of the survey, certificate programs were reporting from 15 to 43 students. These numbers are approximate since students may take classes without signing up for the certificate program; they can only be accurately identified when it is time to issue them the certificate.

Nearly all campuses reported serving students seeking a Supplementary Authorization in ESL in programs ranging from 12 to 21 units. The actual number of students was small, anywhere from 8 to 10, except at Stanislaus where 28 to 35 students were in a liberal studies concentration in TESOL. Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Jose, and Sonoma are all in the process of developing a cross-cultural, language, and academic development/bilingual, cross-cultural, language, and academic development (CLAD/BCLAD) credential program, and Long Beach will implement its program in fall, 1993. Only San Diego and Stanislaus have programs in place. Language development specialist programs affiliated with TESOL are operating on six campuses. Dominguez Hills and San Jose offer a single-subject waiver in English with a TESL option, the Language Development Program at San Diego offers a bilingual specialist degree, and Stanislaus offers an MA in language development specialist: multicultural education.

Faculty teaching in our TESOL programs are predominantly tenure or tenure track and have doctorates in linguistics or applied linguistics with a scattering of degrees in English, anthropology, and education. San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus each have 10 tenure/tenure track faculty members and Long beach has 11. The rest of the programs make do with two to four full-time faculty and perhaps one or two part-timers.

Diversity is most pronounced in the curriculum of the various programs although there is some consensus on essential courses in the TESOL program. Second language acquisition is required in 13 programs, TESOL theory in 12, and TESOL methods, syntax and semantics, and phonology/morphology each in 10. Teaching ESL writing is offered in nine programs while teaching ESL reading is offered in eight. No clear pattern emerges in elective courses; sociolinguistics and ethnography are most frequently listed, each serving as an elective in five programs. Perhaps most interesting are some of the courses offered in addition to traditional TESOL topics. These range from intercultural communication to historical comparative linguistics and from teaching ESL in the workplace to postcolonial literature. Clearly, we regard ourselves as a richly inclusive, multidisciplinary field, and we send our students in a multitude of directions to develop their skills to work with the diversity of students they will encounter as TESOL professionals.

Many CSU TESOL programs have connections, some robust and others more tenuous, with ESL programs. Some of these are credit-bearing or noncredit-bearing programs for matriculated students; others are intensive, preuniversity institutes. TESOL students may observe in ESL classes, tutor ESL students, do research, take part in a practicum, complete an internship, or serve as teaching associates. Many of these ESL programs hire CSU TESOL graduates. Long Beach reports that over 50% of their ESL faculty are graduates of their own TESOL program. At a time when the Assembly Committee on Higher Education is considering a proposal to consolidate ESL instruction in the community colleges (in its April, 1993 *Draft Report: Master Plan for Higher Education in Focus*), it is important to remind legislators and administrators that ESL programs in the CSU provide a fertile training ground for future ESL teachers. At their best, they are laboratories where students can be closely supervised in a sequence of progressively more challenging teaching assignments. At the same time, TESOL students can provide a valuable source, at little cost to the university, of tutors and teachers for the ESL students who are enrolling in ever greater numbers on CSU campuses.

As TESOL practitioners, we see different strengths in our programs reflecting our different emphases and objectives. Many of us attribute our strength to our faculty, calling them "committed and energetic," "excellent teaching faculty," "active, productive faculty," and "a vital, active TESOL faculty." The pull between theoretical and applied which runs throughout our profession appears when TESOL programs assess their strengths. Dominguez Hills cites its linguistic orientation as a strength while Sacramento touts its "pedagogy-oriented rather than theoretical" approach. The Language Development Program at San Diego feels its strength lies in its "integration of a foundation in linguistics...with practical application in education...and research," and Sonoma refers to its "solid interface between theory and practice." Finally, several programs feel that the opportunities to gain practical experience through observation, practica, and internships contribute to their strength.

Not surprisingly, in these times of budget crisis, programs reveal little diversity when identifying the most pressing problems they face. Nine programs say they do not have enough faculty. They cannot offer enough courses to meet student demand, or they cannot offer a broad enough selection of courses. Programs do not receive adequate assigned time to enable faculty to perform the administrative and advising tasks involved in running MA and certificate programs. Sonoma's fear is the most stark of all–fear of being eliminated.

However, not all attention is being directed to the budget quagmire. Fresno is concerned about its lack of a practicum, and Dominguez Hills hopes to improve the English skills of international graduate students. Northridge wants to shift its emphasis away from linguistics and towards teaching ESL. Several programs want to explore the connection between the CLAD/BCLAD credential and the certificate or MA in TESOL. Both Bakersfield and San Bernardino would like to offer an greater range of courses. Los Angeles and Sacramento are both working towards greater control over the coursework in their programs.

The CSU TESOL teacher education programs exist in uncertain times under less than ideal conditions. However, responses to the English for Academic Purposes Association survey reflect the creativity and energy with which we are pursuing our objectives. We have laid foundations, we are responsive to change in our disciplines and institutions and, most of all, we are committed to our mission to serve the linguistically diverse students flooding our educational system at all levels. It is hard not to feel optimistic that, in spite of the daunting problems, we will continue to make a major contribution to the training of teachers for the California of the 21st century. ■