

Assessing Dual Language Learners and the Desired Results Developmental Profile  
(2015)

Linda Espinosa

University of Missouri, Columbia

Ann-Marie Wiese

WestEd, Center for Child and Family Studies

Carola Matera

California State University, Channel Islands

In the 2013-2014 school year, English learners accounted for more than 9 percent of kindergarten through 12th grade enrollment in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016, as cited in National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, Medicine [NASEM], 2017). A significant percentage of school-age children in California come from homes in which a language other than English is spoken; as of 2015 this number was 45 percent, the highest of any state (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). As of 2016, 22.1 percent of California children in public schools were considered English learners, which are described as children “with a primary language other than English and who lack the defined English language skills of listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing necessary to succeed in a school’s regular instructional programs” (California Department of Education, 2016). More than 65 primary languages are spoken in the homes of English learners overall, although the majority (83.5 percent) of such households speak Spanish (California Department of Education, 2016).

In many other states, numbers of English learners are also increasing. For example, as recently as the 2013-2014 school year, 9.5 percent of school-age children in the state of Illinois were categorized as limited English proficient (LEP), an increase since 2000 when children categorized as LEP accounted for 6.1 percent of school-age children (Illinois State Board of Education, 2014a, 2014b). In total, during the 2011-2012 school year, LEP students spoke at least 138 languages other than English, while the vast majority (81 percent) of LEP students spoke Spanish (Illinois State Board of Education, 2013).

Throughout this paper, the term “dual language learner” (DLL) is used to refer to children who speak a language other than English.<sup>1</sup> The use of this term, in contrast to “English learners,” acknowledges that the child is still developing proficiency in the home language while also acquiring a second language. In fact, the Office of Head Start (2016) states:

Children who are Dual Language Learners acquire two or more languages simultaneously, and learn a second language while continuing to develop their first language. The term “dual language learners” encompasses other terms frequently used, such as Limited English Proficient (LEP), bilingual, English language learners (ELL), English learners, and children who speak a Language Other Than English (LOTE).

Overall, the significant population of children who speak a language other than English brings into play specific considerations for accurate assessment of these children, in particular responsiveness to their linguistic, cultural, social, and developmental attributes (Espinosa, 2010). The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) provides guidance in the supplement to its position statement on early childhood curriculum, assessment, and program evaluation (*Where We Stand: On Assessing Young English Language Learners*): “All young children have

---

<sup>1</sup> For further discussion on the lack of consensus among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners with regards to terminology, see Chapter 1 of *Promoting the Educational Success of Children and Youth Learning English: Promising Futures* (NASEM, 2017).

the right to be assessed in ways that support their learning and development. For children whose home language is not English, this means being assessed in culturally and linguistically responsive ways” (NAEYC, 2009, p. 1).

The chronic academic underachievement of the DLL population across the nation (Galindo, 2010) and their school-readiness gaps at kindergarten entry (Cannon & Karoly, 2007; Lee & Burkham, 2002) underscore the requirement for more effective assessment approaches that are linked to improved instruction for young DLLs. With the ultimate intent of closing the achievement gap, federal initiatives, such as the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge (RTT-ELC) grant program<sup>2</sup> and the National Education Panel Goals,<sup>3</sup> have brought to the forefront efforts to define what areas of learning and development are crucial to school readiness as well as fair and accurate methods to assess school readiness. The U.S. Department of Education defines the essential domains of school readiness as language and literacy development, cognition and general knowledge (including early mathematics and early scientific development), approaches toward learning, physical well-being and motor development, and social and emotional development.<sup>4</sup>

An additional consideration is the need to assess the learning and development of young DLLs in both the home language and English. The Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant calls for states to comply with requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act regarding the development of valid and reliable assessments for DLLs (referred to as limited English proficient students in the legislation) (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009). The revised Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework calls for DLLs to be assessed in both languages (Office of Head Start, 2015). This recommendation is echoed by several states, including California and Illinois, which require that assessments be completed in the child’s home language as well as English. Although many other states do not heed this recommendation, policymakers, researchers, and assessment experts are increasingly concerned that English-only assessments will underestimate children’s true abilities. As such, they agree that there is a critical need for state assessment systems that are accurate and valid for young DLLs (Espinosa & Garcia, 2012; NASEM, 2017).

To this end, the California Department of Education’s (2015a) Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP [2015])<sup>5</sup> represents a significant effort to assess young

---

<sup>2</sup> For further information visit: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ecd/programs/race-to-the-top>

<sup>3</sup> For further information visit: <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/negp/index-1.htm>

<sup>4</sup> For further information visit: <http://www.ed.gov/early-learning/elc-draft-summary/definitions>

<sup>5</sup> The *DRDP (2015): A Developmental Continuum from Early Infancy to Kindergarten Entry* was developed by the California Department of Education (2013). Two divisions of the California Department of Education jointly developed the DRDP (2015): The Early Education and Support Division (EESD) and the Special Education Division (SED). Lead agencies that participated in the development of the instrument include the WestEd Center for Child and Family Studies, the Desired Results Access Project at the Napa County Office of Education, and the Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment Research (BEAR) Center at the University of California, Berkeley. The *Desired Results*

DLLs in a culturally and linguistically appropriate manner. The DRDP (2015) provides a standardized observational assessment aligned with early learning and development standards and kindergarten standards. One developmental continuum for use with children from early infancy to the end of kindergarten is represented with three instrument views: Infant/Toddler View, Preschool View, and Kindergarten View. To develop the DRDP (2015), WestEd collaborated with researchers and content area experts to design an observational instrument to assess children in the core domains of learning and development. Throughout the development of the DRDP (2015), special consideration was taken to address the needs of young DLLs, particularly the call to assess their knowledge and skills in both the home language and English.

### **DRDP: Assessing Learning and Development from Birth through Kindergarten**

The DRDP (2015) was developed to be a comprehensive, ongoing, fair, technically adequate, and developmentally and psychometrically valid instrument to document children's progress toward the intended outcomes, in line with guidance provided by the National Research Council (2008) regarding early childhood assessment. The DRDP (2015) also aims to address the linguistic and cultural diversity of the state of California.

The instrument was also developed in line with guidance from early childhood education professional associations on how to improve and individualize instruction through observational assessment approaches that are aligned to curriculum goals, focus on educationally significant outcomes, combine data from multiple sources gathered over time, and include families to provide the most valid and comprehensive data on children's growth and development (NAEYC and NAECS/SDE, 2003). Frequent ongoing assessment for instructional improvement and adjustment includes observations of each child's performance during everyday activities and can include checklists, rating scales, work samples, and portfolios (Espinosa, 2008). Ongoing observation, and the documentation that accompanies the observation, form the foundation of the DRDP (2015) set of assessment tools. This documentation of children's progress is based on naturalistic observations of the child throughout his or her day. Naturalistic observations focus on children's behavior, which includes their communication and language. The primary purpose of the DRDP (2015) is to inform teachers as they plan curriculum and instruction across learning and development domains on an ongoing basis; it is less formal than assessment strategies employed by administrators for program accountability or evaluation purposes. The National Research Council's publication on early childhood assessment underscores this important point: "Different purposes require different types of assessments, and the evidentiary base that supports the use of an assessment for one purpose may not be suitable for another" (National Research Council, 2008, p. 2).

The content of the DRDP (2015) corresponds to all domains addressed by the California Infant/Toddler Learning & Development Foundations, the California Preschool

---

*Developmental Profile-Kindergarten* was developed by the California Department of Education in collaboration with the BEAR Center at the University of California, Berkeley with additional enhancements created in collaboration with the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE).

*DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION*

Learning Foundations, the California Kindergarten Content Standards, the Common Core State Standards, and the Next Generation Science Standards. The DRDP (2015) is designed to support teachers in observing, documenting, and reflecting on children's learning, development, and progress from birth through kindergarten.<sup>6</sup> Assessment practices that are embedded as part of the daily curriculum inform ongoing support of children's learning. These assessment practices provide evidence for rating individual children's interim progress on knowledge and skills assessed by the DRDP (2015) two to three times a year. The ratings help teachers identify next steps in supporting individual children's learning and development intentional teaching in one-on-one interactions and with small groups for of children. Overall, to support young children's continued learning and development, the DRDP (2015) provides a strengths-based approach to assessment and helps teachers understand a child's progress in mastering of knowledge and skills.

### **Principles Regarding Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Assessment to Inform the DRDP (2015)**

The following principles regarding culturally and linguistically appropriate assessment informed the development process of the DRDP (2015) (DRDP Collaborative Research Group, 2018):

- Take into consideration the specific cultural and linguistic characteristics of the intended child population during development of the assessment instrument (National Research Council, 2008). For DLLs this includes assessing children in both the home language and English to gain an accurate picture of their knowledge and skills (see "Assessing DLLs' Knowledge and Skills in Both Languages" in this paper).
- Review the assessment instrument for cultural bias and, as needed, make appropriate revisions. While many goals for development are universal, how children are supported in reaching these goals may differ across cultures (Rogoff, 1991). The diversity in the ways different cultures teach, learn, and display knowledge plays out when we assess young children (National Research Council, 2008; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011).
- Review the translations of the assessment instrument and consider the measure equivalence (Barrueco, Lopez, Ong, & Lozano, 2012). For example, consider both cross-linguistic variation (e.g., Spanish vs. English) and within-language variation (e.g., regional varieties of Spanish). NAEYC recommends that "translations of English-language instruments are carefully reviewed for linguistic and cultural appropriateness by native speakers well versed in the complex issues of assessment and translation" (NAEYC, 2009, p. 5).

---

<sup>6</sup> The term "kindergarten" used throughout this paper is inclusive of both traditional kindergarten and transitional kindergarten classrooms. In 2010, California adopted the Kindergarten Readiness Act, which provides developmentally appropriate transitional kindergarten curriculum for children with fall birthdates.

Higher education faculty in the areas of child development, assessment, and pre-service education with a focus on culturally and linguistically diverse populations reviewed the continuum for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. The feedback provided on the instrument's sensitivity, clarity, and appropriateness for use with culturally and linguistically diverse children was incorporated through revisions of the DRDP instrument. The following section provides further detail regarding the need to assess young DLLs in both the home language and English, which played a significant role in the development of the DRDP (2015). In addition, a Spanish translation of the instrument has been provided as a supplemental guide to support Spanish-dominant assessors. The translation was reviewed by fluent speakers of different regional varieties of Spanish to address within-language variation, and Spanish-English bilinguals to address differences between Spanish and English. It is important to note that the translation serves as a resource, not as a Spanish version of the instrument.

The following sections provide further detail regarding how the DRDP (2015) takes into consideration the specific cultural and linguistic characteristics of the child population, which for young DLLs focuses on the need to assess in both the home language and English.

### **Assessing DLLs' Knowledge and Skills in Both Languages**

Research indicates that DLLs develop and learn best when provided with high-quality interactions in both the home language and English, though DLLs often do not have opportunities for such optimal experience (Goldenberg et al., 2013; NASEM, 2017).<sup>7</sup> Notwithstanding the language of instruction, as teachers individualize instruction with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and learning for young DLLs, the assessments they use must allow for children to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in the home language and English (Espinosa, 2008; Espinosa & Garcia, 2012; NASEM, 2017). This requirement is essential primarily because young DLLs' language and literacy development differs from that of their monolingual peers, and, in fact, beginning early in life DLLs have two separate language systems whose development is influenced by the amount of language exposure and the use of each language, among other factors (Hammer et al., 2014). Given these two language systems, accurately documenting young DLLs' competencies and abilities across developmental domains requires assessment of the children in both their home language and English (Bedore & Peña, 2008; Peña & Halle, 2011). Espinosa and Gutiérrez-Clellen (2013) further elaborate that assessing young DLLs in both languages is imperative:

---

<sup>7</sup> Syntheses of evaluation studies that compare outcomes for young English learners who receive English-only instruction with outcomes for those in bilingual programs find either no difference or that English learners in bilingual programs outperform those who receive English-only instruction (Chapter 7, NASEM, 2017). In fact, there is evidence of positive correlations between literacy skills in the home language and the development of English literacy skills (Chapter 6, NASEM, 2017). Furthermore, exposure to English early (preschool and into the early elementary school years) puts children at risk of losing their home language (Chapter 6, NASEM, 2017).

Becoming proficient in a language is a complex and challenging process that takes many years for children of all ages (Hakuta, Bialystok, and Wiley, 2003). As with any type of learning, children will vary enormously in the rate at which they learn a first and a second language. The speed of language acquisition is due to factors both within the child and in the child's learning environment. The child's personality, aptitude for languages, interest and motivation interact with the quantity and quality of language inputs and opportunities for use to influence the rate and eventual fluency levels. As children acquire a second language one language may be more dominant because they are using that language more often than the other at a particular point in time (Conboy, 2013; Sandhofer and Uchikoshi, 2013; Paradis, Genesee, & Crago, 2011). (pp. 177–178)

Thus, if children are assessed only in their least proficient language (typically English), their abilities — in language, but also in other developmental domains — will be underestimated. Espinosa and Gutiérrez-Clellen (2013) continue:

As there is much variability in the amount and quality of English exposure as well as home language development, DLL children will show uneven progress between the two languages, depending on the language tasks. For example, a child may be proficient in one language for one task (e.g., letter naming, simple vocabulary) but not for another (e.g., listening comprehension) (Valdés & Figueroa, 1994). Another child may be able to hold a simple conversation in English but not be able to answer questions about a story or a sequence of pictures in that language (Gutiérrez-Clellen, 2002). . . . [R]esearch shows that when the child's achievements are examined in the home language, teachers can also make fairly accurate predictions about the child's potential for learning in the second language (Gutiérrez-Clellen, 1999; Gutiérrez-Clellen, Simon-Cerejido, and Sweet, 2012). If the young DLL is able to learn age-appropriate concepts in the home language, it is probable he will be able to transfer this knowledge to English language learning. Because of this variability and the fact that knowledge is mediated by language, it is impossible to obtain an accurate measure of progress without examining development in the two languages. (pp. 182–183)

### **The DRDP's Approach to Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Assessment**

The DRDP (2015) addresses the assessment of young DLLs in the home language and English in three primary ways:

- 1) *From early infancy through kindergarten*, teachers observe and document children's behavior in both the home/first language and English to obtain a more accurate profile of the children's knowledge and skills across developmental domains. If the teacher does not speak the child's home language, he or she draws upon teachers and staff who speak the child's language and know the child. The teacher should also be collaborating with families to collect documentation in the home language.

*DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION*

- 2) *Beginning in preschool*, teachers rate children's progress on two language and literacy development domains. The Language and Literacy Development (LLD) domain assesses all children's progress in developing foundational language and literacy skills. The English-Language Development (ELD) domain assesses current knowledge and skills and progress in learning to communicate in English.
- 3) *During kindergarten*, teachers in a Spanish-English bilingual education program (e.g., Spanish immersion, two-way immersion, developmental bilingual, transitional bilingual) can rate children's progress on an additional LLD domain that assesses progress in learning to communicate in Spanish: Language and Literacy Development in Spanish (SPAN). Note: This is a supplemental domain of the DRDP (2015).

### **Guidance for Administering the DRDP (2015) with DLLs**

The DRDP (2015) takes into consideration research indicating that teachers can be highly reliable in determining a child's level of language proficiency and English usage based on observations (Gutiérrez-Clellen & Kreiter, 2003) and that observations conducted by other teachers, staff, or family members can contribute to understanding a child's language proficiency (Gutiérrez-Clellen, Restrepo, & Simon-Cereijido, 2006). The DRDP (2015) allows for documentation and evidence of abilities in English, the first language, or both languages for all domains, including the LLD domain. In addition, to assess language and literacy development specific to English, the instrument includes the ELD domain.

Guidance related to DLLs appears in two sections of the introductory text of the DRDP (2015). The first section provides general information and considerations:

Dual language learners are children learning two or more languages at the same time, as well as those children learning a second language while continuing to develop their first (or home) language. A child's experience with one or more languages is an asset to build on in the early childhood setting.

It is critical to consider the child's communication in all the languages that he or she is learning in order to have an accurate picture of a child's knowledge and skills. Young children, including children with disabilities, can successfully learn two or more languages. Learning two or more languages has linguistic, social, cognitive, academic, and cultural benefits. The path to learning one language shares many similarities with the path to learning two or more languages.

There are also differences that must be taken into consideration when assessing young children who are dual language learners. Children may have vocabulary for concepts in one language and vocabulary for other concepts in another language. So it is important to assess children in all of the languages he or she understands and uses. (California Department of Education, 2015b, p. Intro-2)



The second section specifically addresses observation and documentation of young DLLs:

Dual language learners may demonstrate knowledge and skills in their home/first language, in English, or in both languages. They may also code-switch, which is using more than one language within a conversation. Therefore, communication in all languages the child uses should be considered when collecting documentation and completing the measures in all domains.

The adult who is conducting observations and collecting documentation should speak the child's home/first language. If not, the adult should receive assistance from another adult who does speak the child's home/first language. This may be an instructional assistant, teacher, director, parent, or other adult who knows the child....

Code switching is the use of multiple languages within a single conversation. It is a typical feature of learning two or more languages. [Note: Text goes on to provide a definition and examples of code-switching.] (California Department of Education, 2015b, p. Intro-5–Intro-6)

This guidance is intended to ensure that adults who are assessing DLLs have the capacity to judge the child's abilities in other languages, not just English.<sup>8</sup> Especially for children who are in the early stages of English acquisition, it is crucially important that someone who is proficient in the child's home language documents the child's understanding of mathematical concepts, the child's social skills, and the child's progress in the other developmental domains. Without an assessor who knows the child's home language, inaccurate information would result. For example, it would be extremely difficult for an assessor who does not understand the language a child is using when communicating to a peer to determine if that child is displaying empathy for others.

### **Three Domains in Assessing Language and Literacy Development**

The LLD domain of the DRDP (2015) is used to assess all children's progress in developing foundational language and literacy skills. For young DLLs, teachers can document in the home language, English, or both. LLD does not, however, necessarily provide clear guidance on age-appropriate progression in languages other than English

---

<sup>8</sup> The California Department of Education has made available professional development opportunities for the administration of the DRDP in California, as well as training on how to use the results for educational planning, to all teachers and adults implementing the instrument. This professional development offering is critical to the utility of the instrument in improving targeted instruction for individual children and improving the quality of services for groups of children, such as dual language learners. For information about professional development to support the administration of the DRDP, refer to <https://www.desiredresults.us>.

because some of its measures, such as Phonological Awareness, relate to specific features of English, which may or may not be applicable to other languages.

The ELD domain focuses exclusively on DLLs in preschool and kindergarten. The four ELD measures are used to document and assess progress in learning to communicate in English<sup>9</sup> and consist of Comprehension of English (Receptive English), Self-Expression in English (Expressive English), Understanding and Response to English Literacy Activities, and Symbol, Letter, and Print Knowledge in English. The developmental progression captured in each of these measures describes the general phases of English-language development (Ervin-Tripp, 1974; Kohnert & Kan, 2008; Oller, Jarmulowicz, Pearson, & Cobo-Lewis, 2011) and reflects contextual factors that affect the way a child learns second language, for example, age, personality, amount of exposure to English, quality of exposure to English, or opportunities to practice English (Paradis et al., 2011).

Given California's extraordinarily large population of DLLs with Spanish as their first language and the presence of bilingual education programs for kindergarten, the kindergarten view of the DRDP (2015), the DRDP-K (2015), includes the SPAN domain. The SPAN measures focus on aspects of easily observable language development across a continuum that is typical for kindergarten children. The measures draw from research on young Spanish-English DLLs in the United States and monolingual and bilingual Spanish-speaking children in Spain and the Americas. The measures apply in classrooms implementing kindergarten curricula that provide opportunities for the learning and development of Spanish. As such, the measures can be used with both Spanish-speaking children and English-speaking children in Spanish or Spanish-English dual language kindergarten programs.

The SPAN measures take into consideration how the child's use of each language shapes and influences his or her development of speaking, reading, and writing skills in Spanish (Anthony et al., 2011; Goldenberg, et al., 2014; Gorman & Gillam, 2003). For example, when looking at the early stages of writing in Spanish, research in Spanish-speaking countries with Spanish speakers has documented that children predominantly use vowels to represent words (Vernon & Ferreiro, 1999). However, for Spanish-speaking children in the United States who are learning English, emerging research documents that these children use both consonants and vowels when writing in Spanish (Rubin & Galván, 2005). This finding appears to be due to the transparency of Spanish orthography compared to the more opaque grapheme-phoneme relationship in English (Gutiérrez-Clellen, 1999).

In terms of spoken language, the assessment considers whether children might, for instance, also transfer a feature specific in one language to another language that is grammatically incorrect, but which is a demonstration of competency in overall language acquisition. For example, a child might say, "*¿Qué es esto para?*" (What is this for?) instead of "*¿Para qué es esto?*" (For what is this?), showing typical use of English sentence structure. A child might also intend to state, "*Me duelen las encías,*" (My gums are hurting) but say instead, "*Me duelen los chicles*" (My chewing gums are hurting), illustrating vocabulary from one language applied in error to the other.

---

<sup>9</sup> It is important to note that the ELD measures are not intended for use with infants and toddlers.

DLLs also practice code-switching, which is defined as “the use of two or more languages in the same stream of talk or as the ability to alternate between two language systems in a conversation” (California Department of Education, 2009, p. 58). Research has shown that even when children mix two languages, they tend to honor the grammatical rules of each, as in “I want leche” (I want milk), using one word within a phrase or sentence, or “¿Jugamos cartas? ¡Te voy a beat-e-ar!” (Can we play cards? I’m going to beat you!), using the English verb “to beat,” using a Spanish verb ending “ar” with the linking sound “e.” Often code-switching is influenced by the context or purpose of the child’s communication. Using the SPAN domain, kindergarten teachers observe examples of language use like those described here and identify where the child aligns on the continuum of Spanish-language development.

Overall, the DRDP (2015) observational instrument represents a major effort to provide a reliable and valid tool for teachers to assess young DLLs from birth through kindergarten with the ultimate objective of informing curriculum and instruction.

### **Conclusion**

Overall, the DRDP (2015) is evidently at the forefront of meeting the pressing need for authentic observation-based approaches to assessment of learning and development that is also culturally and linguistically appropriate. It affords teachers a tool to assess young DLLs from birth through kindergarten with the ultimate objective of informing curriculum and instruction. As Espinosa (2010) articulates:

The central challenge in the accurate assessment of young dual language learners is to determine what each child knows in each language, how much of the curriculum was learned, and how the learning environment should be adapted to maximize future learning. This requires individual child assessments that address all the important domains that are responsive to the linguistic, cultural, social and developmental attributes of each child. (p. 120)

The DRDP (2015) affirms the importance of assessing young DLLs in both the home language and English to gain an accurate representation of their knowledge and skills in all domains. The DRDP (2015) also offers a systematic, comprehensive way for teachers to document young DLLs’ learning and development across all domains in both English and the home language and, in turn, provides critical information to teachers as they design individualized instruction that supports DLLs.

Future research related to the DRDP (2015) could explore how practitioners assess young DLLs with the instrument. For example, it may be valuable to explore assessor variance or rater effects that depend on the assessor’s understanding of dual language acquisition and knowledge of a child’s other language(s). It would be important to consider whether systematic sources of variability in ratings can be attributed to the individual who is completing the assessment instrument and not the child’s actual skills and knowledge. Possible research questions might include exploring variation in how teachers rate young DLLs in comparison to monolingual children. In particular, do they use the category of “unable to rate” more often with young DLLs? Or do they rely more heavily on the DLLs’ skills in English and tend to rate them at earlier levels than their monolingual peers for LLD, ELD, and/or other domains?

*DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION*

Furthermore, it will be important to understand more about the factors that determine when teachers enlist the help of native speakers of DLLs' home languages to complete the assessment. The process of when and how monolingual English-speaking teachers collaborate with native speakers of other languages will be extremely important for future guidance on DRDP (2015) implementation practices.

Given that the research literature states that the pathway DLLs follow for language and literacy development is different from that of their monolingual peers, investigations into how DLLs in Spanish-English bilingual kindergarten classrooms are rated on the SPAN, ELD, and LLD domains could elucidate a nuanced portrait of Spanish-English DLLs' language and literacy abilities across both languages, and how this portrait evolves during the kindergarten year.

The DRDP (2015) is a comprehensive strengths-based assessment of children's learning and development that takes into consideration the full breadth of young children's language and literacy competencies. It informs intentional teaching, instructional enhancements, and children's learning and development from infancy through kindergarten. Investigating how this instrument is implemented and used with culturally and linguistically diverse students will contribute to future improvements in the DRDP instrument and its implementation as well as to the important goal of accurately and validly assessing young DLL development and achievement.

*DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION*

## References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Public Law 111-5 (H.R. 1), February 17, 2009; 123 Stat. 115 as of May 21, 2012.
- Anthony, J. L., Williams, J. M., Duran, L. K., Gillam, S. L., Liang, L., Aghara, R., & Landry, S. H. (2011). Spanish phonological awareness: Dimensionality and sequence of development during the preschool and kindergarten years. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(4), 857–876.
- Barrueco, S., López, M. L., Ong, C. A., & Lozano, P. (2012). *Assessing young children within and across languages: Approaches & measures*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Bedore, L. M., & Peña, E. D. (2008). Assessment of bilingual children for identification of language impairment: Current findings and implications for practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(1), 1–29.
- California Department of Education. (2009). *Preschool English learners: Principles and practices to promote language, literacy, and learning — A resource guide* (2nd ed.). Sacramento, CA: Author.
- California Department of Education. (2015a). *Desired Results Development Profile (2015): A Developmental Continuum from Early Infancy to Kindergarten Entry*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.desiredresults.us/drdp-forms>
- California Department of Education. (2015b). *Desired Results Developmental Profile—Kindergarten (2015)*. Sacramento: Author. Retrieved from [http://drdpk.org/drdpk\\_forms.html](http://drdpk.org/drdpk_forms.html)
- California Department of Education (2016). DataQuest. <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>
- Cannon, J. S., & Karoly, L. A. (2007). *Who is ahead and who is behind? Gaps in school readiness and student achievement in the early grades for California's children*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Conboy, B. T. (2013). Neuroscience research: How experience with one or multiple language affects the developing brain. In Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care, *California's best practices for young dual language learners: Research overview papers* (pp. 1–50). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers.pdf>

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

- DRDP Collaborative Research Group (2018). *Technical Report for the Desired Results Developmental Profile (2015)*. Report prepared for the California Department of Education.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1974). Is second language learning like the first? *TESOL Quarterly*, 8, 111–127. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3585535>
- Espinosa, L. M. (2008). Challenging common myths about young English language learners (FCD Policy Brief, Advancing PK-3, No. 8, January). New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development.
- Espinosa, L. (2010). Assessment of young English language learners. In E. E. Garcia & E. C. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 119–142). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Espinosa, L. M., & Garcia, E. (2012). *Developmental assessment of young dual language learners with a focus on kindergarten entry assessments: Implications for state policies* (Working Paper #1). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute.
- Espinosa, L., & Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. (2013). Assessment of young dual language learners in preschool. In Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care, *California's best practices for young dual language learners: Research overview papers* (pp. 172–208). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers.pdf>
- Galindo, C. (2010). English language learners' math and reading achievement trajectories in the elementary grades. In E. Garcia & E. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners — Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 42–58). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goldenberg, C., Nemeth, K., Hicks, J., Zepeda, M., & Corona, L. M. (2013). Program elements and teaching practices to support young dual language learners. In Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care, *California's best practices for young dual language learners: Research overview papers* (pp. 90–118). Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers.pdf>
- Goldenberg, C., Tolar, T. D., Reese, L., Francis, D. J., Ray, A. R., & Mejía-Arauz, R. (2014). How important is teaching phonemic awareness to children learning to read in Spanish? *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(3). doi: 10.3102/0002831214529082
- Gorman, B. K., & Gillam, R. B. (2003). Phonological awareness in Spanish: A tutorial for speech-language pathologists. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 25(1), 13–22.

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F. (1999). Language choice in intervention with bilingual children. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 8, 291–302.
- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F. (2002). Narratives in two languages: Assessing performance of bilingual children. *Linguistics and Education*, 13, 175–197.
- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F., & Kreiter, J. (2003). Understanding child bilingual acquisition using parent and teacher reports. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24, 267–288.
- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F., Restrepo, M. A., & Simon-Cereijido, S. (2006). Evaluating the discriminate accuracy of a grammatical measure with Spanish-speaking children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49, 1209–1223.
- Gutiérrez-Clellen, V. F., Simon-Cereijido, S., & Sweet, M. (2012). Predictors of second language acquisition in Latino children with specific language impairment. *American Journal of Speech and Language Pathology*, 21(1), 64–77.
- Hakuta, K., Bialystok, E., & Wiley, E. (2003). Critical evidence: A test of the critical period hypothesis for second language acquisition. *Psychological Science* 14(1): 31–38.
- Hammer, C. S., Hoff, E., Uchikoshi, Y., Gillanders, C., Castro, D. C., & Sandilos, L. E. (2014). The language and literacy development of young dual language learners: A critical review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 29, 715–733.
- Illinois State Board of Education, Data Analysis and Accountability Division and English Language Learning Division. (2013). *Bilingual education programs and English language learners in Illinois: SY 2012 (2011-2012 School Year) statistical report*. Retrieved March 13, 2015, from [http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/pdfs/ell\\_program\\_stat\\_report12.pdf](http://www.isbe.state.il.us/research/pdfs/ell_program_stat_report12.pdf)
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2014a). *Illinois state report card*. Retrieved March 13, 2015, from [http://www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/report\\_card/2014/StateReportCard14.pdf](http://www.isbe.net/assessment/pdfs/report_card/2014/StateReportCard14.pdf)
- Illinois State Board of Education (2014b). *School report card: 15-year statewide trend data (2002-2014)*. Retrieved March 13, 2015, from [http://www.isbe.net/assessment/report\\_card.htm](http://www.isbe.net/assessment/report_card.htm)
- Kohnert, K., & Kan, P. F. (2008). Fast mapping by bilingual preschool children. *Journal of Child Language*, 35, 495–514.
- Lee, V., & Burkham, D. (2002). *Inequality at the starting gate: Social background differences in achievement as children begin school*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NASEM). (2017). *Promoting the educational success of children and youth learning English: Promising futures*. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/24677/promoting-the-educational-success-of-children-and-youth-learning-english>

DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION



- National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). (2009). *Where we stand: On assessing young English language learners*. Retrieved from <https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/resources/position-statements/WWSEnglishLanguageLearnersWeb%20%282%29.pdf>
- National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education. (2003). *Early childhood curriculum, assessment, and program evaluation: Position statement*. Location: Washington, DC.
- National Research Council. (2008). *Early childhood assessment: Why, what, and how*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Office of Head Start. (2016). *Head Start Program Performance Standards*. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/policy/45-cfr-chap-xiii/1305-2-terms>
- Office of Head Start. (2015). *Head Start early learning outcomes framework: Birth to five*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/elof-ohs-framework.pdf>
- Oller, D. K., Jarmulowicz, L., Pearson, B. Z., & Cobo-Lewis, A. B. (2011). Rapid spoken language shift in early second-language learning: The role of peers and effects on the first language. In A. Durgunouglu and C. Goldenberg (Eds.), *Language and literacy development in bilingual settings* (pp. 94–120). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Paradis, J., Genesee, F., & Crago, M. B. (2011). *Dual language development and disorders: A handbook on bilingualism and second language learning*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Peña, E. D., & Halle, T. G. (2011). Assessing preschool dual language learners: Traveling a multiforked road. *Child Development Perspectives*, 5(1), 28–32.
- Rogoff, B. (1991). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, R., & Galván, C. V. (2005). Using writing to understand bilingual children's literacy development. *The Reading Teacher*, 58, 728–739.
- Sandhofer, C., & Uchikoshi, Y. (2013). Relationship between dual language development and development of cognition, mathematics, social-emotional development, and related domains. In Governor's State Advisory Council on Early Learning and Care, *California's best practices for young dual language learners: Research overview papers*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers.pdf>



Shepard, L., Kagan, S. L., & Wurtz, E. (1998). *Principles and recommendations for early childhood assessments*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2016). American Fact Finder Table.  
<https://factfinder2.census.gov/>

Valdés, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Vernon, S. A., & Ferreiro, E. (1999). Writing development: A neglected variable in the consideration of phonological awareness. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69, 395–415.

*DRAFT – NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION*