

From Vision to Implementation: Building California's Bilingual Educator Workforce

Field-informed recommendations for state leaders and philanthropic organizations to address barriers, amplify assets, and turn multilingual educator workforce commitments into statewide results.

August 2026



Executive Summary

California has rebuilt a strong public commitment to bilingualism and biliteracy, but the educator workforce efforts needed to deliver that vision remain fragmented. Drawing on 52 interviews and focus-group sessions with 66 participants, an inventory of 144 initiatives, and public data and research, this report identifies four key findings and five actions to take to produce more well-prepared bilingual educators across the state.

Key findings

- **California has a multilingual vision, but no state-level workforce plan to deliver it.** The state lacks clear ownership, measurable workforce goals, and a sustained implementation strategy connecting student access to educator preparation, placement, and retention.
- **California leaders cannot yet see where bilingual educators are most needed or whether existing talent is reaching classrooms.** Preparation, authorization, assignment, and retention data remain disconnected, making it difficult to distinguish an overall shortage from regional challenges in preparation, hiring, placement, or retention.
- **California is losing bilingual candidates to avoidable barriers.** Uneven authorization routes, added costs, unpaid clinical preparation, and workload pressures can make pathways difficult for qualified candidates to enter and complete.
- **California's existing networks are an asset to build from.** Strong regional and statewide relationships already support collaboration, but learning, coordination, and successful approaches are not yet consistently connected across institutions or to state-level decision making.

Five actions California can take now

1. **Assign clear state leadership and develop a multi-year bilingual educator workforce plan** with measurable goals, responsibilities, funding, and accountability.
2. **Collect workforce data on a small set of practical questions** about program demand, candidate progress, and whether authorization holders are teaching and staying in bilingual classrooms.
3. **Evaluate, expand, and target new bilingual pathway investments** toward regions and languages where student need is high and access to preparation is limited.
4. **Improve access to authorization and paid clinical preparation** while maintaining rigorous expectations for bilingual educators.
5. **Strengthen an existing statewide network to coordinate field learning and action** across regional, community, preparation, advocacy, and public-system partners.

Public systems must ultimately own statewide leadership, data, accountability, and recurring funding. Philanthropy can accelerate progress by supporting short-term capacity, regional participation, evidence-building, and early implementation while helping successful approaches transition into durable public systems.

Introduction

California's multilingual vision now needs a workforce strategy

Just before 2020, California state TK-12 leaders established a bold vision for bilingualism and biliteracy¹. Since then, the state has not defined an implementation strategy to guide the preparation, placement, and retention of the educators essential to making that vision a reality.

Since California voters passed Proposition 58 in 2016 (which repealed the 1998 Proposition 227 that enacted significant restrictions on bilingual education, including English-only instruction, in the state) California has spent a decade rebuilding its commitment to multilingual education. From the English Learner Roadmap, Global California 2030, the Bilingual Teacher Professional Development Program (BTPDP), to the State Seal of Biliteracy, various state-level initiatives reflect a clear public goal: more students should have access to bilingualism and biliteracy because bilingualism is an asset. Yet the state has not established a coherent strategy to prepare, hire, place, and retain the educators needed to make that goal a reality.

Despite this, experienced educators, advocates, preparation programs, public investments, and community-rooted partnerships are developing multilingual talent statewide. Stakeholders interviewed for this study identified 144 initiatives spanning recruitment, preparation, authorization, hiring, professional learning, and retention. These efforts include integrated bilingual pathways, paid residencies, classified-to-teacher programs, community college partnerships, language-specific consortia, and regional collaborations (see [TNTP's initiative inventory](#) for more information). Many remain dependent on one-time funding, local relationships, or individual leaders. Importantly, the state lacks a single, accountable leader, shared workforce goals by region and language, and a public way to track candidates from preparation into bilingual assignments and through retention.



Students gather around Emerson Elementary School teacher Veronica Busby in celebration.

¹ In 2017, the California State Board of Education unanimously approved the [California English Learner Roadmap](#); and in 2019, the California Department of Education released [Global California 2030](#). Both documents laid out strong public support and commitments to advance multilingualism in the state.

The central challenge to advancing California's bilingual workforce is not a lack of activity. It is that activity is not producing and retaining more well-prepared educators in bilingual classrooms consistently and equitably across the state. Preparation programs may develop candidates without stable hiring demand. Districts may want to expand dual-language programs but hesitate because they cannot staff them. Educators may earn authorizations and then avoid or leave bilingual assignments because the workload, placement, or compensation is not sustainable. California cannot solve this problem by increasing credentials or expanding programs without a statewide staffing plan.

A policy window is now open. Assembly Bill 181 creates an Education Commissioner under the Governor's office, offering a clear place to assign responsibility for a statewide bilingual educator workforce strategy. In addition, the 2026-27 state budget establishes and provides \$10 million in one-time funding for the Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program, which supports partnerships among school systems and institutions of higher education to develop bilingual teacher pathways. Developments like these give California stronger tools than it had even a year ago—but legislation alone will not produce near-term workforce capacity, and full implementation will take time. State and philanthropic leaders can use this window to begin now by establishing or supporting clear state-level roles and responsibilities for implementation that connect existing data, strengthen regional pathways, and align current investments so they work together toward a coherent implementation strategy.

Prior research has documented bilingual teacher shortages, preparation deserts, uneven pathway access, and variation in program design. This report builds on that work by asking a different question: **What is preventing California's existing investments and expertise from increasing statewide capacity, and what should state leaders and philanthropic organizations do next?**

To answer this, TNTP conducted 52 interviews and focus-group sessions with 66 participants, developed an inventory of 144 stakeholder-named initiatives, and reviewed public data and existing research. The findings that follow identify where the system is misaligned, followed by recommendations outlining the most important actions California's state and philanthropic leaders can take now to advance solutions that alleviate those barriers.

The Findings

Finding 1: California has a vision for multilingualism in the state, but no state-level workforce plan to deliver on that vision

The state lacks clear ownership, measurable workforce goals, and a sustained implementation strategy connecting student access to educator preparation, placement, and retention.

The consistent gap that participants identified was not a lack of statewide vision for multilingualism in TK-12, but the concrete state-level actions needed to translate that vision into implementation. California's multilingual commitments do not specify how many or what types of educators are needed, where they are needed, or how to measure progress. Reflecting on the distance between the state's ambitions and its current trajectory, one participant put it plainly: "Handing someone the guiding principles doesn't teach them how to achieve them."

Without a clear, enforceable state implementation plan aligned with the bold vision laid out in the state's California English Learner Roadmap and Global California 2030, different parts of the system plan on different assumptions. Districts weigh program expansion against uncertain staffing. Preparation programs decide whether to open or sustain pathways without a stable picture of regional demand. Funders support promising models without a common measure of whether those investments are increasing access for students. Authorization totals often become the default indicator, even though they do not show whether educators are teaching in bilingual classrooms or remaining in those roles.

Participants also described how state funding supports promising work but rarely provides the stability needed to sustain it. California has invested in residencies, professional learning, candidate aid, and pathway development, but these efforts often operate on separate timelines and funding cycles. As one participant observed, the state has an "unfortunate trend of starting successful programs during funding surpluses, then pulling funding during downturns." Programs can demonstrate value and still struggle to retain staff, recruit another cohort, or plan beyond the grant period.

The governance transition creates an opening for clearer ownership, but within the current structure, participants could not name a single leader accountable for aligning workforce goals, investments, and results. This fragmentation is not unique to bilingual education; it reflects a broader challenge within California's TK-12 educator workforce system. Responsibility remains distributed across the California Department of Education (CDE), the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), higher education, county offices, districts, labor, and individual initiatives.

“

Handing someone the guiding principles doesn't teach them how to achieve them.

—Technical assistance provider and bilingual education leader, reflecting on the outcomes of Global 2030

Finding 2: California leaders cannot see where bilingual educators are needed, or whether existing talent is reaching classrooms

Preparation, authorization, assignment, and retention data remain disconnected, making it difficult to distinguish an overall shortage from regional challenges in preparation, hiring, placement, or retention.

When we asked where California's bilingual teacher shortage was most severe, the answer changed by region, language, grade level, and role. Districts described vacancies in particular classrooms. Preparation programs reported candidates who completed coursework but did not clear the final authorization requirement. Researchers pointed to geographic access and retention. Anecdotal evidence did not point to a single clear source of the shortage.

California has many of the pieces needed to better understand and quantify its bilingual educator workforce, but those pieces remain scattered across separate data systems rather than assembled into a complete picture. CTC data identifies who holds an authorization, which preparation program recommended the educator, and whether the credential is active. CDE holds employment and assignment data. But California does not collect a consistent classroom-level identifier to connect preparation and workforce data; this key missing piece would allow CTC and CDE to connect more easily and show where educators with Bilingual Authorization (BILA) and Bilingual, Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) certification are teaching. The employment information CTC receives from CDE has also historically come through an annual file limited largely to assignment monitoring, constraining broader supply-and-demand analysis. As a result, the state has only a partial view of the workforce. This has significant implications for the state's ability to respond with regionally targeted data-informed solutions to strengthen its educator pipeline. California cannot reliably identify where programs operate and plan to grow, how candidates move through different authorization routes, or whether authorization holders are teaching and staying in bilingual assignments.



Second-grade students engage in their morning lesson.

Finding 3: California is losing bilingual candidates to avoidable barriers

Uneven authorization routes, added costs, unpaid clinical preparation, and workload pressures can make pathways difficult for qualified candidates to enter and complete.

Across interviews, participants shared that the bilingual teacher pipeline narrows significantly, not because multilingual talent is absent, but because candidates often encounter burdensome requirements and financial tradeoffs. These barriers disproportionately affect paraprofessionals, first-generation college students, working adults, and candidates already rooted in communities that need bilingual educators.

Preparation and authorization pathways are uneven

California permits several routes to bilingual authorization. Some institutions integrate the authorization into the initial credential, use approved coursework, or offer an in-house language proficiency assessment; others rely on a stand-alone exam. Candidates therefore face different requirements, costs, and timelines, partly based on the institution they attend.

Participants described an avoidable mismatch between what some preparation pathways develop, what authorization processes assess, and what bilingual teaching requires. Some educators interviewed reflected upon programs that prioritized conversational fluency but did not prepare candidates for the formal writing, academic vocabulary, and instructional language required in bilingual classrooms. As one program leader put it, “Being bilingual is not the same as being biliterate.” Additionally, participants repeatedly questioned whether language assessments, preparation, and the actual work of bilingual teaching are sufficiently aligned.

“

Being bilingual is not the same as being biliterate.

—Bilingual educator preparation leader, reflecting on gaps between preparation and classroom practice

Time, cost, and clinical preparation push candidates out

Participants described added tuition and assessment fees, demanding course loads, and unpaid clinical practice as significant barriers. In one district, an employee pursuing a credential had to take unpaid leave and lose salary and benefits to complete student teaching. At one county office, between 85 and 100 people attended a Bilingual Teacher Professional Development Program information session, but only eight entered the first cohort; staff attributed the drop to existing workload and anxiety about the authorization exam.

Clinical placements can create another bottleneck when programs cannot find enough qualified, language-matched mentor teachers. Together, these conditions can make a pathway technically available but practically out of reach for candidates who need to continue earning while they prepare.

The burden can continue after authorization

Participants also described bilingual roles that carry added translation, family communication, materials development, and instructional responsibilities without dependable compensation or planning time. In some schools, educators saw the authorization become a “workload trap,” discouraging teachers from pursuing or remaining in bilingual assignments. Qualified authorization holders may also teach in English-only roles or be reassigned away from bilingual classrooms.

Across the initiative inventory, stronger pathways address several of these barriers at once: integrating bilingual authorization into the initial credential, allowing candidates to earn while they learn, providing sustained clinical preparation with language-matched mentors, and connecting preparation to actual district hiring needs. These examples suggest that California does not need to lower expectations for bilingual educators. It needs pathways that are rigorous, aligned, affordable, and achievable for qualified candidates.

Finding 4: California’s existing networks are an asset to build from

Strong regional and statewide relationships already support collaboration, but learning, coordination, and successful approaches are not yet consistently connected across institutions or to state-level decision making.

California already has places where the field works together. Participants named Multilingual Education for All by 2035, California Educator Diversity Action Network (CEDAN)², the Emerging Bilingual Collaborative (EBC), regional partnerships, and funder collaborations as trusted tables for developing policy, exchanging information, coordinating investments, and solving problems. The opportunity is not to create another space, but to support existing ones so the field can align more effectively.

Participants described relationships within these networks that are strong but not always easy to navigate beyond the people within them. Experienced leaders often know whom to call or where to send a candidate. Newer organizations, candidates, and leaders outside established networks may not have access to the same knowledge.

The initiative inventory shows where stronger connections could add value. Institutions of higher education operate roughly 40 percent of the initiatives identified, including multiple programs serving overlapping regions. Yet participants described few consistent routines for sharing candidate referrals, faculty, course designs, or lessons across institutions. Regional capacity also varies widely. One county office described its entire multilingual education function as “a team of one.”

40%

of identified bilingual workforce initiatives are operated by institutions of higher education, yet participants described few consistent routines for sharing candidates, faculty, or lessons across institutions.

² TNTP is a Core Partner of the California Educator Diversity Action Network.

The evidence points to a coordination opportunity, not a coordination failure. Many of these networks and coalitions are relatively nascent; it will be paramount for them to prioritize alignment and information sharing with existing partners and potentially with new ones where the inventory shows stronger connections could add value. California has trusted relationships and strong organizations. What is less developed is a reliable way to carry grants and learning across institutions, preserve knowledge beyond individual leaders, and connect what the field is learning to state decisions.

Five actions California can take now

California leaders have promising work underway. The next step is a focused, state-level implementation strategy that clarifies who should act, what should happen next, and how to measure progress. This report's recommendations focus specifically on state leaders and philanthropic leaders. The five recommendations below identify actions these system-level leaders can take to move California from a patchwork of promising activities to a more coherent bilingual educator workforce strategy. Each names the public or field actor best positioned to lead, the next step that actor can take now, and ways philanthropy can help advance the work. They are intentionally specific about the desired result while leaving agencies, regional partners, and field leaders room to determine the best implementation approach, and without creating parallel systems or shifting responsibilities that should ultimately be publicly sustained.

Recommendation 1: Assign clear state leadership over an implementation strategy and require a multi-year bilingual educator workforce plan

Make the bilingual educator workforce an explicit part of the Education Commissioner's core mandate and set measurable goals to increase student access to well-prepared educators.

The transition to an appointed Education Commissioner creates an opportunity to clarify state responsibility for the bilingual educator workforce. The incoming Education Commissioner, mandated by recent state legislation, should designate a senior leader to coordinate this work across the CDE and with other state and regional partners. While this report focuses on bilingual and dual-language educators, this approach also could inform and benefit the state's broader educator workforce strategy.

Recommendations for state leaders

Within the Commissioner's first year, the designated leader should work with state education agencies and key partners to publish a three- to five-year bilingual educator workforce plan. The participating agencies should establish memoranda of understanding and data-sharing agreements that clarify their respective responsibilities, the information each will contribute, and how they will jointly monitor progress. The plan should:

- **Update Global 2030** to include vision, strategy, goals, and implementation plan.
- **Set student-access and dual language program-growth** goals by region, language, and grade span.
- **Translate those goals into targets** for educator preparation, hiring, bilingual assignment, and retention.
- **Define each state agency and system partner's responsibilities**, including who makes decisions, coordinates implementation, produces data, and reports results.
- **Identify the recurring public funding** needed to carry out the plan.
- **Establish a small set of student and educator outcome measures** and report progress annually.

- **Identify immediate actions** that can begin before the full plan is implemented, such as establishing shared definitions, completing a baseline workforce analysis, connecting existing data, and testing regional planning approaches.

Recommendations for philanthropic leaders

- **Fund planning capacity and a baseline analysis to support the development of California's first bilingual educator workforce plan.** Support the meaningful participation of regional, community, and practitioner partners in the planning process.
- **Support an independent annual progress brief** that helps the field understand where the state is advancing, where implementation has stalled, and where additional action is needed.
- **Fund early analyses or regional demonstrations** to test workforce planning, data coordination, and regional implementation before scaling statewide.

Recommendation 2: Collect data to answer key questions about California's bilingual workforce to inform strategy

Start with the information that state and regional leaders need to plan programs, target investments, and better understand workforce gaps.

California's data needs are many, and addressing those challenges can be overwhelming if approached all at once. But the state does not need to solve every workforce data problem at one time.

Recommendations for state leaders

The CDE, CTC, and Office of Cradle-to-Career Data (C2C) should first focus on three practical data priorities:

- **Map where dual language and other bilingual instructional programs are operating and growing.** CDE should establish a common way to identify bilingual programs and classrooms and publish information on program model, language, grade span, and enrollment. It should also test practical ways to capture vacancies and planned program expansion based on student need. A county-level inventory underway in Los Angeles County could provide a useful model and testing ground for this work.
- **Track where candidates enter and leave the bilingual educator pathway.** CTC should build from existing preparation-program and authorization data to make candidate entry, completion, and bilingual authorization more visible by language, preparation program, pathway type, and assessment route. Where important gaps remain, CTC should phase in a small number of additional indicators, such as whether candidates enter through classified or paraprofessional roles or other multilingual talent pools.
- **Connect authorization data to bilingual assignments and retention.** CDE and CTC should define the information needed to distinguish bilingual assignments from other teaching roles. C2C should phase in the connection of authorization, assignment, and retention data. The state should pair these data with targeted regional analysis to better understand why authorization holders may not enter or remain in bilingual assignments, including factors such as vacancies, reassignment, workload, compensation, and professional support.

Together, these priorities would help California distinguish an overall supply shortage from more specific challenges in preparation, hiring, assignment, program growth, or retention. Implementation should be phased: first establish shared definitions, ownership, and a baseline using existing data; then test and add the limited new measures or data linkages needed to fill the most consequential gaps.

Recommendations for philanthropic leaders

- **Fund the technical design, regional testing, and interim analyses needed to develop these data priorities**, including documenting lessons from Los Angeles County and other early efforts that state agencies can adapt.
- **Support state and local advocacy for streamlined data collection, cross-agency data sharing, and public reporting** so that technical improvements lead to durable changes in California's public data infrastructure rather than a separate philanthropic system.

Recommendation 3: Evaluate, expand, and target the Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program

Use new funding to build affordable, complete pathways in regions where student need is clearly defined and access to preparation is limited.

The Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program provides a timely opportunity to address several barriers identified in this report by supporting regional partnerships among school systems, community colleges, and educator preparation programs. Its emphasis on integrated preparation and regional collaboration could help connect parts of the bilingual educator pathway that too often operate separately. Its impact, however, will depend on whether funding reaches communities with the greatest unmet need, supports complete pathways rather than isolated activities, and produces evidence the state can use to improve and sustain future investments. The promise of this new funding law depends on strong, effective state oversight and accountability.

Recommendations for state leaders

- **Establish and use a clear definition of student need to evaluate and prioritize applicants for Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program funding**, including the number and concentration of English learners and multilingual students; student access to bilingual and dual language programs; bilingual educator vacancies and authorization needs; existing or planned district bilingual programs; and proximity to preparation providers. Using multiple indicators would help the state avoid defining need solely through English learner enrollment or existing vacancies, both of which may understate demand in communities where programs have not expanded because the workforce is unavailable.
- **Increase and target funding for the Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program in 2026-27**, prioritizing regions with high concentrations of English learners but limited access to nearby bilingual educator preparation, rural communities, languages other than Spanish, and regions with demonstrated Local Education Agency (LEA) vacancies. Use implementation and outcome data from funded partnerships to inform future funding decisions.
- **Ensure funding supports complete pathways** that connect preparation to district needs; integrate the bilingual authorization into the initial credential when possible; provide paid clinical practice; ensure access to prepared and language-matched mentors; create clear handoffs across the educator preparation and placement process; and report key candidate metrics using the shared measures developed under Recommendation 2.

Recommendations for philanthropic leaders

- **Offer planning support** to regional partnerships to apply for The Pathways to Bilingual Teaching Program AB 2325 funding
- **Support partnerships** seeking funding where a single institution cannot sustain a complete pathway on its own
- **Invest in regional analysis of workforce needs** to position regions to apply for public funding

Recommendation 4: Improve access to authorization and paid clinical preparation

California can reduce avoidable differences across programs while maintaining rigor and supporting candidates who need to keep earning while they are in training.

Two practical changes would make the pathway into the classroom more consistent and affordable without lowering programmatic rigor: strengthening authorization routes to better align with practice and make them easier to access, and making clinical preparation financially possible for working candidates.

Recommendations for state leaders

- **Review whether existing bilingual authorization examinations are aligned with the work of bilingual teaching.** The CTC should conduct and publish a review assessing whether examination content and formats align with the language knowledge, academic literacy, and instructional skills required in bilingual classrooms. The review should be informed by preparation-program faculty, practicing bilingual educators, recent candidates, language-assessment experts, and representatives of languages other than Spanish.
- **Ensure candidates in state-funded bilingual pathways can complete required clinical preparation without leaving paid employment.** Programs should connect candidates to available student-teaching stipends, residencies, apprenticeships, or other earn-while-you-learn models.
- **Make the full cost of preparation transparent and reduce avoidable candidate expenses.** State-funded pathways should disclose the full-time and out-of-pocket cost of completion before candidates enroll, including whether clinical practice will require them to reduce or leave paid employment. When funding permits they should cover added tuition, fees, and assessment costs.

Recommendations for philanthropic leaders

- **Fund technical assistance to support preparation programs** to integrate BILA into credential programs to make them accessible and more affordable.
- **Provide temporary scholarship support for BILA candidates** while paid clinical preparation is incorporated into state grants and other recurring public funding streams.
- **Support efforts by public agencies to update, strengthen, and streamline the authorization process**, as described in the state-leader recommendations above.

Recommendation 5: Leverage existing network infrastructure to coordinate field learning and inform action

Use existing, trusted tables to connect regional work, share learning, align advocacy, and help state leaders act on what the field is seeing.

California does not need another coalition. Participants described several trusted networks already bringing together advocates, preparation programs, regional partners, funders, and other leaders working on multilingual education. The opportunity is to strengthen existing infrastructure so that regional experience and promising approaches are shared more consistently, recurring challenges can inform policy development and coordinated advocacy, and the field can provide useful feedback and support as the state implements a stronger bilingual educator workforce strategy.

Recommendations for state leaders

- **Engage existing field networks as implementation partners.** The Education Commissioner and designated bilingual educator workforce lead should regularly seek input from established statewide and regional tables on implementation challenges, emerging needs, and progress toward workforce goals.
- **Use field learning to inform state action.** State leaders should draw on recurring issues surfaced through these networks to help shape policy, budget, data, and implementation decisions rather than creating a new advisory body.

Recommendations for philanthropic leaders

- **Fund coordination capacity for existing statewide networks**, including facilitation, shared priority-setting, and meaningful participation from regional and community partners, to enable them to explicitly collaborate with each other on the state's multilingual workforce needs.
- **Support existing networks in identifying common implementation barriers**, sharing promising approaches across regions, and advancing coordinated policy and funding priorities.
- **Use shared learning to better align philanthropic investments**, reduce duplication, and direct resources toward gaps identified by the field.

Conclusion

California has a strong foundation for expanding access to bilingual education: a clear multilingual vision, committed educators and advocates, active preparation programs, regional partnerships, public investments, and philanthropic support.

The challenge is not a lack of effort, but that these assets do not yet add up to a statewide strategy that consistently prepares, places, and retains well-prepared educators in bilingual classrooms. Candidates continue to face financial and authorization barriers, state data cannot yet show where bilingual educators are most needed or whether authorization holders are working and staying in bilingual roles, and coordination often depends on individual relationships and time-limited funding.

The five recommendations in this report offer a practical agenda for addressing these conditions: clarify state leadership, strengthen workforce data, expand regional pathways, improve access to authorization and paid clinical preparation, and strengthen field coordination.

No single agency, organization, or investment can carry this work alone. Public systems must ultimately own statewide leadership, data, accountability, and recurring funding. Regional partners must connect statewide goals to the realities of candidates, educators, districts, and communities. Philanthropy can help by providing time-limited capacity, supporting regional participation, and building the evidence needed to inform stronger public decisions.

About TNTP

TNTP is the leading research, policy, and practice organization dedicated to transforming America's public education system to meet the needs and expectations of tomorrow—for students, families, communities, and the nation. We are educators, researchers, innovators, and futurists committed to the belief that every student deserves access to a quality education and formative experiences that lead to a lifetime of economic and social mobility, regardless of zip code, race, class, primary language, or learning style.

Appendix

Methodology, Evidence Base, and Scope

Evidence base

This report draws on three sources of evidence:

1. **Interviews and focus groups.** TNTP conducted 52 sessions with 66 participants who prepare, hire, support, regulate, study, fund, and advocate for California's bilingual educator workforce. Participants represented state agencies, school districts, county offices of education, institutions of higher education, community and advocacy organizations, research organizations, and philanthropy.
2. **Initiative inventory.** Participants identified 144 initiatives spanning recruitment, preparation, authorization, hiring, professional learning, funding, research, advocacy, and coordination. TNTP coded the inventory to identify where activity is concentrated, which organizations and regions are involved, and where connections or gaps may exist.
3. **Public data and existing research.** TNTP reviewed information from the CDE, CTC, C2C, and other public sources, along with research and policy documents on educator preparation, bilingual authorization, geographic access, state governance, and workforce investments.

Analysis

TNTP analyzed 389 coded observations from interviews and focus groups for patterns across stakeholder groups and the workforce pathway, from recruitment and preparation through authorization, clinical practice, hiring, assignment, working conditions, and retention. Findings were considered strongest when they appeared across multiple stakeholder groups and were also supported by public data, research, or the initiative inventory. Quotations illustrate broader patterns and should not be interpreted as representing every participant's view.

How to use the initiative inventory

The initiative inventory is a **field-informed resource, not a comprehensive statewide census**. It reflects initiatives named by participants and can help users:

- Understand the range of work underway across the workforce pathway.
- Identify similar approaches across organizations and regions.
- Surface potential gaps or questions requiring deeper analysis.
- Strengthen connections among initiatives working on related challenges.

An initiative's absence does not mean the work does not exist; it may simply not have been named during this project.

Scope and limitations

This report identifies patterns, shared challenges, and opportunities for action; it does not evaluate or rank individual programs. The available evidence does not allow TNTP to:

- Determine the effectiveness or comparative impact of every initiative or identify a single “best” model.
- Account for every public or philanthropic investment or definitively identify funding or preparation deserts.
- Calculate the full bilingual educator shortage by region and language.
- Consistently connect bilingual authorization data to classroom assignment and retention.

Information on initiative funding, duration, outcomes, and geographic reach was not consistently available, and public data limitations constrain analysis across preparation, authorization, assignment, and retention.

Accordingly, the report distinguishes between what the evidence **shows, suggests, and still requires additional data or validation to determine**. Its findings and recommendations are intended as a starting point for action and continued learning, not a final accounting of every program, investment, or workforce need in California.