

Alexander Urasaki  
Oxford Scholars  
07 October 2016

Proposition 58 appearing as "SB 1174 (Chapter 753, Statutes of 2014), Lara. English language education" on the ballot, states that it would no longer be required for schools to enforce English-only education for English learners. Instead, schools would be allowed to utilize multiple programs, including bilingual education programs in which students learn from a teacher who speaks both their native language and English. In addition, parents would no longer need to sign parental waivers in order for their children to take non-English-only classes. The exact summary on the ballot reads as follows: "Preserves requirement that public schools ensure students obtain English language proficiency. Requires school districts to solicit parent/community input in developing language acquisition programs. Requires instruction to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and effectively as possible. Authorizes school districts to establish dual-language immersion programs for both native and non-native English speakers. Fiscal Impact: No notable fiscal effect on school districts or state government." Also, the state's legislative analyst and its director of finance have published "no notable fiscal effect on school districts or state governments."

A vote "yes" is a vote in favor of repealing most of the 1998 Proposition 227, the "English in Public Schools" Initiative, which effectively allows non-English languages to be used in public educational instruction. The proposition was sponsored by 6 congressmen and proposed by Sen. Ricardo Lara (D-33). The prop has support from 47 officials including Gov. Jerry Brown (D). Major backing for the "yes" vote comes from the California Teachers Association/Issues PAC. In addition, groups including the California Democratic Party, California Chamber of Commerce, and SEIU California support the measure to approve

Proposition 58. Supporters of the prop argue that passing the prop would result in a multitude of benefits for all California students. Supporters make the argument that it would allow all students to become proficient in English at an accelerated rate, as well as benefit English speakers as it would encourage schools to use instruction programs rather than expand multilingual education, thereby providing English speakers the opportunity to learn a second language. By removing the statewide regulations in place from Proposition 227, it would restore local control for California schools. Additionally, multilingual education, supporters argue, would prepare students more effectively for the future, and encourage "intercultural interactions and empathy.

A vote "no" is a vote against repealing the previous regulations in place from Proposition 227, which were designed to prohibit non-English languages from being used in public schools. The "no" side has yet to organize a PAC and has the sole support from U.S. Rep. Tom McClintock. However, the California Republican Party, as well as the Libertarian Party of California oppose the measure to pass Proposition 58. The argument opposing the motion can be broken up into two complaints. First opponents state that the prop hides other repeals that would be detrimental to students. Specifically, focusing on Section 8, in which repeals all restriction on the California Legislature to make future changes. Opponents argue that this would allow the Legislature to reestablish Spanish-Almost-Only instruction with a single vote. This would effectively force Latino children into these classes, independent of their parents' wishes. The second major argument the opposition makes is to the success of the education system under the restrictions of Proposition 227. They argue that the regulations have shown to benefit Latino children, quoting figures that show the test scores increased within four years of the passing of Prop 227. The basis for this argument is that before Prop 227, bilingual classes were

unsuccessful, and if the regulations are repealed then the education system will be less successful.

In my personal opinion Proposition 58 will pass. I make this assumption based on what is revealed when you compare context of 1998 in which Proposition 227 was passed, and the current situation of California. In 1998 this issue was a lot more emotional a support for reform was strong. USA Today, in a May 20, 1998 editorial stated, "California initiative exposes flawed bilingual programs... Polls suggest the referendum [Proposition 227] will pass by a wide margin June 2. But no matter which way it turns out, the proposal's popularity, has exposed broad and deep national failures in the way bilingual programs are run." In 1998 support for Proposition 227 was widespread including the Los Angeles Times, which on May 6, 1998 published an article with the headline, "Sensible Bilingual Reform."

However the situation in California has changed since 1998. The most recent polls show 59% support, 21% oppose, and 21% are undecided. There is a large amount of support for the repeal of Proposition 227. The Santa Rosa Press Democrat, recently published an article that read, "Proposition 58 on the Nov. 8 ballot would repeal Proposition 228 and restore the ability of local school districts, in consultation with parents, to offer bilingual education programs. Over the past several years, California has been increasing local control of K-12 education. Proposition 58 is another step in that direction, and The Press Democrat recommends a yes vote." Overall there has been a change in opinion over the last 18 years in California. The Los Angeles Times revised their opinion stating "... there's a difference between bilingual education done badly and bilingual education done right. A vast store of research shows that bilingual education, when it is well-designed and implemented, can be at least as good, and often better at helping immigrant and other non-English speaking students gain academic proficiency... And if

students aren't achieving academically, Proposition 58 could be amended through a simple majority vote of the Legislature. Immigrant parents and their local school districts should be trusted to work this out together. Vote yes on Proposition 58.” Even the man who wrote Proposition 227, Ron Unz, has changed his opinion. During his campaign for Barbara Boxer’s vacant seat, Unz stated that the main reason for his candidacy was to raise awareness about SB 1174 and efforts to repeal Proposition 227, releasing a statement that read, “After considering various options, I decided that becoming a statewide candidate myself was the probably the best means of effectively focusing public attention on this repeal effort and defeating it,”