DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 922 JC 820 289

AUTHOR Petersen, Allan; Cepeda, Rita
TITLE Bilingual Crosscultural Programs: A Plan for Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 56p.; Discussed as Agenda Item 4 at the Meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, June 3-4, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Community Colleges; *Cross Cultural Training; *Curriculum Development; Definitions; Educational Needs; English (Second Language); Federal Legislation; Models; Program Development; State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report presents the California Community Colleges (CCC) Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs and explains the background and context of the plan's development. First, the report provides a summary of the history of the proposed plan; an overview of relevant federal and state legislation concerned with bilingual education; and the informational and procedural concerns of the CCC's Board of Governors in relation to the plan (e.g., its cost; the availability and training of teachers; consonance with community college missions, Board policy, and legislative authority of the state; and responsiveness to local college needs). Next, the plan itself is presented, beginning with a statement of its purpose, a historical overview, legislative and educational code provisions, and community college policies. Then, existing bilingual crosscultural programs are reviewed based on a survey of 107 community colleges. In the following section, a rationale is put forward for the continued development of bilingual crosscultural programs on the basis of demographic trends and projections. Then a structural framework is outlined, which would allow any community college student in any field to pursue a bilingual crosscultural option within their major. Included in this section are the master plan for the development of such an option, and discussions of its interdisciplinary applicability and general education and field study requirements. Definitions of terms and a bibliography are appended. (HB)

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
June 3-4, 1982

Item 4

Title: Bilingual Crosscultural Programs: A Plan for Community Colleges

Staff Presentation: Allan Petersen, Administrator.
Rita Cepeda, Specialist
Program Evaluation and Approval

Summary

From 1976 to 1981 community colleges experienced a rapid growth in bilingual crosscultural programs and courses. This growth has been paralleled and in some cases, surpassed by increased enrollment of students from language minority background.

On February 3, 1981 the Program Evaluation and Approval Unit of the Chancellor's Office began a six-month survey of community college bilingual crosscultural education programs and courses. This survey formed the basis for the California Community College Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs (Attachment A). The plan was developed over a twelve-month period (March 1981-March 1982) in conjunction with the Advisory Committee on Bilingual Crosscultural Education. During this time, the Plan has undergone four revisions and has been endorsed in draft form by bilingual representatives from thirty community colleges (11/20/81), participants of the 1981 La Raza Faculty Association Fall Convention (10/9 10/10/81), and the Interagency Task Force on Bilingual Teacher Preparation (12/6/81). The Task Force was established by the Legislature in its supplemental language to the Budget Act of 1977 and includes membership from each of the postsecondary education segments in addition to the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL), State Department of Education/ Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education (SDE/OBBE), and the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC). The Plan has also been the subject of a workshop at the 1981 Asian-Pacific Bilingual Education Conference (11/21/81) sponsored by the California Association for Asian-Pacific Bilingual Education (CAFABE).

The Plan provides a model that can be easily adapted in the planning processes at the local level. In addition, the proposed format includes a number of characteristics that are designed to facilitate master planning and program implementation such as:

(1) The provision of a specific curricular framework

(2) Interdisciplinary applicability

(3) Inter-relations of program requirements with General Education Breadth requirements, and

(4) Field study requirements emphasizing "hands-on" experience.

On January 8, 1982, the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs was presented to the Education Policy Committee of the Board of Governors. After Committee review, the Plan was returned by staff for clarification with a request for a second presentation.

Staff has responded to the Committee's request by noting several specific areas of concern raised by committee members. These points are addressed in a question and answer format included in the "Statement of Reasons" section of this item (pp. 6-14).

On May 14, 1982, the Board's Education Policy Committee again considered this item. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend adoption of the Bilingual Plan to the full Board.

A complete text of the Plan is included in Appendix A.

Education Policy Committee Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board adopt the following resolution approving the California Community Colleges' Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs and urging the inclusion of the Bilingual Crosscultural Model Framework in the educational planning of community colleges.

WHEREAS, The Board of Governors is charged with providing leadership in regard to the mission and function of community colleges; and

WHEREAS, Program and course offerings must be responsive to local needs as reflected by the profile of students enrolled in these colleges; and

WHEREAS, It is clearly evident that the numbers of minority language students have increased and will likely continue to increase within the community colleges; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Governors approves the California Community Colleges Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Education, and urges the inclusion of the Bilingual Crosscultural Education Model in the educational planning of community colleges.

Background

With the passage of federal and state bilingual education legislation, local, state and federal education agencies were required to assume a number of administrative, monitoring and program implementation responsibilities. There are six pieces of legislation and a Supreme Court case which have had particular impact on the role of community colleges and other postsecondary institutions in bilingual education.

Federal Legislation

1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (PL 89-10) Title VII; Bilingual Education. (20 U.S.C.A. Section 880b et. seq.)

The Act was extensively amended by the Education Amendments of 1978 and is now entitled

(1978) The Bilingual Education Act (PL 95-561) Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended. (20 U.S.C.A. Section 3221-3261)

The Act established a federal discretionary grant program for bilingual education. Pursuant to Title VII, funds are appropriated to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies and state agencies to carry out programs to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking pupils.

The Act created an increased demand for bilingual crosscultural certificated personnel. As a result, postsecondary teacher training institutions became directly involved in meeting this demand.

1974 Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 . United State Supreme Court Decision

Lau involved a class action by non-English-Speaking students of Chinese ancestry against officials of the San Francisco Unified School District. The lower courts had ruled that offering identical services to all students is sufficient to meet the strictures of the Equal Protection Clause and, implicitly, of Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (42 U.S.C.A. Section 2000d), even though students actually received disparate benefits because of significant differences in their opportunities to take advantage of these services. Rejecting this analysis, the Supreme Court relied on the Title VI regulations and guidelines promulgated by the department which require equality in the offering and receipt of benefits. The Court stated:

> ". . . there is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education."

1974 Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, (PL 93-380); 20 U.S.C.A. Section 1703(f).

Section 1703 of the United States Code Annotated strengthened the federal commitment to rectify language barriers in schools as follows:

> "1703. No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex or national origin, by --
>
> * * *
>
> "(f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instruction programs."

It has been held that these provisions make it

> ". . . an unlawful educational practice to fail to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers . . ." (Morales v. Shannon, 516 F. 2d 411, 413; cert. denied, 46 L. Ed. 2d 408.)

1976 Education Amendments of 1976 (PL 94-482 and PL 95-40), 20 U.S.C. 2301 to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210).

In the amended law, the declaration of purpose states (section 101) that the objective is to:

> "assist States in improving planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training by involving a wide range of agencies and individuals concerned with education and training within the State in the development of the vocational education plans."

The VEA has had direct impact on Bilingual Programs at the California Community Colleges, particularly in its mandate and establishment of National Priority Programs (NPP). NPP are those programs, services and activities under Subpart 2 and those supportive services under Subpart 3 which assist disadvantaged persons, persons with limited English proficiency, and handicapped persons to participate in regular vocational education programs.

State Legislation

1974 Chapter 1496 of the Statutes of 1973, Education Code Section 52150 (AB 2817). The Bilingual Teacher Corps Act (BTC).

The BTC expired June 30, 1981. It provided funding in the form of stipends to students enrolled in community colleges and state universities who were pursuing bilingual teaching credentials. The grant program was administered by the State Department of Education.

1976 Chapter 978, of the Statutes of 1976, Education Code Sections 10101, 10103, 10104, and 10106 (AB 1329). The Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Education Act.

The Act set forth policy that each limited-English-speaking pupil enrolled in the California public school system in kindergarten through grade 12 shall receive instruction in their primary language.

AB 1329 created an unprecedented demand for bilingual personnel in the state. In order to comply with the law, the demand was initially and most immediately served by using bilingual teacher aides. The aides turned to the community colleges to acquire paraprofessional skills and the A.A. transfer degree.

1980 Chapter 1261 of the Statutes of 1980 E.C. Section 52150 (AB 2615). The Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program (BTDGP).

The bill replaces AB 2817, creating one major grant program inclusive of all postsecondary institutions both public and private. The intent remains the same - to increase the number of bilingual crosscultural teachers in the State of California.

In response to these legal mandates, the Chancellor's Office gave the Program Evaluation and Approval Unit primary responsibility for bilingual programs. Specific functions include:

- To provide a summary overview of existing programs and courses.
- To ascertain the availability of programs in areas with high density minority language populations.
- To provide a ready reference source of successful program types which can be utilized as models for new and developing programs.
- To study, propose and analyze related legislation and;
- To recommend a Board of Governors' policy congruant with the mission of the community colleges.

Statement of Reasons

There are two major areas of concern which serve as the guiding criteria for proposed Board of Governors action items. These two areas may be said to be divided into informational and procedural. Informational concerns relate to the content of the proposed policy item. What does the item entail? What does it propose? Is the item clear and understandable? Why does the item merit Board consideration? Procedural concerns assume that a proposed item meet a set of specific requirements before it can be considered as an appropriate statement of Board policy. Procedural questions would relate to the following:

- Congruence with the "mission and function" of community colleges
- Consonance with previously established Board policy
- Conformance with legislative and regulatory authority of the State of California
- Responsiveness to emerging state and local needs of community college students.

I. Informational Details Concerning The Plan for Bilingual Cross-cultural Program

Appendix A includes the entire text of the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs (PBCP). Section V of the Plan specifically details a model framework which may be adopted or adapted by local community colleges in their efforts to develop bilingual programs. The material which follows capsulizes the information in Section V and answers specific questions which have arisen concerning the proposed Plan.

These questions are a composite of field and Board input and have been included in direct response to these requests.

Questions Related to Terminology

1. *What is meant by Bilingual Education?*

Bilingual education is a mode of instruction which utilizes the student's primary language as the means to develop subject matter competency and dual language fluency.

The ultimate aim of bilingual education is to provide educational opportunities to students in a language they can understand with concurrent English language instruction. This approach insures the development of a successfully skilled bilingual individual.

There are various approaches utilized in a bilingual education program. These approaches may be used separately or in any combination which best suits the resources of the institution and the needs of the individual student. The most well known approaches include:

a). "English as a Second Language (ESL)" is the instruction of English to speakers of other languages. The focus is strictly transitional (i.e., to transition the student from his/her primary language to English). Main program features include: emphasis on language usage and conversational skills (audio-lingual).

b) "Partial bilingual instruction" means listening, speaking, reading and writing skills developed in both languages. Material realted to culture and history is taught in the language the student understands better.

c) "Full bilingual instruction" means basic language skills developed and maintained in both languages. Instruction in required subject matter or classes is provided in both languages in addition to culture and history.

d) "Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL)" VESL - Like ESL the emphasis is to teach English to speakers of other languages and the goal is that of rapid transition into English. VESL differs from ESL, however, in that language acquisition is directed to enable the student to participate in a) occupational education, b) pre-employment program, or c) on-the-job training. VESL attempts to teach language skills which are occupation specific and as such course content is far more structured and specialized.

e) "Bilingual Vocational Education" Bilingual vocational education is defined by the Federal Register, Volume 42, No. 191, "Vocational Education, State Programs and Commissioner's Discretionary Programs." October 3, 1977, Part VI.

"Bilingual vocational training" is training or retraining in which instruction is presented in both the English language and the dominant language of the persons receiving training and which is conducted as part of a program designed to prepare individuals of limited English-speaking ability for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or subprofessionals in recognized occupations and in new and emerging occupations which require a baccalaureate or advanced degree; bilingual vocational training includes guidance and counseling (either individually or through group instruction) in connection with such training as for the purpose of facilitating occupational choices.

The modes of instruction defined above are currently being used in various colleges either singly or in combinations.

The common strand unifying all existing programs is their adherence to the same goal concerning their students. All programs have as their objective to produce well trained bilingual persons.

2. *What is the role of ESL in the proposed plan; and should we (community colleges) not limit ourselves to the provision of ESL-only instruction?*

ESL plays a key role in the proposed plan. In many cases ESL classes represent the primary introductory vehicle to community college for persons with limited-English proficiency (LEP). ESL, however, is not available at all community colleges inasmuch as the Education Code relegates primary responsibility for its provision to the Adult Schools within the high school districts. Community colleges may offer ESL only in those areas where the Adult Education program has relinquished this responsibility or where a mutual agreement has been established.

ESL is also not viable as a single alternative for programs that wish to include subject matter instruction in the major field chosen by the student. ESL is not designed to impart academic instruction therefore the student is unable to enroll in any type of training until it is deemed that he/she has attained English fluency. This approach is time consuming and totally unnecessary as proven by existing bilingual programs.

3. *Why is there a need to include the term "crosscultural" in the Plan? Why is history and culture a necessary component if the primary goal is language fluency?*

Most language instructors and linguists, even the greatest "purists" among them, agree that language is a function of culture. A person whose primary language is other than English, needs to understand the values and history of the majority culture in relationship to his own.

The crosscultural application included in the proposed Plan is particularly significant to its core philosophy. The Bilingual Crosscultural Program Option when attached to the AA/AS degree should certify that a student has acquired competency in a given area, is fluent in English and a second language and understands the target population group to be served. It is easy to see that a specialty can only be put to full use if the practitioner understands the group or cultural milieu for its application. For example; nurses working with Samoan patients will be more effective if: 1) they are bilingual and 2) they understand the role of medicine within the Samoan culture.

4. *Is this a teacher training model?*

No. It is a student training plan. Until now most postsecondary efforts related to bilingual education have been limited to the preparation of bilingual teachers needed to fulfill the federal mandates at the K-12 level.

This Plan may be followed by any student in any field and will result in one of these achievements:

a) An A.A. degree with an added Bilingual Crosscultural Option;

b) An A.S. degree with an added Bilingual Crosscultural Option;

c) A Certificate of Achievement with an added Bilingual Cross-cultural emphasis.

5. *What type of student will benefit most from the proposed Plan?*

There are three student types that can benefit directly from pursuing the Bilingual Crosscultural Option.

Student Profile #1

A non-English-speaking or limited-English proficient student seeking to learn English, enroll in a field of study which will provide them with a marketable skill and/or a transfer AA/AS degree in the shortest possible period.

Student Profile #2

A bilingual student seeking to capitalize on their dual language capabilities by adding an extra credential to their AA/AS degree.

Student Profile #3

A native English speaker who recognizes the added increased employment possibilities of a degree which is accompanied by a bilingual crosscultural certificate.

Each of the student types described above can adapt the model framework proposed by the Plan to their individual needs by enrolling in the appropriate level and type of language instruction while maintaining all other requirements of the Program as prescribed.

6. *Won't the proposed Plan be too costly for colleges to implement, particularly at a time of fiscal constraints?*

One answer could be that colleges cannot afford not to offer such a program given the tremendous increase of LEP persons in the state coupled with the high influx of refugees seeking to enroll in community colleges. A second answer looks directly at the problem of cost in adding new courses and setting up new programs. It is particularly in this second aspect that the Plan is found to be extremely cost-efficient.

The Plan does not propose the establishment of a separate department, office or component; it simply proposes a way of packaging courses which for the most part are already offered by the foreign language, sociology, history and ethnic studies departments. A survey conducted by the Chancellor's Office indicates that 59 colleges presently offer a total of 674 bilingual courses and 78 bilingual programs. These courses and programs would fit neatly into the prescribed model framework.

The costs involved would be attributable to the planning process and time involved in assigning staff to coordinate and monitor the implementation and maintenance of the proposed Plan. However, the required extra resources should be small because community colleges have an already established planning process through their curriculum committees and academic master planning procedures.

7. *Who would be available to teach these courses? How can we respond to all the language needs present in this state?*

The Bilingual Crosscultural Education Survey conducted by the Chancellor's Office between February and July 1981 reported that 508 faculty members were directly involved in bilingual course and program offerings at 59 participating colleges systemwide. Of these 508 persons, 239 were identified as bilingual while 269 spoke only English. The point to be made here is that our instructor need not be fluent in two languages to teach linguistic crosscultural theory or the socio-political history of minorities in this state. Many courses may be taught with the help of a bilingual aide or team taught with the bilingual instructor responsible for the language acquisition part of the program.

The second part of this question concerns the number of languages (90) identified as represented in this state. It is important to note that only five of these languages comprise a significant portion of the LEP population. The State Department of Education/

Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education has collected some of the best data concerning the number of LEP students enrolled at the K-12 level. The top five language categories ranked by percentage of total LEP student population, are as follows:

Spanish	75.8%[1]
Vietnamese	6.1
Cantonese	3.8
Korean	2.0
Filipino/Tagalog	1.8
TOTAL	89.5%

II. Procedural Rationale For Consideration Of The Plan For Bilingual Crosscultural Program

The summary and background section included in this item have already presented the process for the development of the Plan along with key pieces of legislative authority which have led to the evolution of bilingual education in this state. Appendix A containing the full text of the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs provides an in-depth explanation including:

- o A historical overview and legislative chronology;
- o An analysis of current programs;
- o A rationale for continued program development; and
- o A proposed model framework for future programs.

This section will summarize those portions of the appended Plan pertaining to those procedural concerns which justify the adoption of the proposed Plan as Board of Governors policy.

As stated earlier, there are four major questions that must be answered positively if an item is to become a statement of public Board policy. In specific relationship to the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs these questions are as follows:

1. *How is the proposed Plan congruent with the mission and function of community colleges?*

   The mission and function of community colleges is clearly spelled out in sections of the California Education Code. In particular, Education Code Section 76001 and Education Code Section 78201. These sections define persons eligible for admission to community colleges and the courses of study to be offered at various campuses. The Education Code singles out community colleges as the postsecondary institution accessible to any person who is over eighteen and who is capable of profiting from the instruction offered. Furthermore, the type of instruction to be offered is to be provided at the 13th and 14th grade levels and must be relevant to the "civic" and liberal education" needs of the citizens of the local community.

[1]SDE/OBE - Data BICAL Report #81-2

The Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs is the direct result of the growing educational needs of LEP persons in the state of California. These individuals now comprise 30% of the present community college student enrollment and as such they have the right to profit from the instructional services provided by community colleges. As "open-door" institutions community colleges many represent the only viable educational access option open to the large influx of refugees in California.

2. *Is this Plan consonant with previously established Board Policy? Is it within the purview of the Board to adopt the proposed Plan?*

Article 2 Section 71023 of the Education Code contains some of the most pertinent pieces of legislation concerning the function of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors. The section reads as follows:

Legislative Intent

71023. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of community colleges as an integral and effective element in the structure of public higher education in the state. The work of the board shall at all times be directed to maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the community colleges.

(Enacted by Stats. 1976, Ch. 1010.)

In the past, the Board has passed many resolutions and adopted frameworks for the development of programs and courses in areas where state level "leadership" was deemed necessary. Several examples of past Board actions are included in the text of the Plan. Some of these program areas include Ethnic Programs (2/20/69), Apprenticeship Programs for Disadvantaged Students (4/24/69), Programs and Services for Disadvantaged Students (8/21/69) and the adoption of a statewide articulation framework for Bilingual Teacher Aide Programs recently adopted (9/24/81). This last program was fully recommended by CPEC under the mandates of AB 2615, The Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program.

It is also within the purview and responsibility of the Board to establish criteria for program approval and evaluation. The proposed Plan establishes criteria and guidelines heretofore lacking for the approval of Bilingual Programs in community colleges. The model framework delineated in Section V of the Plan has been carefully designed not only to fulfill general education requirements but also to coincide with similarly established frameworks. One such framework is presently used statewide by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) for the acquisition of the bilingual teaching credential.

---

[2]Chancellor's Office Fall 1980 enrollment data

3. *Does the Plan conform with existing legislative and regulatory authority of the state?*

There are four major pieces of state law which mandate and promote bilingual education for LEP students. These are:

1974 - AB 2817 The Bilingual Teacher Corps Act
1976 - AB 1329 The Chacon-Moscure Bilingual Education Act
1977 - AB 579 The Bilingual Cross-Cultural Teacher Development Program
1980 - AB 2615 The Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program

The four pieces of legislation noted focus on the preparation of bilingual teachers to meet the growing state demand. As a result, all postsecondary institutions were directly urged to develop bilingual education training programs. Community colleges became particularly involved as bilingual teacher aide training institutions. These aides became, and still are, one of the most viable means for the provision of bilingual instruction. In two years community colleges are able to prepare an aide for the classroom whereas a fully certificated teacher will require six years of training. Furthermore, these aides become primary candidates for full certification as bilingual teachers.

Community college involvement in bilingual education as well as the involvement of other postsecondary education segments was established and maintained by Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1977, Item 300-26. This item established a five-member Interagency Task Force on Bilingual Education. The Task Force is charged with the annual reporting of the status of bilingual teaching preparation, a report which is the composite result of the efforts of each of the postsecondary education segments in the state.

4. *Is the proposed Plan responsive to the emerging local needs of community colleges?*

Section IV of the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Programs provides an extensive rationale for the maintenance and development of bilingual programs in community colleges. This rationale is based on demographic and language census data available for the state.

The salient points provided by these data indicate that:

- Thirty percent of the population in the State of California comes from minority backgrounds. Of these 30% 4/5 are members of language minority groups.

APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
PLAN FOR
BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL PROGRAMS

DEVELOPED BY: RITA M. CEPEDA, SPECIALIST
BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL
EDUCATION CCCCO

CHARLES KLEIN,
EDITOR

PAMELA HUNT,
OFFICE ASSISTANT II

JUNE, 1982

APPENDIX A

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
PLAN FOR
BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL PROGRAMS

DEVELOPED BY: RITA M. CEPEDA, SPECIALIST
BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL
EDUCATION CCCCO

CHARLES KLEIN,
EDITOR

PAMELA HUNT,
OFFICE ASSISTANT II

JUNE, 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

California Community Colleges pride themselves on their responsiveness in meeting the needs of the local community. It is for this reason that educational programs at community colleges are dynamic in nature and have historically kept pace with changes in the population, the economy, and the labor market.

The diversity of community college students is a factor that has become central to educational program planning for each community college district. The past ten years and in the next decade the growth of linguistic minorities across the state has increased greatly. This growth has been paralleled in community colleges, and, as such, the demand for educational programs that meet the needs of these students has also increased.

The California Community College Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Education Programs is the first statewide effort of its kind at the post-secondary education level. It represents the state level perspective through Board of Governors' leadership. It also insures local control through the utilization of a proposed framework for a bilingual cross-cultural option that can only be implemented through local planning efforts.

This plan moves away from the compensatory, "deficit" model which, however erroneously, is most often associated with bilingual education. Instead the Plan presents the bilingual crosscultural education option as an asset and a set of viable skills that may be made available to students in any field of study. A highly skilled bilingual individual is in fact one of the best responses to increased labor market demands in a number of occupational areas. In addition, bilingually trained service providers in the areas of education, health, and human services will fill an important void in current services available in many communities.

It is in the spirit of educational access and responsiveness to local needs that the Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Education Programs is presented.

Gerald C. Hayward
Chancellor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Especial commendation is to be made to members of the 1981-83 California Community Colleges Bilingual Crosscultural Education Advisory Committee; whose expert advice culminated in this Plan.

Hector Cordova Assistant Dean of Instruction Arts Science and Technology	Ohlone College Fremont-Newark Community College District
Jose Flores Coordinator of Bilingual Programs	Los Angeles Mission College Los Angeles Community College District
Dr. Julio Garcia Dean of Social Sciences	Southwestern College Southwestern Community College District
Dr. Henry Liu Assistant Director San Francisco Community College District	San Francisco Community College District
Dr. Pete Luna Director of Academic Affairs and Continuing Education	Rio Hondo College Rio Hondo Community College District
Olivia Mercado Dean of Intercultural Studies	De Anza College Foothill-De Anza Community College District
Hector Morales Coordinator of Bilingual Programs	Santa Monica College Santa Monica Community College District
Dr. Alicia Ramirez-Brewer	Fillmore Community School Fillmore Unified School District
Dr. Jose Saldivar Dean of Cultural Studies	San Diego City College San Diego Community College District
Ana Maria Valle Mini Teacher Corps Program Coordinator	Oxnard College Ventura County Community College District
Dr. Patricia Zevin, Director of Bilingual Bicultural Studies	Palomar College Palomar Community College District

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of the California Community Colleges Plan for Bilingual Cross Cultural Programs is to facilitate the development, maintenance, and expansion of program and course offerings which are designed to serve the needs of linguistic, racial and ethnic populations. It is with these clear objectives in mind that the Plan for Bilingual Cross Cultural Education seeks to respond to issues of educational access and community concerns. The rapid growth of the population in the State of California coupled with the increased number of language-minority populations have made the issues of access and local responsiveness even more crucial for community colleges.

The objectives of the Plan are consistent with the mission and functions of community colleges. These functions are delineated in the California Education Code; particularly in those sections which define persons eligible for admission to community colleges and the courses of study to be offered at the various campuses:

Education Code Section 76000 provides:

> 76000. The governing board of a community college district maintaining a two-year community college shall admit to the community college any person possessing a high school diploma or the equivalent thereof.
>
> Such governing board may admit to the community college any apprentice, as defined in Section 3077 of the Labor Code, who, in the judgment of the governing board or of the president of the community college if he is so authorized by rule of the governing board, is capable of profiting from the instruction offered.
>
> Such governing board may by rule determine whether there shall be admitted to the community college any other person who is over 18 years of age and who, in the judgment of the board or of the president of the community college if he is so authorized by the rule, is capable of profiting from the instruction offered.

Education Code Section 78201 provides:

> 78201. The course of study for two-year community colleges shall be designed to fit the needs of students of the 13th and 14th grades and may include courses of instruction designed to prepare for admission to the upper division of higher institutions of learning and such other courses of instruction designed to prepare persons for agricultural, commercial, homemaking, industrial and other vocations and such courses of instruction as may be deemed necessary to provide for the civic and liberal education of the citizens of the community.

The Education Code singles out community colleges as the postsecondary institution accessible and open to any person who is over 18 and who is capable of profiting from the instruction offered. No other segment can make a similar claim and no other segment has been purposely planned to ensure access geographically and academically quite in the same manner as the existing 107 community colleges in the State of California. But there is a second characteristic which is unique to community colleges - their decentralized system of governance. Decentralization and local control is one of the mechanisms most conducive to meeting community needs.

The rest of this document seeks to present the Plan not only from a pedagogical context, but also from the legislative, economic and demographic context relevant to this state and to community colleges in particular.

II. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 is singled out by many as the cornerstone for many subsequent pieces of public policy which are of particular concern to racial and ethnic minorities. Nearly all educational policies focusing on equality of educational opportunity, educational access, bilingual education, sex and racial bias in textbooks, etc. can trace some portion of their legislative authority to the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

There are many other pieces of federal and state legislation which form part of a comprehensive chronology of events which lead directly to the formation of a policy for bilingual cross-cultural education at the elementary, secondary and postsecondary levels. The following section contains a selective sequence of those events considered to be most significant to the formulation of the Plan for Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education:

Federal Legislation and Case Law

1964 Civil Rights Act of 1964 (PL 88-352), (42 U.S.C.A. Section 2000d)

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, (PL 89-10) Title VII; Bilingual Education. (20 U.S.C.A. Section 880b et. seq.)

The Act was extensively amended by the Education Amendments of 1978 and is now entitled

1978 The Bilingual Education Act (PL 95-561) Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended. (20 U.S.C.A. Section 3221-3261)

The Act established a federal discretionary grant program for bilingual education. Pursuant to Title VII, funds are appropriated to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies and state agencies to carry out programs to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking pupils.

The Act created an increased demand for bilingual crosscultural certificated personnel. As a result, postsecondary teacher training institutions became directly involved in meeting this demand.

1974 Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, (PL 93-380); 20 U.S.C.A. Section 1703(f).

Section 1703 of the United States Code Annotated strengthened the federal commitment to rectify language barriers in schools as follows:

> "1703. No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex or national origin, by --
>
> * * *
>
> "(f) the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instruction programs."

It has been held that these provisions make it

> ". . . an unlawful educational practice to fail to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers . . ." (Morales v. Shannon, 516 F. 2d 411, 413; cert. denied, 46 L. Ed. 2d 408.)

1976 Education Amendments of 1976 (PL 94-482 and PL 95-40), 20 U.S.C. 2301 to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210)

In the amended law, the declaration of purpose states (section 101) that the objective is to:

> "assist States in improving planning in the use of all resources available to them for vocational education and manpower training by involving a wide range of agencies and individuals concerned with education and training within the State in the development of the vocational education plans."
>
> The VEA has had direct implication on Bilingual Programs at the California Community Colleges, particularly in its mandate and establishment of National Priority Programs (NPP). NPP are those programs, services and activities under Subpart 2 and those supportive services under Subpart 3 which assist disadvantaged persons, persons with limited English proficiency, and handicapped persons to participate in regular vocational education programs.

State Legislation

1974 Chapter 1496 of the Statutes of 1973, Education Code Section 52150 (AB 2817). The Bilingual Teacher Corps Act (BTC).

The BTC expired June 30, 1981. It provided funding in the form of stipends to students enrolled in community colleges and state universities who were pursuing bilingual teaching credentials. The grant program was administered by the State Department of Education.

1976 Chapter 978, of the Statutes of 1976, Education Code Sections 10101, 10103, 10104, and 10106 (AB 1329). The Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Education Act.

The Act set forth policy that each limited-English-speaking pupil enrolled in the California public school system in kindergarten through grade 12 shall receive instruction their primary language.

AB 1329 created an unprecedented demand for bilingual personnel in the state. In order to comply with the law, the demand was initially and most immediately served by using bilingual teacher aides. The aides turned to the community colleges to acquire paraprofessional skills and the A.A. transfer degree.

1977 Chapter 1236 of the Statutes of 1977, Education Code Section 10104 (AB 579) The Bilingual Cross-Cultural Teacher Development Program

Established funding to be administered by the California Student Aid Commission for the provision of stipends to students seeking to meet the demand for bilingual teachers created under AB 1329.

1980 Chapter 1261 of the Statutes of 1980 Education Code Section 52150 (AB 2615). The Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program (BTDGP).

The bill replaces AB 2817, creating one major grant program inclusive of all postsecondary institutions both public and private. The intent remains the same - to increase the number of bilingual crosscultural teachers in the State of California.

California Education Code

Section 51004. Preparation for the World of Work provides for the following:

a. That every student leaving school shall have the opportunity to be prepared to enter the world of work;

b. That every student who graduates from any state-supported educational institution should have sufficient marketable skills for legitimate remunerative employment;

c. That every qualified and eligible adult citizen shall be afforded an educational opportunity to become suitably employed in some remunerative field of employment; and

d. That such opportunities are a right to be enjoyed without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, sex, or economic status.

Section 78208. Bilingual Teacher Assisting Course establishes that:

The governing board of each community college district may offer a course of study leading to an associate in arts degree in bilingual, bicultural teacher assisting. The curriculum may include courses of study in bilingual, bicultural education and practicum in bilingual, bicultural teacher assisting.

Community Colleges Policies: Board of Governors Resolutions and Significant Events

Board Actions

2/20/69 Ethnic Programs Available to All Students

Resolution urging community college districts to offer ethnic programs to all students.

4/24/69 Apprenticeship Programs for Disadvantaged Students

The Board adopted a resolution to provide stronger and more effective planning in the area of apprenticeship programs for disadvantaged students and requested community college districts to:

a. Study ethnic composition of their related and supplementary instructional program for apprentices.

b. Determine the ethnic composition of their district and of the individual communities from which the districts receive apprentices.

c. Report to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, by November 1, 1969, progress made in regard to a and b above.

8/21/69 Statement of Policy for Disadvantaged Student Programs

Adoption of a statement of policy for Disadvantaged Student Programs which set guidelines for evaluating student programs and services.

3/19/81 Vocational Education Act Division of Funds With State Department of Education and Statewide Project Priorities and Set-Asides (Res. # 810309)

Board adopted "set-asides" for disadvantaged and limited-English proficiency students as a top level funding priority. Set-asides refers to the specific designation of a percentage of grant funds for a particular use.

9/24/81 Bilingual Teacher Education. Transfer Issues (Res. # 810934)

Board concurred with a report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission and supported stronger monitoring efforts to be conducted in the area of transfer of credits for bilingual teacher education students.

Significant Events Within The Chancellor's Office

1972	Approval of the first Bilingual Teacher Assisting Program at a community college.
1977	Formation of the California Community Colleges Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education Advisory Committee
1978	Issuance of First Bilingual Cross-Cultural Programs Survey (Survey findings not finalized)
1980	Hiring of a permanent full-time employee designated as Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education Specialist
1981	Issuance of the Second Bilingual Cross-Cultural Programs Survey
1981	Publication of the statewide California Community Colleges Plan for Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education (the present plan).

III. CURRENT PROGRAMS

In February 1981, the Chancellor's Office sent a questionnaire to the field entitled the "California Community Colleges Bilingual Cross-Cultural Education Programs Survey." The purpose of the survey was three fold:

- To obtain a summary overview of existing programs and courses.
- To ascertain the availability of programs in areas with high density minority language population and;
- To establish a ready reference source of successful program types which could be utilized as models for new and developing programs.

The survey achieved a 90% response rate, with 96 of the 107 colleges responding. The data-base established the rationale for a model framework which would apply to existing programs in the field.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Colleges with Bilingual Education Offerings

  Of the 96 community colleges responding to the survey, 59 colleges or 61% of the total indicated the availability of bilingual cross-cultural programs and/or courses. Thirty-seven colleges or 39% reported no programs and/or courses of this nature.

- Bilingual Cross-Cultural Programs

  Programs are defined as a cluster of related courses designed to provide the student with a specialization or area of emphasis. Examples of existing programs include bilingual teacher assisting, nursing, and early childhood education. These programs can be included within the total unit requirements established for the Associate of Arts Degree.

  The survey indicated that the earliest bilingual program was established in 1971 by the San Francisco Community College District. The great majority of programs, however, were developed in 1976, most likely in response to the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Education Act of 1976.

  The number of bilingual programs available per campus ranged from 0 to 9. While some colleges stated that they had no programs available, they did indicate the existence of independent courses. The total number of programs reported was 78. Of these 78 programs:

  a. Fifty-three reported Spanish as their target language.

  b. Nine reported Vietnamese as their target language.

  c. Seven reported offering programs in Chinese/Cantonese.

d. Three colleges reported Cambodian as their primary target language.

e. One college reported American Indian language programs in Yurok, Tolowa and Hupa.

f. One program each was also reported in Laotian, Hmong and Italian.

o Bilingual Cross-Cultural Courses

Courses are single offerings to fulfill program and/or degree requirements in a given area. The earliest recorded bilingual course offering was found at Modesto Junior College in 1960. The majority of courses, however, were established between the years of 1975 and 1976.

The number of courses available per campus varied from one course at Sierra College to sixty-eight courses at Palomar College. The total number of courses systemwide was 674.

o Transfer Status of Programs and Courses

Community colleges reported the availability of both transfer and nontransfer courses and programs. In many cases both these options were available within the same campus.. Eighty percent of the colleges indicated that their programs/courses were transferable, while 56% also reported the availability of non-transferable offerings.

o Staffing of Bilingual Cross-Cultural Programs

A summary of the responses provided indicated that there were 508 faculty members involved with bilingual cross-cultural programs/courses. This large number of faculty represents "head-counts" of persons associated with programs and not full-time equivalencies.

A second question included in the survey requested information on the language background of the faculty members involved in these programs/courses. It was reported that 269 of the 508 faculty members were monolingual English speaking, while 239 were considered to be bilingual.

o Funding Sources

The primary source of funding identified by most colleges was the revenue generated by Average Daily Attendance (ADA). Fourteen colleges reported federal sources of funding while 43 colleges reported receiving state funds. In addition, 34 col leges named local sources of funding for their bilingual curriculum offerings. Specific funding sources reported were:

- AB 2817 - The Bilingual Teacher Grant Program
- VEA - P.L. 94-482 - Basic Vocational Education Grants
- VEA - P.L. 94-482 - Subpart 3 - Special Program Funds
- State Department of Education
- P.L. 94-142 - Handicapped Program Funds
- EOPS - Special Projects Funds
- State Employment Development Department - CETA and CWETA
- Title VII - Bilingual Teacher Corps Funds
- Title I - Migrant Education - Mini Teacher Corps

IV. RATIONALE FOR CONTINUED PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Several implications can be drawn from the survey findings. Some of the data reinforce the fact that bilingual crosscultural education is widely spread among community college campuses. Other data refute previously held beliefs concerning the nontransferability of bilingual crosscultural programs and courses. Based on the information reported, some of the conclusions are:

- Bilingual Crosscultural Education is an educational option present in 61% of all college campuses. This establishes community colleges as the postsecondary education segment most involved in the field of bilingual instruction.

- Bilingual crosscultural programs and courses are neither sporadic nor marginal in the community college curriculum. In fact, such offerings are numerous and wide-spread.

- Bilingual crosscultural offerings have grown and spread rapidly. Comparatively speaking, bilingual education as a discipline has attained a very large growth rate in only a ten year period (1971-1981). It is difficult to find any other curriculum area that has achieved equal growth in the same period of time.

- Despite previous contentions that bilingual courses and programs were noncredit and nontransferable, the majority of bilingual crosscultural offerings are transferable credit offerings. This finding confirms the legitimacy and mainstream quality which are characteristic of this area of study.

- Bilingual crosscultural studies are not the domain of a handful of bilingual faculty members. On the contrary, of the 508 faculty members involved in this area one half were bilingual while the other half were monolingual English speaking. This finding indicates that bilingual studies go far beyond the mere offering of course work in a language other than English. It supports the fact that the discipline as a whole is inclusive of a broad area of expertise encompassing sociology, history, psychology and other social sciences.

Based on the material reported there are several implications for the future. The first statement is that bilingual crosscultural education, as a program option, is and will continue to be an element of the California Community College System. Of equal importance, is the finding that existing programs have grown although largely unsupported by program development funds, but extremely well-supported by local advocacy efforts. Finally, based on demographic projections for the state of California for the next decade, bilingual crosscultural education will be in high demand by students and by the econony as the reed for bilingual workers grows in this state. Community colleges should respond to the needs of limited-English proficient student on the one hand while preparing bilingually competent individuals on the other. It is a supply and demand situation in which community colleges will play a pivotal role.

IV. RATIONALE FOR CONTINUED PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: POPULATION TRENDS

This document has established the policy basis for the California Community Colleges Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Education by detailing federal, state and local authority in this area. The material refers to the community college governance processes established in the Education Code and officiated through the Board of Governors. In addition, the narrative has provided a "current programs" section depicting the magnitude of existing programs and course offerings throughout the California Community College system. This section is designed to present a further rationale for the formulation and implementation of the Plan supported by the most basic of planning tools - demographics.

There are several reasons why a careful study of demographic trends must be at the basis of any curriculum, program, facilities or staffing plan of any community college. As "open door" institutions, community colleges must regard the entire population of the State of California as their service population. Second, if community colleges, as the name implies, are to be responsive to the needs of their service area, then the demographic characteristics of their communities must be analyzed and integrated into all aspects of their education services plan.

Most pertinent to the implementation of the Plan are demographic factors concerning race, ethnicity and language background. In this respect, we need to ask ourselves several questions:

I. What is the racial and ethnic breakdown of the population in the State of California?

II. What is the racial and ethnic breakdown of the students enrolled in community colleges?

III. What is the number and percentage of persons that come from a language minority background:

- estimated for the state;
- estimated for community colleges.

IV. What population trends are forecast for the next decade?

The following tables provide a reference format and answer some of the questions concerning demographic projections for the State.

I. Racial and Ethnic Breakdown in the State of California

TABLE 1

PERSONS IN CALIFORNIA BY RACE AND SPANISH ORIGIN COUNTS:
1980 CENSUS U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS "ADVANCED REPORT" 1980

Race	Count	Percentage of State Total Pop.
White	18,031,689	76
Black	1,819,282	7.7
American Indian	201,311	0.9
Asian/Pacific Islanders	1,253,987	6.0
Spanish Origin	4,543,770(a)	19.0
Other	362,293	1.9
State Total	23,668,562(b)	111.5(c)

Source: California State Department of Finance, Population Research Unit.

Note: Points a, b and c are inter-related and can be explained as follows:

a - "Spanish Origin" count is representative of a double count inasmuch as Spanish Origin persons were also counted under the "White," "Asian" and "Other" categories. The U.S. Bureau of the Census has developed an ethnic cross-coding procedure which will make possible the separation of "Spanish origin" counts per racial category. The Bureau of the Census has found nationally that 55.6% of all Hispanics called themselves "White," 2.7% listed themselves as Asian and 40% were classified as "Other." A state by state ethnic cross-code breakdown is expected from the Bureau in the next six months.

b - The state total of 23,668,562 is the actual total, not the cumulative total of the counts per race as indicated in this column. The reason is the "double-count" situation created by the "Spanish-Origin" category.

c - The State percentage total does not add to 100%. The reason is the same as in a and b above.

Table 1 indicates that over 30% of the State's population comes from a minority background. Of these 30%, 4/5 come from language minority backgrounds. This factor supports the need for bilingual instruction in this state.

II. Racial and Ethnic Breakdown for Community College

TABLE 2

FALL 1980 COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ENROLLMENT BY RACE

Race	Count	Percentage of Total Enrollment
White	790,725	63.12%
Black	96,567	7.70%
American Indian	16,658	1.33%
Asian/Pacific Islander	77,208	6.16%
Hispanic	128,692	10.27%
Non-Response	30,836	2.46%
Unknown	112,285	8.96%
Total	1,252,971	100.00%

SOURCE: California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office, Information Systems Project.

The Fall 1980 enrollment statistics for community colleges are impressive for a number of reasons. First, the fact that California Community Colleges enroll 1.25 million students makes our system the largest provider of postsecondary education, not only in the state, but nationwide. Secondly, the ethnic representation in terms of enrollment is proportionately more equitable than that of other systems of postsecondary education. Nevertheless, there are some areas of disparity which leave room for improvement, for example, the number of minorities enrolled in community colleges in proportion to their percentage of the total state population.

While comparison of the statewide demographic figures with the community college demographic figures is made difficult by the overlapping of the Hispanic origin designation with the racial categories, nevertheless some general conclusions may be drawn:

1. Blacks, American Indians, and Asian/Pacific Islanders appear to enroll in community colleges at a rate equal to or higher than their state total population percentages.

2. Whites appear to be represented in community colleges at roughly their percentage of the statewide population.

3. Hispanics comprise 19% of California's population but only 10% of the community college enrollments. They are thus the single most underrepresented group and are enrolled at roughly 47% below their parity level.

III. Language Census Projections

There is no comprehensive data collection mechanism in California which can enumerate the number of limited English proficient (LEP) persons in the state. Three recent studies have attempted to project LEP population counts: (1) The California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Unit, Language Census Count, 1976, 1980; (2) The Children's English Services Study 1976 (CESS) and (3) The National Center for Education Statistics, 1981 (NCES). One of the best comparisons of these three reports is provided in a study published by the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education (CACVE). The study is entitled, "Vocational Education and Employ ment Training Related Services for Limited-English Proficiency Persons In California: An Overview" (CACVE, 1981).

The following table is taken directly from the CACVE Study:

COMPARISON OF LEP POPULATION COUNTS BY SELECTED DATA SOURCES, 1976-2000

Data Source	Collection Approach	Age Group Studied	POPULATION COUNT AND PROJECTIONS			
			1976	1980	1990	2000
California State Department of Education	Census of all students proficiency test based	K-12 public schools	290,000	325,748	500,000	
CESS	Sample reliable at State level for Calif. proficiency test based	5-14 only	594,000			
NCES Study	Analysis of sample-based SIE, CESS, and CPR data	5-14 only	609,900	580,600	712,900	902,500

1. Projected
2. Count for 1978

SOURCES:

1) State Department of Education Language Census 1976, 1980.
2) "Education for Limited-English Speaking and Non-English-Speaking Students - Part II" July 1978 (State Department of Education).
3) CESS 1978
4) Projection of Limited-English Proficient Persons in the U.S. (unpublished figures from NCES 3-81)

The data provided by SDE, CESS and NCES focus primarily on the K-12 populations. The most pertinent and most accurate data in the state of California is that which has been gathered by SDE. The LEP projections made by SDE have applicability to the profile of future community college students. In fact, educators and administrators could safely infer an increase in the number of LEP students that will be attending community colleges in the next ten years.

There are other methods which have been utilized as indirect sources of the LEP population. One such study was conducted by the California School Finance Reform Project and the California Association for Bilingual Education in 1979. In examining enrollment in K-12 schools throughout California counties they found that the percent of LEP/NEP students was highly correlated with the percent of Hispanics students (r= .91) and percent of Asian students (r= .31). It is important to note that this high correlation applies only to the group studies, namely K-12 pupils in California during 1979. Nevertheless, given this high correlation, it is plausible to make some conjectures about the growing percentage of Hispanics and Asians in the state and a corresponding high correlation of LEP/NEP populations.

Refugee Resettlement in California

An important factor in the present demographic picture of California concerns the influx of refugees, especially Indochinese refugees. A preliminary report issued by the Department of Finance, Population Research Unit entitled, "Estimated Southeast Asian Refugees in California Counties August 31, 1981" contains some of the latest statistics for this group. The report places the total number of refugees at 201,781. This figure is higher than that which is reported by sources such as the American Public Welfare Association. In their July, 1981 newsletter, "Refugee Report" records the Indochinese refugee population for California at 170,412. Some of the reasons for this discrepancy may be due primarily to the "secondary-wave" migration being experienced by the state. "Secondary-wave" refers to refugees who have settled in other states, but move to California in search of jobs and education. Regardless of the reporting source, one fact is very clear--California has between 35 and 40% of the entire refugee population in the United States.

The implications for community colleges are very significant. Most of these refugees are in need of language and vocational skills training. The community colleges are charged with the responsibility to provide ESL and citizenship instruction. Secondly, community colleges are the largest, most accessible source of vocational education and, as such, the best source to meet the needs of refugees.

IV. Demographic Trends

The demographic picture presented in this section is one which clearly establishes a statement of need based on the ethnic and racial makeup of the population in the state. The two groups with the

highest growth factor between 1976 and 1980 are also the same groups with the highest incidence of LEP population. Three of the best indicators for the growth, decline or changing pattern of any particular segment of the population include; comparisons between two time periods, school enrollment statistics, and percentage of live births attributed to specific ethnic groups. The three following tables address these specific areas and are clearly indicative of future demographic trends in the state of California.

GROWTH IN STATEWIDE POPULATION BY SELECT ETHNIC GROUPS, 1976, 1980

Ethnic Group	SIE - 1976		1980 Census		Percent Increase of Ethnic Group
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Total Population	21,522,000	100.0	23,668,562	100.0	10.0
White	15,393,000	71.5	15,505,348*	65.5	.7
Hispanic	3,409,900	15.8	4,543,778	19.2	33.3
Asian	801,800	3.7	1,131,305	4.7	41.1

SOURCES: 1) CACVE - Study Report on the Vocational and Employment Related Services for Limited English Proficiency Persons in California (1981).
2) 1976 SIE, adjusted by State Department of Finance to include persons institutionalized and on ships.
3) Calculations based on data released by SDF, State Census Data Center.

*Note: The White population count in Table 5 (15,505,348) differs from that reported in Table 1 (18,031,689). The reason for this discrepancy is that Table 5 represents an adjusted figure which has utilized "ethnic cross-code" information available from the U.S. Bureau of the Census which permits manipulation of reported data by separating Hispanic origin persons from the White and Asian count and into their own discrete category. This statistical treatment eliminates double counting in the aforementioned categories.

TABLE 6

STATEWIDE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, K-12,
BY SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS, 1967-1979

Ethnic Group	1967		1979		Percent of Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total	4,431,995	100.0	4,068,020	100.0	- 8.2
Total Minority	1,123,167	25.3	1,626,900	40.0	+44.8
White	3,308,828	74.7	2,441,120	60.0	-26.2
Hispanic	616,226	13.9	953,295	23.4	+54.7
Asian, Filipino	121,596	2.8	230,873	5.7	+89.9

SOURCES: 1) CACVE - Study Report on the Vocational and Employment Training Related Services for Limited English Proficiency Persons in California (1981).

2) SDE Racial and Ethnic Survey, Fall 1979

TABLE 7

STATEWIDE NUMBER* OF BIRTHS BY
SELECTED ETHNIC GROUPS, 1979

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent of Toal Births	Ethnic Proportion of Total State Population, 1980
Total Population	377,211	100.0	
White	211,131	56.0	65.5
Spanish surname or Mexican-American	102,297	27.0	19.2
Asian/Filipino	14,239	3.8	4.7

SOURCES:

1) CACVE - Study Report on the Vocational and Employment Training Related Survey for Limited English Proficiency Persons in California (1981).

2) State Department of Health Services, Center for Health Statistics

*Births to California mothers out-of-state, estimated 1% of total not included.

There are many conclusions which may be drawn from the three preceding tables. It is very clear that those portions of the population from language minority backgrounds have had tremendous increases. In a relatively short period of time (1967-1969), the white K-12 population has decreased by 26.2% whereas Hispanic enrollment has increased by 54.7%. The same large rate of increase can be seen for Asian and Filipino students with a gain of 89.9 percent in their enrollment. This trend is very significant for the future of all postsecondary institutions. Lastly, it is crucial to note the figures concerning live births for 1979. Although whites make up 65.5% of the total population in the state, they only accounted for 56% of all live births. Hispanics on the other hand, accounted for 27% of all births even though they re present only 19% of the entire state population. Statistics concerning births further support the conclusion that the growth of linguistic minorities in the state is neither a recent nor a passing phenomenon, but rather, it is a solid, demographic trend that must be at the core of all future planning efforts at the primary, secondary and postsecondary educational levels.

V. PROPOSED MODEL FRAMEWORK

The California Community Colleges Plan for Bilingual Crosscultural Education is proposed as a structural framework for the planning processes of the various curriculum committees statewide. The Plan provides a bilingual crosscultural option to any community college student in any field. This option is to be made available through a specified course of study which would lead to an Associate in Arts degree with an added "Bilingual Cross-Cultural Specialization" or to a "Bilingual Cross-Cultural Certificate."

The Plan can also be of help in the "self study" process conducted by each college in preparation for the accreditation process as established by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. It is with these possible uses in mind that the Plan strives for inclusion of a number of characteristics that are designed to facilitate implementation.

Components of the Master Plan

I. Formulation of a Structural Framework

The plan provides a framework for a course of study which designates areas of concentration but does not specify courses. In accordance with Chancellor's Office policy, the selection of courses which constitute the framework is left entirely to the individual college district. There are four areas of emphasis which are included in the framework:

1. Area of major study - This is determined individually by students as they select a major. These could be any of the "Program Options" in the California Community Colleges Taxonomy of Programs which is offered by that particular college.

2. Crosscultural Relations Theory.- This area shall address and provide a broad introduction to the content and principles of cultural diversity as they are relevant to the Native American, the Afro-American, the Asian/Pacific Islander, and the Hispanic origin populations in the United States.

3. History and Culture of Target Group - This area shall also be determined by students' choice. They will enroll in ethnically oriented sociology, history and other courses for the target population desired (i.e., Hispanics, Asians, Native American, etc...). The content of course work shall include the study of cultural patterns of the target group based on historical antecedents of their respective "minority experience" in this country.

4. Language Competency and Comparative Contrastive/Linguistics The target language is to be determined by the student as Spanish, Cantonese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, Cambodian, Laotian, etc. The student is to achieve an exit level standard consistent with that required of bilingual teachers under the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (i.e., Foreign Services

Instrument [PSI] Level III). In addition, there is to be a requirement in the field of linguistics that will provide the student with rudimentary knowledge of the science of language and language construction.

II. Interdisciplinary Applicability

As stated earlier the proposed framework may be adopted or adapted across the various disciplines taught at a particular community college. These areas of study are defined in the "Master Plan and Inventory of Programs" published by the Chancellor's Office and include the following:

Agriculture and Natural Resources
Architecture and Environmental Design
Biological Sciences
Business and Management
Communications
Computer and Information Science
Education
Engineering and Related Fields
Fine and Applied Arts
Foreign Language
Health Services
Home Economics
Law
Letters
Library Science
Mathematics
Military Studies
Physical Sciences
Psychology
Public Affairs and Services
Social Sciences
Commercial Services
Interdisciplinary Studies
Apprenticeship

The following section presents a schematic diagram of the two educational options available to the student under this Plan.

STRAND A

A.A./A.S. Degree with a Bilingual Crosscultural Option

Step:
1. AA/AS Degree Major Requirements (18+ units)
2. Bilingual Crosscultural Option Requirements (12 to 18 units)*
3. General Education Requirements (G.E.)

+

4. Remainder Number of Units required to complete the 60-64 units as required for the degree
5. Receipt of AA or AS degree with a major and Bilingual Crosscultural Education option.

* May also be used to fulfill G.E. requirements

STRAND B

Certificate of Achievement with a Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis

Step:
1. Major Requirements (18+ units)
2. Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis Requirements (9 units)
3. Receipt of Certificate of Achievement in a major with a Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis

The number of units and course of study required for all the degrees and certificates granted by a community college district are clearly defined in the California Administrative Code Title 5 (Sections 51620-51626). The number of units and program of study required for each student will vary only within the guidelines provided by Title 5. Some of the factors for this variance in the proposed Plan for the Bilingual Crosscultural Education Option include:

1. Type of Credential, Degree or Certificate sought:
   a) Associate in Arts Degree
   b) Associate in Science Degree or;
   c) Certificate of Achievement

2. Type of Bilingual Crosscultural Program Selected:
   a) The Bilingual Crosscultural Option with General Education Equivalence (12-18 units) or;
   b) The Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis (9 units).

Three examples that further illustrate these program options have been provided below:

Example 1 - STRAND A
Associate in Arts Degree with a Major and Bilingual Crosscultural Option.

1. Journalism Major Requirements

JOURNALISM		Major Units Requirement	AA Degree Units Required
Required Courses:			
Jour.	Mass Communications: Print Media	3	
Jour.	News Writing	3	
Jour.	Editing	3	
Required Additional Courses:			
Select one (1) of the following courses			
Jour. A	Newspaper Management & Production	3	
Jour. B	Newspaper Management & Production	3	
Select six (6) units from the following courses:			
Engl. AB	Creative Arts Magazine Production	3-3	
Jour. AB	Newspaper Management & Production	3-3	
Jour. AB	Commercial Graphics	3-3	
Jour./Photo	Press Photography	3	
Spch.	Mass Communications; TV & Radio	3	
		18	18

+

2. Bilingual Crosscultural Education Option Requirements

Area of Study	Units	
Linguistics	3	
Crosscultural Studies	3	
History/Cultural Studies	3	
Foreign "Target" Language	0-6	
Field Study/Work Experience	3	
	12-18	18
Sub Total		36

+

3. Additional Units (24-30) to be completed through a combination of: 24
   - General Education Courses
   - Other Recommended Courses in the Major
   - Electives

Example 2 - STRAND A
Associate in Science with a Major and Bilingual Crosscultural Education Option.

Total 60

Example 2 - STRAND A

Associate in Science Degree with a Major and Bilingual Crosscultural option.

1. - Banking and Finance Major Requirements

	BANKING AND FINANCE	Major units Requirements	AA Degree Units Required
Required Courses:			
Bus.	Business Law	3	
Bus.	Principles of Bank Operations	3	
DP	The Computer and Society	3	
Econ.	Principles of Macro-Economics	3	
Sup.	Elements of Supervision	3	
Required Additional Courses:			
Select one (1) of the following sequences:			
Bus. AB	Accounting Principles I & II	4-4	
Bus. AB	Applied Accounting I & II	3-3	
Select one (1) of the following courses:			
Bus.	Business Communications 1	3	
Engl.	English Composition: Level 2	5	
Select one (1) of the following options and complete all courses listed:			
Bank Management option:			
Bus.	Bank Management	3	
Bus.	Bank Marketing and Public Relations	3	
Bus.	Analysis of Financial Statements	3	
Bank Services option:			
Bus.	Calculating Machines I	2 1/2	
Bus. AB	Intermediate Typing I & II	3-3	
Bus.	Commercial Bank Teller Training	3	
Credit Administration option:			
Bus.	Analysis of Financial Statements	3	
Bus.	Installment Credit	3	
Bus.	Negotiable Instruments	3	
		33-35 1/2	35 1/2

+

2. Bilingual Crosscultural Option Requirements

Area of Study	Units	
Linguistics	3	
Crosscultural Studies	3	
History/Cultural Studies	3	
Foreign "Target" Language	0-6	
Field Study/Work Experience	3	
Sub Total	12-18	18
		53 1/2

+

Additional Units (6 1/2-7 1/5) to be completed through a combination of:	6 1/2
- General Education Courses	
- Other Recommended Courses in the Major	
- Electives	
Total	60

Example 3 - STRAND B

Certificate of Achievement with a Major and Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis

1. Automotive-Industrial Technology Major Requirements

AUTOMOTIVE-Industrial Technology

Required Courses:		Units
Auto	Power Plant	9
Auto	Drive Line	9
Auto	Electrical Systems and Tune-up	9
Auto	Fuel Systems	9
		36

+

2. Bilingual Crosscultural Emphasis Requirements

Area of Study	Units
Crosscultural Communications	3
Foreign (Target) Language	3
Occupational Specific Language Instruction (Vocational Eng. as a Second Language/VESL)	3
	9 units

Total Number of Units Required - 45

III. Inclusion of General Education - (GE) Requirements

The program of study proposed by this framework has been carefully selected from areas which can also be applied toward the fulfillment of GE requirements. This approach would eliminate any "extra units" problem and would fulfill a key requirement within the A.A./A.S. degree program. Furthermore, these areas would be assured transferability to four-year institution.

The criteria for assessing general education applicability include both the general education requirements for the Associate degree, as expressed in the California Administration Code Title 5 (Section 51623), and the requirements for the Bachelor's degree, as expressed in Executive Order 342, issued by the Chancellor of the California State University. The Title 5 regulations are, at the time of this writing, being considered for revisions to increase their conformity to the CSU general education requirements.

As specified in Executive Order 342, the general education requirements for undergraduates seeking the Bachelor's degree include:

A. A minimum of nine semester units in communication in the English language, to include both oral communication and written communi cation, and in critical thinking, to include consideration of common fallacies in reasoning.

B. A minimum of 12 semester units to include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms, with some immediate participation in laboratory activity, and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

C. A minimum of 12 semester units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages.

D. A minimum of twelve semester units dealing with human social, political, and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

E. A minimum of three semester units in study designed to equip human beings for lifelong understanding and development of themselves as integrated physiological and psychological entities.

IV. Field Study

The inclusion of a direct "hands-on" practicum is recommended as an area of required study. The student shall participate in 3 units of work experience or field study to be chosen from the students major and conducted within a bilingual crosscultural setting. For example, a Health Sciences student would be asked to secure a field placement for 3 units of coursework in a public health facility primarily serving the chosen target population or a student in the field of education would be asked to function as a teacher aide in a bilingual classroom, etc.

Summary

The Plan proposes four areas of emphasis. Throughout each of these areas the student is involved in the planning process, thus making this plan highly individualized in nature. The student shall be called upon with the aid of a counselor to make the following decisions concerning:

1. Area of major study
2. Type of credential sought (AA/AS degree or Certificate Program)
3. Target Population and Language selected for study.
4. Type of bilingual crosscultural program sought (transfer option or certificate of emphasis).

The Plan also seeks to accomodate programmatic and administrative concerns of the faculty and staff by insuring adaptability across disciplines and transferability of course work. The following table capsulizes the Plan as defined in this section by describing the two proposed strands and general education equivalency requirements which are met by the recommended course work.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

PLAN FOR THE BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL PROGRAM OPTION

STRAND A CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BILINGUAL CROSS-CULTURAL AA/AS DEGREE TRANSFER OPTION	GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE B.A. DEGREE	STRAND B BILINGUAL CROSS-CULTURAL CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT WITH A BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL EMPHASIS
12-18 UNITS DISTRIBUTED AS FOLLOWS:		9 UNITS REQUIRED AS FOLLOWS:
3 units Linguistics - Comparative/Contrastive	Objective C - requiring 12 semester units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages.	
3 units Cross-Cultural Coursework - Content should focus on the dynamics of cross-cultural interactions (sociological, educational, political, etc.,.).	Objective D - requiring 12 semester units dealing with social, political and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.	3 units Cross-Cultural Communications - Course work should focus on the dynamics of cross-cultural interaction in U.S. society (sociological, historical, educational, etc.).
3 units in the area of History/Culture of target group - content of course work should include cultural patterns of target groups based on historical antecedents and their respective "minority-experience" in this country.	Objective D - requiring 12 semester units dealing with social, political and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.	
0-6 units in the Target Language - This may be specified by the student as Spanish, Cantonese, Laotian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Tagalog, etc. Course work may be waived by examination. Exit level criteria should be the same as that presently required by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.	Objective C - requiring 12 semester units among the arts, literature, philosophy and foreign languages.	3 units in the Target Language - This is specified by the student as Spanish, Cantonese, Laotian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Tagalog, etc. Exit criterion should be the acquisition of conversational skills.
3 units Field Study - To be chosen from the area of major study and to be conducted within a bilingual cross-cultural setting (requirement could be fulfilled through conferences, workshops, or field placement).	Will fulfill a student elective requirement.	3 units Occupational Specific Language Instruction - For the Limited-English Proficiency student, this would be the equivalent of Vocational Eng. as a Second Lang. (VESL). English speakers would choose occupational specific Lang. Inst. in the target language.

AS INDICATED BY THE ARROWS, THE CORE COURSE REQUIREMENTS RECOMMENDED FOR THE ACQUISITION OF THE BILINGUAL CROSSCULTURAL OPTION, CAN ALSO BE APPLIED TOWARD THE PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE.

VI. APPENDIX

A. Definition of Terms

B. Bibliography

A. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Instruction-Related Terminology

(a) "Partial bilingual instruction" means listening, speaking, reading and writing skills developed in both languages. Material related to culture and history is taught in the language the student understands better.

(b) "Full bilingual instruction" means basic language skills developed and maintained in both languages. Instruction in required subject matter or classes is provided in both languages in addition to culture and history.

(c) "Bilingual bicultural education" means instruction which uses two languages, one of which is English. It is a means of instruction which builds upon and expands the existing language skills of each participating pupil which will enable the student to achieve competency in both languages.

This instruction shall include:

1. Daily instruction in English, language arts, listening, speaking, reading and writing;
2. Language development in the student's primary language;
3. Reading in the student's primary language;
4. Selected subjects taught in the student's primary language; and
5. Development of an understanding of customs and values of the cultures associated with the languages being taught as well as an understanding of the history and culture of California and the United States.

(d) "Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students" are students who do not have the clearly developed English language skills of comprehension, speaking, reading and writing, necessary to receive instruction only in English at a level substantially equivalent to students whose primary language is English. The determination of which students are limited English speaking shall be made in accordance with the procedures specified in the California Education Code Section 52164. The term "limited English proficiency" students includes "non-English speaking students."

(e) "Non-English speaking proficiency (NEP) students" are students who communicate in their primary language only or who communicate in English at a level which does not enable them to participate meaningfully in an educational setting where only English is used.

(f) "Individual learning program" is any program of instruction for a limited English speaking student in which instruction is offered in a manner consistent with U.S. Supreme Court Decision in Lau vs. Nichols, (414 US 563), the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (20 USC Sec. 1701 et seq.), and federal regulations promulgated pursuant to such court decisions and federal statutes.

(g) "Primary language" means a language other than English which is the language the student first learned or the language which is spoken in the student's home.

(h) "Bilingual crosscultural teacher" is a person who (1) holds a valid, regular California teaching credential and (2) holds either a bilingual crosscultural certificate of proficiency or other credential in bilingual education authorized by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing or a bilingual crosscultural specialist credential. Such a person shall be fluent in the primary language and familiar with the cultural heritage of the limited English speaking pupils in the bilingual classes he or she conducts. Such a person shall have a professional working knowledge of the methodologies which must be employed to effectively educate those pupils.

(i) "Bilingual crosscultural teacher aide" is an aide fluent in both English and the primary language of the limited English speaking students in a bilingual bicultural program. Such an aide shall be familiar with the cultural heritage of the limited English speaking students in the bilingual classes to which he or she is assigned.

(j) "English as a Second Language (ESL)" is the instruction of English to speakers of other languages. The focus is strictly transitional (i.e., to transition the student from his/her primary language to English). Main program features include: emphasis on language usage and conversational skills (audio-lingual).

(k) "Vocational English as a Second Language (VESL)" VESL - Like ESL the emphasis is to teach English to speakers of other languages and the goal is that of rapid transition into English. VESL differs from ESL, however, in that language acquisition is directed to enable the student to participate in a) occupational education, b) pre-employment program, or c) on-the-job training. VESL attempts to teach language skills which are occupation specific and as such course content is far more structured and specialized.

(l) "Bilingual Vocational Education" Bilingual vocational education is defined by the Federal Register, Volume 42, No. 191, "Vocational Education, State Programs and Commissioner's Discretionary Programs." October 3, 1977, Part VI. "Bilingual vocational training" is training or retraining in which instruction is presented in both the English language and the dominant language of the persons receiving training and which is conducted as part of a program designed to prepare individuals of limited English-speaking ability for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or subprofessionals in recognized occupations and in new and emerging occupations which require a baccalaureate or advanced degree; bilingual vocational training includes guidance and counseling (either individually or through group instruction) in connection with such training or for the purpose of facilitating occupational choices.

Teacher Training Related Terminology

The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing authorizes the following credentials in bilingual education:

1. Bilingual-Crosscultural Specialist Credential. This credential may currently be issued on the basis of direct application to the Commission verifying completion of requirements in language, culture, and methodology. As of March 1978, 24 institutions had programs approved by the commission to prepare bilingual specialists.

2. Bilingual-Crosscultural Emphasis Credential. This credential may be issued on the recommendation of an institution conducting an multiple subject emphasis or single subject instruction program approved by the commission.

3. Emergency Bilingual-Crosscultural Credential. A district may recommend an applicant for this credential after verifying that the candidate has met all requirements, including language and culture proficiency.

4. Certificate of Competence. A certificate of competence may be issued to an applicant who submits an application and a fee of $30 and is recommended by an approved assessor agency certifying that the applicant has met the following requirements:

   - Possession of a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and student teaching.

   - Verification, by means of an approved assessment procedure, of ability to read, write, and communicate orally in the target language.

   - Verification, by means of an approved assessment procedure, of knowledge of the culture of the target population.

   - Verification of the ability to teach the basic subject matter in English and a language other than English.

B. BIBLIOGRAPHY

California Advisory Council on Vocational Education. 1981. HORIZON - "An Overview of Vocational Education And Employment Training Services For Limited-English Proficient Persons In California."

California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office. 1980. Information Systems Project. Fall 1980 Community College Enrollment By Race.

_____. 1979. Vocational Education Operational Policies: Supplementary Information for the Implementation of the Education Amendments of 1976 Title II, Vocational Education (P.L. 94-482 and P.L. 95-40).

_____. 1969. Policies of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges On Vocational Education.

_____. 1981. Resource Guide for Vocational Education - Utilization and Documentation of Federal Funds.
Agency's Master Plan for Refugee Assistance and Services.

_____. 1980. State Legislation Affecting California Community Colleges 1979, 1980 Legislative Sessions.

_____. 1980. Master Plan and Inventory of Programs.

_____. 1980. Reference Manual: Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions. Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

_____. 1981. California Community Colleges And The Comprehensive Employment And Training Act: Patterns Contributing To Obtaining Significant Amounts of CETA Funds In California Community College Districts.

_____. 1977. Program And Course Approval Procedures In California Community Colleges.

California Department of Education. State Board of Education. 1977. The California Five-Year State Plan for Vocational Education: A Planning Process. Vols. I, II and III (1977-82).

California Department of Education. Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. 1980. Background Statement on the Bilingual Education Program Quality Assessment Instrument, K-6.

_____. Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. 1979 and 1980. Data/BiCal Reports Nos. 79-1, 79-2, 79-2A, 80-2, and 80-3B.

_____. Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education. 1979. Federal and State Legal Basis For Bilingual Education.

_____. Office of Intergroup Relations. 1979. Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1979.

_____. "Statewide Summary of Pupil Performance on School District Proficiency Assessments." Report prepared in response to the requirements of California Education Code Section 51219, March 1981.

California Employment Development Department. Education/Industrial Liaison Office. 1980. Programs and Services Provided by EDD for the Limited- and Non-English Speaking.

California Employment Development Department. 1981. Hispanics in California: A Discussion of Labor Market Issues.

Commission For Teacher Preparation And Licensing. 1981. Status Report On Bilingual-Crosscultural Teacher Preparation In Accordance With California Education Code Section 10101: A Report To The State Legislature.

_____. 1981. Supply Of And Demand For Bilingual Teachers In School Districts In California.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. 1981. "Bilingual Teacher Education Credit Transfer Issues (A.B. 2615, Chacon)."

Development Associates, Inc. Management and Government Consultants. 1980. Evaluation of California's Educational Services to Limited and Non-English Speaking Students (Vol. I, Final Report).

State of California, Administrative Code, Title 5. 1981. (Register 77, No. 45 - November 5, 1977)

State of California Department of Finance, Population Research Unit. 1981. Population Estimates of California Cities and Counties. (January 1, 1980 and January 1, 1981.)

_____. 1980. Persons by Race and Spanish Origin and Housing Counts: 1980.

_____. 1981. Estimated Southeast Asian Refugees In California Counties.

State of California Education Code. 1979. Vols. I, II, III and IV.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Language Usage in the United States, July 1975 (Advance Report): Current Population Reports - Special Studies. Series P-23, No. 60 (July 1976).

_____. Bureau of the Census. Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1979 (Advance Report). Current Population Reports - Population Characteristics. Series P-20, No. 347 (October 1979).

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics: 1978-79. Bulletins 78-121, 78-134, and 79-144.

_____. National Center for Education Statistics, 1980. The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans.

_____. Social Security Administration. Office of Refugee Affairs. "Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program." Report to Congress. 31, December 1979.