State Early Learning and Development Standards, Policies and Related Practices:

How Responsive are they to the Needs of Young Dual Language Learners?

Linda M. Espinosa, Ph.D.

Miriam Calderon, MSW

BUILD Initiative

May 2015

Table of Contents

Part I: Narrative Report

Purpose and Audience: This report is designed to answer the questions:

1) *To what extent do the states' Early Learning and Development Standards (ELDS) reflect the current research and address the learning needs of preschool-aged dual language learners (DLLs) and*
2) *What next steps can states take to better meet the needs of DLLs?*

The primary audience for this report is those responsible for developing ELDS and early childhood assessments systems, including kindergarten entry assessments aligned to states ELDS, and those working to build equitable and inclusive early childhood programs and systems.

Format of the Report

This analysis and report includes the following: Part I, The narrative report, includes the Introduction and Overview, the research basis for the analysis, the program classification and review criteria and the results with recommendations. Part II, includes individual state profiles with exemplary language highlighted when possible. Part III, provides an "At-a-Glance" spreadsheet that shows how all states are scored across the program classifications and review criteria.

Introduction

State Early Learning Development Standards (ELDS) are important for all children, families, and early childhood practitioners[1]. They frame the expectations for young children's development, the curricular and instructional approaches implemented, the specific child and program assessments administered and in most states, the evaluation and quality improvement systems adopted. They articulate an explicit learning trajectory that underlies a vision for preparing children for school and life success. A joint position statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education states, " we believe that early learning standards can be a valuable part of a comprehensive, high quality early childhood system of services for young children." They caution, however, that early learning standards "can only support positive development and learning if they: emphasize significant, developmentally appropriate content and outcomes, are developed and reviewed through informed, inclusive processes, are implemented and assessed in ways that support all young children's development, and are accompanied by strong supports for early childhood professionals, programs, and families" (NAEYC, 2009, p.2).

States have generally based their ELDS on both developmental theory and empirical research on typical developmental norms and early predictors of future school success, such as important

---

[1] ELDS are also called early learning guidelines.

early math or literacy skills that predict later abilities, (i.e., number sense, phonological awareness and strength and breadth of vocabulary). The early childhood years, birth to eight, span critical periods in children's development. This is a time when children have an endless fascination, curiosity and inherent motivation to learn about their world. They are also actively processing the sounds of language—any language present in their environment—to develop social, cognitive, cultural, and linguistic competencies. This is when virtually all typically developing children master the fundamentals of their first or primary language.

Many children also are in the process of acquiring a second or third language. This population of young children is most often referred to as dual language learners (DLLs) in the early care and education system, and as English language learners in the K-12 education system. Dual Language Learners are learning two or more languages simultaneously from the first months of life or are learning a second language after their first language is established—usually around two-three years of age. The term "dual language learners" encompasses other terms, such as Limited English Proficient (LEP), bilingual, English language learners (ELL), English learners, and children who speak a Language Other Than English (LOTE) (OHS, 2009).

The purpose of this report and accompanying state ELDS analysis is to review a subset of states' ELDS standards for pre-k aged children (three -five years of age) to identify the most common approaches to meeting the needs of young DLLs, to determine the extent to which these standards reflect the current scientific research on the development and learning of preschool-aged DLLs, and the extent to which states provide adequate guidance for supporting early childhood programs and professionals in implementing effective programs for young DLLs. In addition, we offer recommendations for strengthening states' ELDS to reflect current research and to fully support the learning needs of DLLs across multiple domains of development. Whenever possible, we provide exemplary standards from states' existing ELDS or accompanying documents that fully articulate a vision with consistent expectations and recommendations for practice.   This is provided in order to assist states to further enhance their ELDS for DLLs and to facilitate cross-state collaboration.

Research Base for Early Childhood Standards for Dual Language Learners[2]

The population of young DLLs has tripled in the last several decades, and these children now account for one quarter of all young children in the U.S. (Migration Policy Institute, June 2014). By the most recent 2010 census data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014), the ethnic/racial distribution of the population is: 77.9% white alone or 63% white alone not Hispanic/Latino; 13.1% Black or African American alone; 5.1% Asian alone; 1.2% American Indian/Alaska Native alone; 0.2%

---

[2] This section of the report describes general research findings on the development of young dual language learners. The next section of the report provides specific citations for research tied to program classifications and rating criteria.

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander alone; and 2.4% identified as two or more races. Nearly 17% of the population identifies as Hispanic/Latino; for some states these figures are much higher as in California, for example, over 39% of population is Latino. Nearly 13% of the population is foreign born and in over 20% of the homes family members speak a language other than English. Again, in some states these figures are much higher. In California, for instance, over 27% are foreign born and over 43% of families speak a language other than English at home.

As the population of young children who speak a language other than English in the home and are acquiring English as a second or third language continues to increase across the U.S., most states are experiencing the challenges of adapting and revising their ELDS to include young DLLs. Fortunately, during the past decade, there has been an explosion of research findings that provide a scientific basis for designing expectations, program approaches, and assessment procedures that support the development of young DLLs. In addition, the field is beginning to incorporate and apply an emerging knowledge base regarding effective instructional and assessment approaches. We now know more about how the development of DLLs is similar to and distinct from monolingual children, and how best to support this development in the early childhood classroom.

Young DLLs are a very diverse group with many different languages, countries of origin, family circumstances, and cultural backgrounds. These important socio-cultural differences influence the development of DLLs across all learning domains. However, all DLLs share a common trait, they are learning at least two or more distinct linguistic systems during a critical and rapid period of linguistic and cognitive development. New, sophisticated brain imaging methods in the field of cognitive neuroscience have produced insights about how exposure to more than one language during the earliest years changes brain functioning. For example, we now know that the brain of a bilingual child processes language differently than monolinguals. We also know that young bilinguals demonstrate advanced executive function abilities, e.g., working memory, inhibitory control, attention to relevant vs. irrelevant task cues, as well as some improved language skills. These early linguistic advantages have been linked to improved reading and academic performance well into the later school years. A strong foundation in one's home language has been shown to facilitate the acquisition of a second language. Exposure to multiple languages during the first years of life also results in enhanced speech perceptual abilities that enable learners to speak and hear sounds and inflections distinct to those languages (such as the different "r"s in French and Spanish). Finally, many important language skills (e.g., phonological awareness) learned in a child's first language facilitate the development of those skills in English.

We also now know that learning more than one language during the early childhood years does not delay the acquisition of English or impede academic achievement in English when all languages are well supported. Almost all young children can successfully learn more than one language, and do not need to give up their home language in order to learn English. In fact, as

discussed above, there are significant linguistic, social, cognitive, as well as cultural advantages to early bilingualism. Recent research suggests that these advantages are larger in children with more advanced and balanced skills in each of their two languages. In short, there is compelling scientific evidence on the benefits of learning two or more languages at an early age!

There are also developmental risks associated with loss of a child's first language. Children who do not develop and maintain proficiency in their home language may lose their ability to communicate with parents and family members and risk becoming estranged from their cultural and linguistic heritage. Dual language learners who are proficient in their first language are able "to establish a strong cultural identity, to develop and sustain strong ties with their immediate and extended families, and thrive in a global multilingual world" (Espinosa, 2006, p. 2). Thus, there are compelling reasons to actively support the development of young DLLs' first language as well as the acquisition of English.

Despite all of these well-documented developmental advantages, there are some areas of early language development that unfold differently for DLLs and may look like delays to the uninformed observer. Young children who are learning through two languages often make slower initial progress in each of their languages than monolinguals. In addition, they typically have smaller vocabularies in each of their languages than monolinguals, but their total vocabulary size (the sum of what children know in both their languages) is frequently similar to monolinguals. Young DLLs also take longer to recall words from memory and have lower scores on verbal fluency tasks, as their language processing is more complex than that of monolinguals. Most often these differences are temporary and disappear as young DLLs become more proficient in each of their languages.

One area of recent focus in the ECE literature is the social and emotional development of young DLLs. [i] Researchers are examining how growing up with more than one language may influence the development of social-emotional competencies with particular attention to the cultural, linguistic, and contextual factors that are unique to young DLLs. Most research on young DLLs has focused on their language, literacy, and cognitive development. While there are relatively few studies that focus on key dimensions of social-emotional development and young DLLs, the recent research is suggesting an emerging profile of the unique strengths and needs of DLLs. Taken together, the research suggests that Hispanic, Spanish-speaking DLLs have strong social-emotional competencies (at least equal to and in some areas better than monolinguals), but little is known about the specific influences on their social-emotional development. To date, the influence of culturally based parenting practices that are common among some language groups and DLLs social-emotional outcomes is relatively unstudied. However, as for all children, positive, nurturing relationships are the basis for healthy social-emotional development and the language used during interactions communicates important cultural meanings.

Further, the use of the child's home language in ECE settings by both the teacher and peers seems to be important for closer, more positive relationships. There is also some evidence that becoming fluent in more than one language is positively associated with fewer behavior problems. Thus, it is important for state ELDS to address how to promote positive relationships and social interactions for their children who are not yet proficient in English.

Assessment of Young Dual Language Learners.

Due to the unique developmental patterns of young DLLs, the assessment tools, methods, procedures, and their interpretation must be carefully considered when assessing these students. Accurate, valid and reliable assessments that are aligned to a state's ELDS are critical to individualized instruction and improved outcomes, but are often challenging during the preschool years. When a child has language skills and concepts in more than one language, it becomes even more difficult to ascertain with certainty what the child knows, what the child needs to learn, and where to target instruction. Even the process for identifying which children are dual language learners is often not well defined or consistently applied within state ECE systems. Compounding these challenges is the lack of well-established, valid and reliable assessments that have been designed for young DLLs.

Accurate assessment of young children is always a challenging and multi-step process that is further complicated when a teacher is monolingual or does not speak the child's language. However, valid assessment in both languages is essential to the growth and development of young DLLs. Recently, the Office of Head Start, the state of California, the state of Minnesota, as well as most assessment experts have recommended that DLLs be assessed in both their level of English and home language proficiency. The Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework (2010) states, "…programs are to ensure that children have opportunities to interact and demonstrate their abilities, skills, and knowledge in any language, including their home language." (p.4). It has been well established that assessing a child only in English will most likely underestimate the DLL child's knowledge and true abilities. A recent research overview paper published by the state of California outlines specific decision steps, suggested instruments, and methods for the assessment of young DLLs (Espinosa & Gutierrez-Clellan, 2013).

Family Engagement

Family engagement with schools has been linked to important outcomes for children of all families, including families with children who are DLLs. The term family instead of parent is used intentionally because many DLL children in immigrant families live with grandparents, and other extended family members, all of who participate in the child's upbringing and can be resources to support the child's learning. The term engagement is used to emphasize the shared and mutual responsibility between families and educational programs to act in the child's best interests over time and across settings. Family engagement approaches can include a range of activities from joint decision-making, collaboration and two-way exchange of information to

family literacy programs in the home and social-networking opportunities for DLL families. Although prior research has shown that DLL families have lower rates of participation in school events, there is evidence that when culturally and linguistically sensitive strategies are implemented, DLL families will actively engage with schools. These increased levels of family engagement have been associated with improved school readiness skills and higher literacy scores as well as fewer behavioral problems for DLLs.

The policy and practice implications of the foregoing research on current demographics, the impacts and advantages of early bilingualism, assessment, and family engagement have been summarized by Castro & Espinosa, (2014).

1. The young bilingual brain processes language differently from monolingual children and this neural adaptation influences several aspects of cognitive and linguistic development.
2. The acquisition of two languages in young children has no inherent or long-term negative social, linguistic or cognitive consequences, and has been linked to advantages in specific social, linguistic and cognitive domains.
3. There is a scientific consensus that children have the capacity to learn two languages from birth and that this early dual language exposure does not confuse children or delay development in either language.
4. All young DLL children should be provided with high-quality language experiences and support to master both of their languages.
5. Bilingualism confers many cognitive and social advantages for children and adults. These advantages are strongest when children demonstrate a balanced bilingualism and are roughly equally proficient in both languages.
6. Learning more than one language during the early childhood years does not delay the acquisition of English or impede achievement in English when both languages are supported.
7. Young DLLs must be assessed in both of their languages in order to make accurate judgments about their competencies and plan effective learning activities.
8. Family engagement is pivotal to understanding and supporting the development of young DLLs.
9. Parents should be encouraged to continue to interact with and speak with their child in their first or dominant language in order to further develop proficiency in that language.

In addition to reflecting the latest research on development, assessment, and family engagement, state ELDS and related policies must address the issue of what is required to effectively teach young DLLs. Therefore we will now briefly discuss what is known about competencies for ECE teachers of young DLLs.

Teacher Qualifications and Professional Development

Qualified and effective teachers comprise one of the most important features of high quality early education for young DLLs. Since across the country, many if not most preschool programs

include young DLLs, it is imperative that all early childhood educators are qualified to meet the needs of children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. It is important for states to identify the specific competencies including the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed in order to effectively promote the learning and development of young DLLs.

The essential knowledge and skills of ECE educators can be learned through effective pre-service or in-service education, and professional development activities as well as continuous learning experiences such as mentorships, individual consultations and coaching. A focus on improving classroom practices and outcomes for young DLLs needs to be systematic, continuous, and of the highest priority. ECE programs need to provide ongoing professional development to all staff on features of effective programming for preschool DLLs that is drawn from theory and supported by research.

Current research on effective ECE teacher preparation has found that most higher education programs offer very few hours of coursework focused on issues of cultural diversity and second language learners (Ray, Bowman, & Robbins, 2006). These researchers have recommended that all prospective ECE teachers receive focused education and training on the process of second language acquisition as well as more field experiences with young dual language learners. Other researchers have also stressed the importance of increasing the diversity of higher education ECE faculty so they more closely resemble the children and families served across the nation. The consensus from current research is that to be effective with young DLLs, ECE teachers need more focused initial preparation as well as continuous professional development that addresses the following topics:

- Role of home language development in English-language development during the early years
- Stages of English-language development during the preschool years
- Early cognitive, literacy, language and overall development for young DLLs
- Developmental consequences of bilingualism for young children
- Effective teaching pedagogy and specific strategies for young dual language learners
- How monolingual ECE teachers can support both English language development and maintenance of home language
- Early intervention strategies for young DLLs with special needs
- Cross-cultural competence
- Assessment strategies for DLLs
- Interpretation and application of assessment results
- Engaging families from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds
- Reflective practices and teaching dispositions (Espinosa, 2015).

Going forward, it will be important for all state ELDS to reflect the current scientific understandings of how young DLLs acquire two languages from the earliest years as well as the

program and practice implications of this research. The development of young DLLs shares many similarities with that of monolinguals; however, there are also distinct patterns of language and early literacy development that must be considered when establishing expectations for learning and articulating typical development. It is critically important that states' definitions of "school readiness" recognize the unique developmental characteristics of dual language learners who are *on track*, for school success, but have a different set of competencies than monolingual children—while also upholding high expectations for young DLLs. Therefore, their developmental profiles at kindergarten entry will look different (especially in the language, literacy, and communication domains), but may still be at normative levels for their age and dual language status. In fact, if DLLs have strong skills in their home language and are making progress in English acquisition, they may be poised for high levels of learning and achievement in English. In order to reduce the achievement gap during the preschool years and at kindergarten entry, state ELDS as well as their assessment systems must accurately represent both the developmental patterns of young DLLs as well as their unique learning needs.

Methodology

The research summarized above shows the clear need to develop ELDS that include specific standards that address the learning strengths and needs of DLLs, and supporting documents aligned to ELDS that will guide programs and professionals to implement high-quality services for young DLLs. In order to analyze the current status of state ELDS in addressing DLLs, we selected 21 states and the District of Columbia and reviewed their ELDS. These initial states represent those states that are part of the North Carolina–led K-3 Assessment Consortium as well as those that have high proportions of DLL populations and are among those most likely to have ELDS that address the specific needs of DLLs. Therefore, the following states are included in this initial analysis: Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

We reviewed each states' published Early Learning and Development Standards/Guidelines for pre-K-aged children for its specific language addressing DLLs. Some states used different terminology, such as English Learners or English Language Learners for the same population of children. Additionally, states ELDS varied considerably in nomenclature, organization, and content. When supporting documents were available that provided further guidance on implementation of the ELDS, such as state Curriculum Frameworks or pre-K program guidelines, those were included in this review.

Comprehensive ELDS include the expectations for what children should know and be able to do as well as instructional and assessment guidelines to support their learning. Since within the ECE field we are in the early stages of both understanding the developmental characteristics of young

DLLs and how to best support their learning and achievement, it will be important for states to provide detailed guidance on all aspects of both the learning expectations as well as how to support and monitor DLLs progress. Simply stating a learning expectation, e.g., *will maintain home language proficiency*, without detailed guidance on *how* to assess what the child should know and what instructional guidelines will help achieve that learning expectation, does not constitute a standard (and likely will leave programs frustrated when it is communicated as an expectation for them). As part of the review, we looked for specific guidance, within the ELDS documents or other sources aligned to the ELDS, regarding appropriate assessment, teacher qualifications, instructional strategies, and DLL identification procedures.

Further, we have included recommendations for future ELDS development as well as exemplars that illustrate "best practices" for DLLs wherever possible. It is our intention to help inform the work of the K-3 Formative Assessment Consortium as well as to provide a much-needed analysis with suggestions for improving states' ELDS appropriateness for DLLs. With the federal and state expansion of ECE services and a priority on those children with the highest degree of need including DLLs, states urgently need more detailed guidance on how to design systems and inform programming that will result in effective outreach and high quality services that will improve outcomes for a unique population of children and families.

Classification System

In reviewing the ELDS, each state's approach to serving DLLs was first categorized as: 1) a Dual Language Approach; 2) English Language Development, or 3) English Immersion. Only a state's official ELDS documents were reviewed for the purposes of determining each state's approach to serving DLLs. All states included in this review referenced DLLs to some extent in their ELDS, most typically references were found in the introduction to the ELDS or in the language, literacy, and communication domain. Other sources beyond the ELDS were considered as evidence of whether or not a state met the program criteria described below. For the purposes of this analysis, the following definitions were used for each category.

Dual Language Approach[ii]

States that explicitly promoted early bilingualism and included the goals of children becoming fully bilingual and biliterate were classified as implementing a dual language approach. A dual language approach can include both native English speakers and young dual language learners, all of who are expected to achieve linguistic proficiency and academic competencies in both languages. Inherent in this approach to ECE for DLLs is the need to instruct and assess children in both of the target languages. In this language model children should spend approximately 50% of the instructional day in the home language for a balanced approach to both home language maintenance and English acquisition. This approach requires qualified bilingual teachers, curriculum materials in both languages, and devotes sufficient time in each language to promote

bilingualism and early biliteracy. This dual language approach requires a coherent set of ELDS that clearly articulate the goals for DLLs and is supported by an infrastructure of curriculum materials, assessment procedures, and professional development. The distinguishing characteristic of this statewide approach is that it explicitly promotes balanced bilingualism for DLLs and supports that goal throughout its ECE system. This classification does not require that all components of the program criteria be totally developed and implemented, but it does require a clear set of expectations in the ELDS.

English Language Development (ELD)[iii]

This language approach recognizes the current conditions facing most ECE programs in the U.S. today. The vast majority of programs do not have the capacity to offer dual language approaches for DLLs for a variety of reasons: the majority of the ECE teaching force is monolingual, English speaking, while there are often multiple languages represented by children and families; an inadequate supply of certified ECE bilingual teachers; limited program resources and materials; and sometimes community and parental values and priorities. In the ELD approach, instruction and interactions are primarily in English, with an explicit goal of English acquisition in combination with intentional support of ongoing home language development. This approach recognizes the benefits to both acquiring English during the preschool years as well as the continued development of the home language. States that employ this approach frequently offer *targeted instructional enhancements* and recommend specific strategies for integrating the child's home language during classroom activities. These instructional methods strategically use the home language to help young DLLs comprehend the meanings of English lessons while explicitly promoting English language development, thus helping children learn important new concepts while they are still in the process of acquiring full English proficiency. Ideally, states that implement this approach also provide detailed guidance on how to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate instruction and assessment.

The ELD approach to the education of young DLLs can be compared to the Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) approach in K-12 education. Historically, this has been the most common type of bilingual program in the United States. In this language model, the goal is to use features of the home language to help the child learn enough English to successfully transition to an all-English learning environment. The goals of TBE programs do not include full bilingualism, but do use the home language to facilitate and speed up the process of learning English.[iv]

The educational goals do not include eventual bilingualism or biliteracy, but focus on academic achievement in English. In some states like California and Texas, there are limits to how much time a K-12 ELL student can spend in a TBE program. As the students acquire proficiency in oral English, instruction gradually shifts from using the child's home language to all English. Typically in a TBE approach beginning in kindergarten, students are expected to transition to mainstream classrooms where all academic instruction is presented in English.

The traditional English as a second language (ESL) approach could also be considered a K-12 version of what we are calling an English language development approach. ESL models usually provide modified instruction in English to individuals or small groups of students. The goal of ESL programs is to promote English proficiency as quickly as possible. In K-12 bilingual or ESL language models, there are several instructional support models that offer specific recommendations for adapted instruction that gives ELL students access to grade-level academic content while they are learning English i.e., Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) and Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD).[3] Some of these instructional strategies have been adapted to be developmentally appropriate for preschool aged children and are showing promise.[v]

For the purposes of this report, the term English language development (ELD) approach was chosen because the preschool years encompass a unique period of rapid linguistic, cognitive, and conceptual growth that is distinguished from the features of first and second language development for older children. For example, typical TBE programs are implemented over a 3-5 year span and preschool programs extend over one to two years. In addition, the methods often employed in K-12 TBE programs may not be appropriate for young children, e.g., subject matter divided into blocks of time and presented exclusively in one language or pull-out ESL practices. What we are labeling a preschool English language development approach can be thought of as a hybrid that encompasses features of both traditional TBE and ESL language models, but is more reflective of the characteristics of typical preschool classrooms and appropriate to the developmental characteristics of preschool children. There is also an emerging knowledge base about specific instructional enhancements and strategies that can be implemented during the preschool years that will promote both English language development as well as ongoing home language maintenance.[vi]

English Immersion

When states' ELDS emphasize English acquisition without substantive attention to the role of the home language, we have classified them as English immersion. Assumptions underlying this approach include the often-unstated belief that earlier and intensive immersion in a second language will lead to more rapid acquisition and higher levels of English proficiency than dual language approaches or approaches that support the maintenance and development of the home language. Inherent in the English immersion approach, is the goal to teach DLLs English as rapidly as possible so that they can be educated in English-only classrooms without attention or responsibility for home language maintenance. In early childhood settings, there often is an English immersion approach by default, as there is no staff capacity to communicate in any

---

[3] See Espinosa, (2015), for a more complete description of specific instructional strategies for young DLLs.

language but English and monolingual staff has not learned specific strategies that will support home language maintenance.

Program Criteria[4]

As the vast majority of state ELDS were classified under an English Language Development Approach, we further analyzed the ELDS and supporting documents with regard to whether they provide: a) a clear statement of philosophy, b) procedures for identification of the DLL population, c) a separate domain for DLLs language development, d) inclusion of DLLs in the language, communication, literacy domain, [e] inclusion of DLLs in the social and emotional development domain f) family engagement strategies for DLL families, g) specific teacher qualifications for teachers of DLLs, and h) detailed recommendations for instructional and assessment practices. Each of these criteria are defined and linked to recent research findings below. It is important to note that for this initial review, states were rated as meeting the program criteria when they had specific language addressing the needs of DLLs in their ELDS or supporting documents. Some states had extensive rationale statements with supporting research citations while other states included statements that addressed the unique needs of DLLs, but were not very elaborated or supported by relevant research.

Statement of Philosophy[vii]

It is important for states to articulate a rationale for their approach to the education of preschool-aged dual language learners. Effective educational systems that include learning expectations, instructional models, assessment recommendations, and evaluation methods need a coherent, consistent foundation based on sound research, theory, and/or set of beliefs. This philosophy statement typically will reveal which specific research or theory of language development underlies the learning expectations for young DLLs. Since there are a variety of approaches to the education of DLLs, it is important for each state to clearly present *what* they are promoting and *why*. In some states, the philosophy statement is written in terms of principles that guide the standards, instruction and assessment of linguistically and culturally diverse children. In some states a carefully crafted perspective is outlined with specific research references. In all cases, the statements should be clear and accessible to ECE professionals and families. These statements will help guide local and programmatic decision-making when ambiguous situations arise. There should be no confusion about what the major educational goals are for DLLs, which values are being promoted in the documents, and how this approach will meet the short and long-term needs of young DLLs.

---

[4] For this initial review states were given credit for addressing the program criteria when they had specific language in any of their ELDS or supporting documents that addressed the criterion. This resulted in a wide range of depth for states that were rated as meeting the criteria.

Method for Identifying Dual Language Learners Clearly Described[viii]

Whenever special interventions or curricular adaptations are recommended for subgroups of children it is critical to know specifically which children are targeted. It is important to identify specific eligibility criteria so that children who need the adapted instruction receive needed services and those who do not need instructional modifications are not inappropriately served. Not all Latino children with Hispanic surnames are dual language learners, nor are all recent immigrants limited in their English proficiency. Ethnicity, immigration and generational status, as well as family language history all are correlated with language proficiencies, but none is sufficient to identify which preschool children are, in fact, dual language learners. These are a specific group of children who demonstrate unique developmental characteristics and are in the early stages of acquiring more than one language. Ideally, the identification process will yield information on language experiences and abilities in both of the child's languages.[ix]

Separate Language Domain for DLLs[x]

As most state ELDS reflect expectations and benchmarks that are based on research focused on the development of monolingual English speaking children, there is a need to carefully lay out what a typical progression of second language acquisition looks like during the preschool years. Fortunately, this is where the research summarized above can guide the development of appropriate learning expectations for dual language learners. For example, California has addressed this need by including the specific developmental patterns and learning needs of DLLs in a separate English Language Development domain in its Preschool Learning Foundations (California ELDS), and in other components of its Early Learning and Development System: the Preschool Curriculum Framework, the Desired Results Developmental Profile (California ECE assessment system), and the new Preschool Program Guidelines.[xi] In some cases, states may decide to integrate the consideration of DLLs throughout their ELDS. This approach is rarely seen in practice, but could promote careful consideration of the unique needs of DLLs across all domains of development. Finally, some states have adopted the WIDA (World-class Instructional Design and Assessment) Early English Language Development standards. WIDA is an organization that supports academic language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students pre-K- 12th grade.

DLLs addressed in Language, Literacy, Communication Domain[xii]

The rationale for including this criterion is similar to the preceding discussion. When important early language and literacy skills such as "recognizes the alphabet" or "children are able to construct complex personal narratives", are part of the goals for preschool, it is important for states to explicitly describe how this expectation will be met for children who are in the early stages of learning English. The Office of Head Start and some states have made it clear that DLLs can demonstrate mastery of these language skills in any language. The important part of the goal is that children understand features of language and how it is used orally and applied to literacy

skills—not in which language the child has learned these skills. As described above, current research has shown that once a child understands how phonologies operate in any language, she can then apply this knowledge to a second language. Within the overall set of language, literacy, and communication expectations, states ELDS need to provide guidance to ECE teachers and programs on how to evaluate the progress of DLLs and design effective instruction.

DLLs addressed in Social-Emotional Domain [xiii]

There is some research that early bilingualism affects other aspects of development in addition to language, literacy, and communication. As described above, it is especially important that state ELDS address the specific strengths and needs of DLLs in the social-emotional domain. While some aspects of social-emotional functioning have shown advanced development for DLLs, it is only with careful language supports and attention to positive, nurturing relationships that these potentials will be realized. In addition, when children do not understand the language of instruction, they may not respond to verbal requests or actively participate in group activities, which may influence teachers' judgments about their competencies in other areas of development.

Instructional Enhancements Recommended[xiv]

As described above, there are several approaches to serving young DLLs that range from comprehensive dual language models that intentionally promote bilingualism and biliteracy to intensive English immersion that does not use the native language and promotes rapid English acquisition. Regardless of the language approach taken, all ECE programs that serve DLLs must provide additional language supports as well as specific instructional adaptations. While the features of high quality preschool such as intentional teaching, positive teacher-child and home–school relationships, qualified teachers, individualized adult–child conversations that promote language and positive relationships, opportunities for children to learn and practice new vocabulary, and frequent assessment that documents individual progress and informs instructional planning, are important for all children, they are not sufficient for equitable achievement for DLLs. Since these children are in the early stages of English comprehension and proficiency, instructional practices will need to be enhanced in order for DLLs to benefit linguistically, socially and cognitively. Current research indicates that all teachers, whether they are bilingual or monolingual English speaking, can implement a variety of strategies to support young dual language learners appropriately and effectively. However, most ECE teachers need specific guidance on exactly *how* to support dual language learners especially when they do not speak or understand the child's home language. Therefore, it is important for states to provide detailed recommendations on specific teaching practices that will help DLLs comprehend the content of lessons, develop advanced oral language skills, and grow in their English language development. Some states have provided this guidance in accompanying curriculum frameworks or supplementary documents and some have integrated suggested teaching practices throughout their ELDS.

Assessment Instruments and Procedures Recommended [xv]

All ECE teachers and support staff need to accurately assess young DLLs' development and achievement in order to individualize instruction, improve the quality of education, and improve academic school readiness. Assessment of young DLLs is a multistep process that requires all program staff to be knowledgeable about aspects of the linguistic and cultural development of young DLLs (see above) as well as the specific characteristics and appropriateness of the assessment instruments they use. Those responsible for conducting assessments will need to understand the stages of English language development for young dual language learners and the importance of home language development for overall language development and future academic achievement. They will also need to be skilled in implementing authentic observational assessment methods that are aligned with curriculum goals as well as in linking ongoing assessment results to individualized instruction. A major consideration when setting assessment benchmarks or kindergarten entry expectations is the unique developmental profiles of children who are acquiring English as a second language during the preschool years. It is inappropriate to expect young DLLs to learn and demonstrate knowledge and skills in the same manner as monolingual children. The unique linguistic, social, and cultural characteristics of young DLLs need to be considered when assessments are conducted and the results are interpreted. Clearly this is a complex process that requires both knowledgeable and trained professionals as well detailed guidance from states to local programs.

Family Engagement Strategies [xvi]

To successfully educate children of all ages, schools and families must work collaboratively. Engaging parents around the importance of maintaining their home language while their child is learning English is critical to the long-term development of DLLs. All states have recognized the importance of successful school-family partnerships and some have provided recommendations for increased levels of school engagement among families with young DLLs. Traditionally, Hispanic Spanish-speaking and linguistically isolated families have been less engaged with school functions. Many barriers have been reported that help to explain these lower levels of involvement: No provisions for language translations or interpreters, culturally inconsistent practices, social feelings of exclusion, lack of transportation, inconvenient schedules, etc. However, recent work has highlighted specific practices that can reduce the barriers and lead to strengthened family-school partnerships such as:

1. Addressing the bilingual/bicultural needs of DLL families;
2. Developing warm and mutually respectful relationships with DLL families;
3. Engaging in regular two-way communication;
4. Approaching DLL families using a strengths-based framework;
5. Engaging families to support their children's development at home; and
6. Utilizing community resources to support family engagement.

Again, many ECE staff members have little or no training or professional preparation that has addressed the specific family engagement practices that are effective with families of DLLs. Some states have provided separate documents or program guidelines that emphasize strategies such as those listed above. The important point is that all families are committed to the success of their children and DL families are critical partners and need to be engaged with sensitivity and attention to their specific strengths and needs.

Teacher Qualifications [xvii]

As described above, ECE teachers who work with DLL children and families need specialized competencies. Although it remains a challenge to recruit and retain qualified staff that are bilingual, bicultural, or have relevant credentials, it is still important for states to have some guidelines on *who* should be teaching young DLLs. While states vary enormously in their professional requirements for the ECE workforce, almost all require some background or preparation in child development and teaching methods. As we are learning more about the specific types of qualifications and competencies that are linked to improved growth and development of DLLs, it is important for states to outline in some detail what the expectations are for teachers of DLLs. In the long run, these plans will need to be coordinated with the Institutions of Higher Education and accompanied by comprehensive professional development.

Findings

These findings are drawn from the review described above; the findings are also represented in the data presented in the "At A Glance" spreadsheet, Document Part III.

State Classifications

As shown in Table 1, of the 21 states and the District of Columbia reviewed, only one state, New Jersey, was classified as a dual language development state. Sixteen states were classified as English language development states and the District of Columbia and 4 additional states were classified as English immersion.

Table 1

Classification	Number of States plus District of Columbia
Dual Language Development	1
English Language Development	16
English Immersion	5

Program Criteria

As shown in Table 2, no state or the District of Columbia met all program criteria as defined for this review. The majority of states, 15, included language to varying degrees, about the needs of dual language learners in their language, literacy, or communication developmental domain, with an additional 3 states addressing the needs of DLLs in a separate domain of learning in their ELDS. Most, 13 also had a clear statement of philosophy in their ELDS that articulated their pedagogical approach to DLLs. Only 6 states had any language about DLLs and their social and emotional development in their standards. This review of ELDS and supporting documents found that 12 states provided some level of guidance regarding appropriate instructional strategies specific to young DLLs. 7 states provided specific recommendations for engaging families that were not native English speakers. Fewer states offered specific guidelines on how to assess young DLLs, 7. A minority of states had specified teacher qualifications for who should be teaching DLLs, 5, or clear procedures for identifying who is a dual language learner, 3.

These results present a picture of highly variable approaches toward the education and care of young children who are acquiring English as a second language. The majority of these states have some language and guidance in their Early Learning and Development Standards/Guidelines and supporting documents that acknowledges the unique learning needs of DLLs, but no state, including the one state classified as having a dual language development approach, has responded comprehensively to a rapidly expanding research base on the developmental patterns and educational needs of young DLLs.

Table 2

Program Criteria	Number of States plus District of Columbia
Statement of Philosophy	13
Identification Procedures	3
Separate DLL Domain	3
DLLs Addressed in Language, Literacy, Communication	15
DLLs Addressed in Social & Emotional Domain	6
Family Engagement Approaches for DLLs	7
Teacher Qualifications	5
Teaching Practices/Strategies	12
Assessment Recommendations	7

Summary and Recommendations

This analysis of state Early Learning and Development Standards reveals a great range of attention to the learning profiles and needs of young DLLs. Only one state was classified as a Preschool Dual Language state; the vast majority met the definition of an English language

development state. This means that most states have recognized the need to set appropriate expectations for the development of young DLLs, and have designed language to guide program practices. However, few states have actually integrated this perspective throughout all aspects of their ECE systems. Therefore, most local programs are probably left with vague expectations about "supporting the child's use of the home language" without sufficient clarity or support about exactly how to accomplish this goal. Since only seven states provided guidance on adapting assessment methods for DLLs, programs are also likely to be confused about how to conduct "linguistically appropriate" assessments for children who know more than one language. For those states that were classified as English Immersion states, it is unclear whether they are informed of current research on best practices for preschool DLLs.

State Program Classifications

As we continue to expand our knowledge base about the development of young DLLs and how to improve their academic school readiness and school performance, it will be important for states to explicitly state their goals for the growing numbers of children who speak a language other than English at home aligned to this research. ECE programs need explicit language that can shape their classroom practices. Otherwise, confusion and inconsistent approaches are likely to prevail.

The following states ELDS clearly outline their overall approaches with a detailed rationale to the education of preschool DLLs:

(1) *Illinois'* ELDS include a separate domain on English language development and home language development that outlines the research and specific goals around development of the home language such as, "for young children who are English Language Learners (ELLs), the home language is the vehicle by which they are socialized into their families and communities. It is the medium that fosters their earliest and most enduring relationships, their initial ideas about how the world works, and their emerging sense of self and identity. When preschool ELLs enter English-only preschool classrooms, they may lose their desire and eventually their ability to speak their home language. The development of linguistic, cognitive, and literacy skills in the child's first language provides the foundation for learning these skills in English. The knowledge and skills children demonstrate in their home language can be applied to the learning of English for social and academic purposes. Therefore, a child's understanding and ability to use her home language is the first step in acquiring English proficiency and English literacy skills."

(2) *New Jersey*. The standards include statements on promoting goals in both languages, both in its ELDS philosophy and in the word language domains. For example, the ELDS state "Students who speak other languages at home, especially those students with limited English proficiency, have specific linguistic needs that must be addressed, that supports their optimal learning and development to ensure that they are provided a quality educational experience. It is important that administrators and teachers acquire knowledge of the stages of second language

development; and developmentally appropriate strategies, techniques and assessments to maintain, develop and support the home language, and proficiency in English. Effective instructional practices that provide young English language learners with linguistic and cognitive support must be embedded within the context of age-appropriate classroom routines, hands-on activities and lessons. Strategies for working with English language learners can be found in each section of the standards… Sensitivity to and support for diversity in culture, ethnicity, language and learning must be woven into the daily activities and routines of the early childhood classroom, " and elaborated on further in the world language domain, "In preschool, children are just beginning to learn about language and how it works. Some of their language learning will focus on the languages spoken in their homes, and some of this learning will focus on the languages they encounter in their community. With the growing number of young children in New Jersey who speak and understand different home languages, preschool teachers and classrooms must be equipped to support children's learning in more than one language. Being bilingual can be an asset for all children."

Program Criteria

The criteria that few states address are: separate DLL domain (3), clear identification procedures (3), and teacher qualification (5). This means that the vast majority of states have no clear process for identifying who is a dual language learner, what the typical developmental trajectory looks like for preschool DLLs, or specific qualifications for teachers of young DLLs.

The following states have addressed these criteria and used language that may be informative for other states:

Clear identification procedure: *Illinois'* Administrative Code provides guidance on identification of young DLLs. An excerpt from this section of the code is as follows, "Each school district shall administer a home language survey with respect to each student in preschool, kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12 who is entering the district's schools or any of the district's preschool programs for the first time, for the purpose of identifying students who have a language background other than English. The survey should be administered as part of the enrollment process or, for preschool programs, by the first day the student commences participation in the program."

Teacher qualifications: The Texas Administrative code make clear the regulations for pre-k teachers in the state, "(a) School districts shall take all reasonable affirmative steps to assign appropriately certified teachers to the required bilingual education and English as a second language programs in accordance with the Texas Education Code (TEC), §29.061, concerning bilingual education and special language program teachers. School districts that are unable to secure a sufficient number of certified bilingual education and English as a second language teachers to provide the required programs, shall request emergency teaching permits or special assignment permits, as appropriate."

Separate DLL domain: *California's* separate domain for DLLs includes clear guidance for ECE professionals regarding use of the standards in this domain, in conjunction with the standards in other domains, such as "The preschool learning foundations in English-language development are foundations in language and literacy for preschool children whose home language is not English. These foundations for English learners are intended for use with children who arrive at preschool functioning predominantly in their home language, not English, and set the stage for further English language acquisition described within the foundation. These foundations are organized to align with the content categories of California's English language development standards, which cover kindergarten through grade twelve, and are divided into the following three categories (1) listening and speaking; (2) reading; and (3) writing. As with the K-12 standards, the preschool learning foundation in English language development are designed to assist classroom teachers in their understanding of children's progress toward English language proficiency. They are meant to be used along with the language and literacy foundations, not in place of them."

While more states have addressed assessment recommendations (7), family engagement strategies for DL families (7), provided guidance on instructional practices (12), and included language about adaptations for DLLs in their language and literacy domains (15), no state has included all these criteria in their ELDS and supporting documents. The following states have provided specific language in these areas that may help other states as they strengthen supports for DLLs:

Assessment recommendations: In *California*, a curriculum framework provides information about the Desired Results Assessment System as part of the California Early Learning and Development System. Information provided states that children should be assessed in home language across all domains except for the ELD domain. It provides much guidance to teachers on how to document and assess competencies that DLLs demonstrate using their home language while they are in the acquisition of English (See CA profile for reference). In addition, some states have adopted the WIDA Early English Language Development standards, (referenced in the state profiles) that provide guidance on assessment of DLLs.

Family engagement strategies: *California's* Curriculum Framework's English–Language Development domain includes a subsection titled, "Engaging Families," that offers recommendations on ways to engage families with children who are DLLs. In addition, a separate document that supports implementation of the foundations titled, Preschool English Learners: Principles and Practices to Promote Language, Literacy, and Learning includes a section "Preschool English Learners, Their Families, and Their Communities" that provides information around the role of families in language and literacy development; the diversity of the immigration experience; connecting school and the home language; varieties of language; and recommended practices. (See CA profile for source).

Instructional practices/strategies: The *New Jersey* standards provide instructional strategies specific to DLLs for many standards for several domains within their ELDS (See NJ profile for references). For example, listed under the "Children Identify and Solve Problems Standard" it states, "Stretch children's thinking and use interesting language and vocabulary in conversations, while keeping the needs of dual language learners in mind. (e.g., 'Alejandra, I noticed that you found the book about butterflies in the science area. Were you able to find a picture of a butterfly that is yellow with black designs like the one you drew? Do you know the words that go with the picture? Let's look at the pictures and read the words again to see if we can find clues to help us learn the name of your butterfly. Then, maybe we can write them down in English and in Spanish so we can remember how to write the words to go with your drawing" (pg. 65). And, "Supplement verbal feedback with gestures and facial expressions for children who are just learning a second language" (pg. 66).

DLLs addressed in Language and Literacy Domain: The Texas guidelines include specific standards for DLLs within this domain, including instructional techniques and child behaviors aligned with each standard. (See TX profile for references). An example for one standard is provided below: "II.D.6. Child increases listening vocabulary and begins to develop vocabulary of object names and common phrases in English (ELL)

Examples of Child Behaviors

The child:
- participates as a speaker and listener in group activities including child-initiated imaginative play (plays the role of the store clerk or a waiter in a restaurant).
- follows directions when introduced to a situation.
- responds appropriately to simple instructions given by the teacher (follows two consecutive instructions, or chooses two flowers from the tray and draws pictures of them).
- follows a command using actions.
- sequences story picture cards.
- retells a story in his own words.
- role plays or pantomimes stories.
- listens attentively and responds to stories and poems (tells a story; enacts a poem; draws a picture to illustrate a story of poem).

Examples of Instructional Strategies

The teacher:
- finds out if new words learned in English are only new labels for concepts already known or if the concept itself must be taught.
- illustrates meanings with pictures or diagrams.
- uses artifacts and hands-on manipulatives.

- uses anchor charts, graphic organizers, and semantic mapping.
- role plays or pantomimes.
- makes drawings on the dry erase board.
- makes use of how things are said (volume, pitch, rate, and emphasis), using as many cues as possible to help child gain the meaning.
- uses the Spanish word and has the child repeat the new word in English, if necessary. (e.g., "El tiene hambre." "He is hungry." "Hungry").
- uses facial expressions, hand gestures or acts out stories to promote child's understanding.
- restates important information by using synonyms, cognates, paraphrasing, and visual cues.
- uses the child's home language as base to support the development of listening skills in English.
- provides instruction or command in the child's home language followed by the command in English (as needed)."

The majority of states had a statement of philosophy that outlined their approach toward the education of young DLLs (13). However, it is important to note that the range of breadth and depth on this criterion was quite large. Some states had elaborated statements that included a well-developed rationale with research citations and some had a few sentences that addressed the need to maintain the home language. The following states had exemplary language in their statement of philosophy about the education of young DLLs:

New Jersey: New Jersey Preschool Teaching and Learning Standards state that, "Students who speak other languages at home, especially those students with limited English proficiency, have specific linguistic needs that must be addressed, that supports their optimal learning and development to ensure that they are provided a quality educational experience. It is important that administrators and teachers acquire knowledge of the stages of second language development; and developmentally appropriate strategies, techniques and assessments to maintain, develop and support the home language, and proficiency in English. Effective instructional practices that provide young English language learners with linguistic and cognitive support must be embedded within the context of age-appropriate classroom routines, hands-on activities and lessons. Strategies for working with English language learners can be found in each section of the standards… Sensitivity to and support for diversity in culture, ethnicity, language and learning must be woven into the daily activities and routines of the early childhood classroom."

Rhode Island: Rhode Island Early Learning and Development Standards state that, "In Rhode Island, the ethnic diversity within communities also means that young learners bring a wide range of linguistic experiences to their early care and education settings. Children who speak a

language other than English in their homes and communities have varying levels of exposure to and competence in English when they enter early care and education programs. While confirming the importance of supporting these children to learn English, the Standards also clearly recognizes these children's home language as a source of tremendous strength, and its guidelines and indicators promote the continued development and growth of every child's home language as the child learns English—thus the term "dual language learners" (DLLs). A child's home language can be thought of as a foundation for the acquisition of English. In fact, research shows that when they have a strong background in their first language, children learn a second language more easily; as well, they have cognitive, academic, personal, and cultural advantages. (Ada & Zubizarreta, 2001; Collier, 1987; Cummins, 1984) In other words, the stronger the foundation in the home language, the better able children are to learn to understand and speak English—and to learn across all domains. Clearly, programs need to ensure the continued development of children's home language, while promoting their acquisition of English. Additionally, children who are dual language learners should have the opportunity to interact and demonstrate their abilities, skills, and knowledge in any language—English and their home language."

Part II. Individual State Profiles (See attachment)

For each state and the District of Columbia, an individual profile was developed that provides a summary of the key features of the state's ELDS and supporting materials, including a rationale for the state's classification as an English Language Development, Dual Language Development, or English Immersion state. For each of the criteria, all references to DLLs were included, unless otherwise indicated, (i.e., some states had too many references to include all of them in their profile). The profile also includes references and links for all source materials reviewed for this report. The individual state profiles should be used in conjunction with the At a Glance Matrix to more deeply understand how a state responded to an individual criterion as well as the overall approach of a state in providing clear and consistent guidance for programs and professionals on the range of criteria.   These profiles are also useful for reviewing additional exemplars from states ELDS, as not all of the exemplars were included in the report narrative.

Part III. At-a-Glance Matrix (See attachment)

This matrix displays the ratings across all states and program criteria. As previously stated, states vary in the depth of support provided in response to each of the criterion, and not all states that were recognized for responding to a particular criterion should be considered as a best practice or exemplary. The At a Glance matrix is a resource for states to be able to easily view other states that responded to specific criteria. It is a tool to be used in conjunction with the individual states profile to guide states in the selection of other state individual profiles to review.

Recommendations

Clearly, as a country, we have much work to do in integrating the recent research on supporting improved achievement for young dual language learners. Fortunately, we have an emerging knowledge base that should guide our efforts to make ELDS more coherent and appropriate for DLLs. Given the growing proportion of children who speak a language other than English at home, the chronic academic underachievement of these children at all stages of their school lives, and the recent expansion of research about how to support their development, states are in an excellent position to strengthen their ELDS for DLLs, and provide programs and practitioners with more clarity and support for serving DLLs and their families.

As a first step, states can review their approaches toward the education of DLLs and determine whether there is a shared commitment to this specific approach. Frequently, there are unstated assumptions implied in state ELDS. For instance, there may be contradictory statements about "using the child's home language whenever possible," and expecting rapid acquisition of English. Or statements about valuing the home language as a basis for English acquisition, but then not providing any information about how to assess a child's progress in the home language as well as in English. All states should have clarity at the state level about their goals for DLLs and their expectations for program implementation. We strongly urge all states and the District of Columbia to review their ELDS and supporting documents to determine if they represent a clear position that is based on recent research.

Key questions to guide this dialogue:
1. What do we believe is in the best interests of young DLLs?
2. Have we derived these beliefs from sound research?
3. Do we all agree on these approaches?
4. Do our ELDS and supporting documents reflect these beliefs?
5. What additional expertise do we need to finalize our deliberations?

After reviewing their approach and agreeing on their goals for DLLs, states can review their ELDS and other supporting documents to see if they address the program criteria described above consistent with the definitions and research presented in this report.

An analysis of *where we are* and *where we want to go* would be helpful at this point. All of the criteria are important, but each state will need to decide which ones are most feasible and urgent within their particular context. A look at how other states with similar approaches and philosophies address the needs of DLLs for specific criteria could also help states make decisions about areas where they would like to enhance or develop new guidance. Based on our combined experience, the authors recommend that states attend to the ELDS themselves to make sure the language around supporting DLLs is explicit, consistent, and integrated throughout all domains.

The specific guidance provided on how to assess DLLs' progress is also critical. Experience and research has shown that what is included in assessment requirements strongly influences what teachers focus on. While the valid assessment of young DLLs presents many technical challenges, several states and the Office of Head Start have provided clear guidance in this area. Many states have built out from their ELDS to further support implementation, by creating aligned curriculum frameworks, pre-K program operating guidelines, statewide standards training, or supplemental guidance specific to implementation of the ELDS for DLLs (see individual state profiles for examples). In instances where the ELDS themselves have been recently updated and modifications cannot be made in the near term, these additional documents provide a way for states to provide clear guidance on how to interpret the ELDS for young DLLs.

Footnotes

[i] (Halle, et al., 2014)

[ii] For a review of language models and their effectiveness, please see:

  California….

  Espinosa, L. (2015). Getting It Right for Children from Diverse Backgrounds: Applying Research to Improve Practice with an Emphasis on Dual Language Learners. Upper Saddle River: New: New Jersey, Pearson.

[iii] For a review of specific program modifications and instructional strategies in an ELD approach, see, Glodenberg, …

[iv] For a review o K-12 educational approaches to English language learners, see, Lindholm-Leary, K. and Genesee, F. Alternative Educational Programs for English Learners, IN Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches. California Department of Education: Sacramento, 2010, pp. 323-382.

[v]

[vi]

[vii] Please see CA, IL, NJ, NY,NC, RI, TX for examples of exemplary statements of philosophy

[viii] Please see IL identification procedures for example of specific screening and scoring criteria, and ME, TX for further examples of states DLL identification procedures that are consistent with their stated philosophy.

[ix]

[x] Please see the ELDS for CA and IL for examples of domains that are specific to DLLs. Note that OR has adopted the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework as the state's ELDS, which also includes a separate domain pertaining to DLLs.

[xi]

[xii] Please see IA, NY, NC, RI, TX for examples of states that have included specific indicators or benchmarks specific to DLLs within this domain.

[xiii] See Sandhofer & Uchkoshi (2013). Cognitive Consequences of Dual Language Learning: Cognitive Function, Language and Literacy, Science and Mathematics, and Social–Emotional Development. In California's Best Practices for Young Dual Language Learners: Research Overview Papers, Child Development Division, California Department of Education (CDE). Available online at

  http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/cd/ce/documents/dllresearchpapers.pd

[xiv] Please see CA, NC, NJ, NY, TX for exemplars for providing guidance on appropriate instructional strategies/enhancements for DLLs.

[xv] Please see CA and OR for exemplary guidance on appropriate assessment for DLLs.

[xvi] Please see CA, NC, TX for sample language on how states provide guidance on family engagement specific to parents of DLLs.

[xvii] Please see IL, ME, TX for exemplars for providing guidance on the qualifications of teachers of DLLs.