PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 1: PLANNING FOR THE INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE, CONTENT, AND CULTURE

The teacher candidate understands the underlying principles behind language, content, and culture integration, and designs curricula, lessons, and assessments that reflect those principles.

1A. Language and content integration in curricular planning

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ When discussing planning or developing lesson plans, the teacher demonstrates a lack of understanding of or resistance to how language and content can be integrated in planning. ☐ The teacher maintains a strict separation of content and language instruction, rarely, if ever, referencing language (form/function/genre) while planning for content instruction.	☐ The teacher can identify instances of integrating language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning. ☐ The teacher can describe several strategies for planning for a focus on language during content instruction (such as planning for noticing, awareness, and practice activities that are contextualized in meaningful content).	☐ The teacher sometimes integrates language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning. ☐ The teacher experiments with planning some language-focused activities (e.g., noticing, awareness, and practice activities that are contextualized in meaningful content) and is occasionally effective.	☐ The teacher regularly and competently integrates language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning. ☐ The teacher consistently and capably plans varied language-focused activities within content-based instruction (e.g., noticing, awareness, and practice activities that are contextualized in meaningful content).

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

1B. Language objectives – discourse level (phrase, sentence, paragraph) or type (e.g., dialogue, report) + function + grammatical feature + vocabulary

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot or does not write language objectives that are appropriate for students. ☐ The teacher appears not to have any understanding of the difference between content-obligatory and content-compatible language objectives. ☐ The teacher does not differentiate language objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics.	☐ The teacher can articulate the purpose of language objectives. ☐ The teacher may attempt to write language objectives, but they tend to lack alignment with content objectives, or to be unclear, too broad, or difficult to assess. ☐ Attempted language objectives regularly lack function, grammatical feature, vocabulary, or descriptions of discourse level or type. ☐ The teacher has trouble distinguishing content-obligatory from content-compatible language objectives. ☐ The teacher can describe strategies for differentiating objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics, but does not do so in lesson plans.	☐ The teacher sometimes writes developmentally and contextually appropriate language objectives. ☐ The teacher's language objectives align with content objectives, are sometimes written clearly, and can be assessed relatively easily. ☐ The teacher's language objectives sometimes include function, grammatical feature, vocabulary, and descriptions of discourse level or type, but often are missing a key aspect (e.g., function) or may not accurately link components (e.g., vocabulary may not correspond to feature). ☐ The teacher can sometimes distinguish between and accurately write both content-obligatory and content-compatible language objectives. ☐ The teacher attempts to differentiate objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics, but lacks competence in doing so.	☐ The teacher writes language objectives that are consistently developmentally and contextually appropriate for students. ☐ The teacher's language objectives regularly align with content objectives, are written clearly, and can easily be assessed. ☐ The teacher's language objectives consistently include clearly and accurately linked functions, grammatical features, vocabulary, and descriptions of discourse level or type. ☐ The teacher's language objectives regularly and accurately reflect both content-obligatory and content-compatible language. ☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully differentiates objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

1C. Classroom assessment – performance (i.e., real-life tasks) and other assessments that require students to demonstrate their content knowledge and their ability to use the language to express their understandings

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not differentiate formative or summative assessments in either language for different learner groups. ☐ The teacher does not use assessment data to inform target features and content for future instruction. ☐ The teacher cannot articulate the purpose or examples of performance assessments and cannot explain how they might be implemented in the curriculum.	☐ The teacher can explain why both formative and summative assessments should be differentiated for different learner groups and can describe strategies for doing so. ☐ The teacher can identify several ways to assess student content understandings and language development. ☐ The teacher can explain how assessment data can be used to inform target features/functions and content for future instruction. ☐ The teacher can articulate the purpose of performance assessments and describe several examples. ☐ The teacher can explain how performance assessment might be implemented in the curriculum but does not apply this understanding in practice.	☐ The teacher at times attempts to differentiate formative and summative assessments for different learner groups. ☐ The teacher sometimes tries to incorporate different ways to assess student content understandings and language development and is somewhat effective. ☐ The teacher attempts to use assessment data to inform target features/functions and content for future instruction, but demonstrates a lack of know-how and/or confidence in doing so. ☐ The teacher attempts to design and implement some performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development, but is not always effective.	☐ The teacher effectively and consistently differentiates formative and summative assessments for different learner groups. ☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses different ways to assess student content understandings and language development. ☐ The teacher capably and confidently uses assessment data to inform target features/functions and content for future instruction and to identify areas in which academic language development is needed. ☐ The teacher effectively and adeptly designs and implements multiple performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

1D. Culture integration throughout the curriculum

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not recognize the promotion of identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation as part of the curriculum. ☐ The teacher does not seek out or attempt to plan for the use of authentic resources (songs, poems, literature, artifacts, people) to promote subject matter teaching and/or identity development or cross-cultural competence/ multicultural appreciation. ☐ The teacher does not include family and community knowledge or assets in instructional planning and may only see deficits (what learners/families lack).	☐ The teacher can describe activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation, but does not incorporate them into planning. ☐ The teacher can identify examples of authentic resources (songs, poems, literature, artifacts, people) to promote subject-matter teaching and/or identity development, cross-cultural competence, or multicultural appreciation, and can sometimes explain whether they are cognitively and linguistically appropriate for students. ☐ The teacher can describe the importance of and identify ideas for including family and community cultural knowledge and assets in planning.	☐ The teacher occasionally plans activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation with some competence. ☐ The teacher often plans these activities as stand-alone culture lessons rather than integrating them into the regular content curriculum. ☐ The teacher sometimes plans for the use of authentic resources (songs, poems, literature, artifacts, people) to promote subject-matter teaching and/or identity development, cross-cultural competence or multicultural appreciation. However, the resources are not always appropriate for students' cognitive and/or linguistic levels. ☐ The teacher at times attempts to include family and community cultural knowledge and assets in planning.	☐ The teacher regularly and competently plans activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and multicultural appreciation. ☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully weaves these activities throughout the content curriculum as appropriate. ☐ The teacher frequently and capably plans for the use of authentic resources (songs, poems, literature, artifacts, people) that are appropriate for students' cognitive and linguistic levels to promote subject-matter learning and identity development/cross-cultural awareness/multicultural appreciation. ☐ The teacher regularly includes family and community cultural knowledge and assets in planning in ways that empower learners.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 2: TEACHING FOR BILITERACY DEVELOPMENT
The teacher candidate understands the fundamental principles of biliteracy development and uses a variety of effective instructional strategies that promote vocabulary and biliteracy development across a range of genres/text types.

2A. Biliteracy instruction

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot explain approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language. ☐ The teacher cannot identify research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.). ☐ The teacher does not demonstrate understanding that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language).	☐ The teacher can describe some approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language. ☐ The teacher can identify examples of a few research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.). ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of using literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).	☐ The teacher sometimes approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language. ☐ The teacher can explain the purpose of several research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.) and attempts to incorporate them into instruction, but has varied effectiveness. ☐ The teacher sometimes uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language) with some effectiveness.	☐ The teacher consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language. ☐ The teacher can confidently articulate research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.) and consistently and competently uses these approaches in practice. ☐ The teacher regularly and effectively uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2B. Vocabulary development, word knowledge, and text types

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not know how to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. ☐ The teacher cannot identify grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary. ☐ The teacher cannot describe strategies to promote word learning (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). ☐ The teacher cannot describe how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.	☐ The teacher can explain criteria for selecting appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. ☐ The teacher can identify grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary. ☐ The teacher can identify some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). ☐ The teacher can explain some ways that different genres/text types are constructed in each program language and can identify a few strategies for drawing students' attention them.	☐ The teacher sometimes selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. ☐ The teacher at times is effective in using grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary. ☐ The teacher at times and with varied effectiveness uses some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). ☐ The teacher sometimes draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.	☐ The teacher regularly and thoughtfully selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. ☐ The teacher competently uses a range of effective, grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary across program languages. ☐ The teacher consistently and adeptly uses varied word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). ☐ The teacher frequently and knowledgeably draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2C. Cross-lingual connections

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not incorporate cross-lingual instruction in lesson planning. ☐ The teacher cannot identify opportunities for cross-lingual connections and cannot explain the importance of developing such connections to support literacy development across program languages. ☐ The teacher is not able to explain how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.	☐ The teacher understands the need to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in the planning of some lessons. ☐ The teacher can identify opportunities to draw students' attention to cross-lingual connections to support vocabulary and literacy development across program languages, but misses those moments during instruction. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of and strategies for primarily remaining in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit. ☐ The teacher can explain ways to model how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.	☐ The teacher at times attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in planning a few lessons, with some competence. ☐ When appropriate, the teacher sometimes is effective in drawing students' attention to cross-lingual connections, focusing on metalinguistic knowledge such as cognates, morphemes, and derivation to support vocabulary and literacy development across program languages. ☐ The teacher sometimes remains in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit, but has a tendency to mix languages occasionally (and unnecessarily) to make the connections. ☐ When appropriate, the teacher sometimes effectively models how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.	☐ The teacher consistently and competently incorporates cross-lingual instruction in planning some lessons (when appropriate). ☐ When appropriate, the teacher regularly and effectively draws students' attention to cross-lingual connections, focusing on metalinguistic knowledge, such as cognates, morphemes, and derivation to support vocabulary and biliteracy development across program languages. ☐ The teacher exclusively (or primarily) remains in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit. ☐ When appropriate, the teacher frequently and capably models how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their biliteracy development.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2D. Biliteracy assessment

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot articulate the principles of biliterate writing and reading or the importance of assessing biliteracy across a range of genres/text types.	☐ The teacher can articulate the basic principles of biliterate writing and reading, but does not design biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.	☐ The teacher can describe the principles of biliterate writing and reading but inconsistently designs effective biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.	☐ The teacher regularly and capably designs effective biliteracy assessments that reflect the principles of biliterate reading and writing across multiple genres/text types.
☐ The teacher does not use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data.	☐ The teacher can explain how knowledge of language transfer can inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.	☐ The teacher is sometimes effective in using knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.	☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.
☐ The teacher observes student reading and writing development without taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in just one language.	☐ The teacher can explain on a basic level how to observe student reading and writing development while taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in just one language.	☐ The teacher may attempt to observe student reading and writing development while taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in just one language, but lacks confidence and skill in doing so.	☐ The teacher consistently and thoughtfully observes student reading and writing development while taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in just one language.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 3: MAINTAINING A LINGUISTICALLY-RICH LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The teacher candidate maintains a linguistically-rich learning environment and uses that environment to enhance students' language development and content learning.

3A. Visual language scaffolds

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not display useful and curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom. **OR** ☐ The teacher displays scaffolds that are confusing and/or lacking in clear purpose. ☐ If any scaffolds are displayed, the teacher does not model how students can use them appropriately.	☐ The teacher can describe the purpose of and strategies for displaying useful and curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom that are specific to the instructional language. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of referring to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production. ☐ The teacher can describe the importance of modeling how students can use classroom scaffolds to support their learning.	☐ The teacher displays some basic curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom, but at times in ways that are disorganized or unclear, and/or not specific to the instructional language. ☐ The teacher sometimes refers to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production. ☐ The teacher at times attempts to model how students can use classroom scaffolds to support their learning, but struggles to do so in ways that lead students to use the scaffolds independently.	☐ The teacher clearly displays a variety of social and curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom that evolve over time and reflect characteristics of the instructional language. ☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully refers to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production. ☐ The teacher regularly and capably models how to use these classroom scaffolds, leading students to independently use the resources as tools for learning.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

3B. Target language use

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot explain the importance of exposing learners to accurate, proficient, and appropriately complex oral and written language input and cannot identify specific examples of such input. ☐ The teacher often unnecessarily uses the non-target language while teaching and does not think that using the target language exclusively (or primarily) is important. ☐ The teacher cannot articulate why having clear and consistent target language use expectations for students is critical.	☐ The teacher can explain the importance of exposing learners to accurate, proficient, and appropriately complex oral and written language input and can identify specific examples of such input. ☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of remaining exclusively (or primarily) in the target language while teaching. ☐ The teacher can give reasons why having clear and consistent target language use expectations for students is critical and can name some strategies for supporting student use of the target language. ☐ The teacher may communicate mixed messages (e.g., telling students to use the target language while inconsistently accepting use of the non-target language).	☐ The teacher exposes learners to mostly accurate, sufficiently proficient, and somewhat complex oral and written language input. ☐ The teacher attempts to use the target language exclusively (or primarily) while teaching, but may at times resort to use of the non-target language unnecessarily. ☐ The teacher mostly communicates clear expectations for students to remain in the target language exclusively (or primarily), but is not always consistent. ☐ The teacher often struggles to employ a wide range of strategies and routines to support all learners' abilities to use the target language.	☐ The teacher regularly exposes learners to accurate, highly proficient, and appropriately complex oral and written language input. ☐ The teacher nearly exclusively uses the target language while teaching. If the non-target language is used, it is done so always in a systematic way to support cross-lingual connections. ☐ The teacher consistently communicates clear expectations for students to remain in the target language exclusively (or primarily). ☐ The teacher effectively employs numerous strategies and routines to support all students' consistent use of the target language.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 4: SCAFFOLDING FOR STUDENT COMPREHENSION
The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of techniques to promote student comprehension in the target language.

4A. Verbal and Non-verbal Scaffolding – focus on how teachers use language and non-verbal cues to support comprehension

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not modify teacher talk to be responsive to students' needs and abilities. **OR** ☐ The teacher over-scaffolds, such as using overly simplified language with secondary students. ☐ The teacher does not use body language or facial expressions to support comprehension. ☐ The teacher does not use developmentally appropriate strategies or adjust them over time.	☐ The teacher can identify verbal and nonverbal strategies for modifying teacher talk to scaffold student comprehension, such as paraphrasing; using cognates; changing speed or intonation; and using body language and facial expressions. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of using scaffolding techniques that are appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities. ☐ The teacher can correctly describe specific strategies that are appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of adjusting scaffolding strategies over time.	☐ The teacher sometimes and somewhat capably modifies teacher talk (speed, intonation, repetition, etc.) so that it is appropriate for students' ages and abilities. ☐ The teacher makes some attempts to include other verbal discourse strategies like paraphrasing and cognates. ☐ The teacher at times (albeit inconsistently) uses body language and facial expressions to support comprehension. ☐ The teacher sometimes uses strategies that are appropriate for students' ages or cognitive and linguistic abilities, but struggles to do so consistently ☐ The teacher sometimes tries to adjust strategies but has varied effectiveness.	☐ The teacher masterfully and consistently modifies teacher talk (speed, intonation, repetition, etc.), as appropriate for students' ages and abilities. ☐ The teacher frequently and competently includes other verbal discourse strategies like paraphrasing and cognates. ☐ The teacher regularly and purposefully uses body language and facial expressions to support comprehension. ☐ The teacher uses strategies that are consistently appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities. ☐ The teacher adjusts strategies intentionally over time as students grow and develop.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

4B. Procedural Scaffolding – focus on how teachers organize activities and routines to support comprehension

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot identify routines (like think-pair-share) that would ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom. ☐ The teacher does not make use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding. ☐ The teacher does not attempt to use instructional routines to ensure student comprehension or boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management. ☐ The teacher does not pair/group students in thoughtful ways to scaffold their comprehension.	☐ The teacher can explain the importance of having predictable routines (like think-pair-share) and structured activities within lessons in order to ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom. ☐ The teacher can give examples of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding. The teacher can identify types of boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management. ☐ The teacher can describe ways to organize students in groupings and cooperative activities that will scaffold student comprehension.	☐ The teacher sometimes and with varied effectiveness incorporates routines (like think-pair-share) to ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom. ☐ The teacher at times makes use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding. ☐ The teacher sometimes is effective using clear boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management. ☐ The teacher sometimes pairs/groups students to scaffold their comprehension, but not always thoughtfully or effectively.	☐ The teacher systematically and effectively uses instructional routines (like think-pair-share) to ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension. ☐ The teacher makes frequent use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding. ☐ The teacher consistently and competently uses clear boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management. ☐ The teacher regularly pairs/groups students systematically and in various arrangements to scaffold their comprehension.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

4C. Instructional Scaffolding – focus on how the teacher makes use of tools within instructional activities to support comprehension

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot identify instructional tools that support learning, such as props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, or language-rich visuals. ☐ The teacher does not use graphic organizers or other scaffolds to support student comprehension. **OR** ☐ The teacher over-scaffolds and does not modify or remove them over time, leading students to become reliant on them and stagnant in their language growth.	☐ The teacher can identify instructional tools that support learning, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals, and can describe how they might be beneficial in the classroom. ☐ The teacher can distinguish which instructional tools are appropriate for students' ages and abilities. ☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of removing or modifying scaffolds over time to promote student growth.	☐ The teacher attempts to incorporate some instructional tools to support learning, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals and has varied effectiveness. ☐ The teacher sometimes is effective in using instructional tools that are appropriate to students' ages and abilities. ☐ The teacher at times removes or modifies scaffolds to promote student growth, but not as intentionally or regularly as needed.	☐ The teacher regularly and knowledgeably incorporates a wide variety of instructional tools to support comprehension, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals. ☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully uses instructional tools that are appropriate to students' ages and abilities. ☐ The teacher intentionally removes or modifies scaffolds when necessary to promote student growth.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 5: SCAFFOLDING FOR STUDENT PRODUCTION

The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to promote extended student discourse and academic language production.

5A. Verbal Scaffolding – questioning techniques and follow-up moves to support student language use and development

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher struggles to articulate the purposes of different questioning techniques and follow-up moves and how to use them strategically to improve student production. ☐ The teacher nearly exclusively uses the Initiate-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence during classroom instruction, reacting to student responses with evaluative comments. ☐ The teacher does not use wait time effectively.	☐ The teacher can explain the purpose of different questioning techniques and how they can be used to elicit more student language production. ☐ The teacher can identify effective follow-up moves such as prompts for clarification, precision, or elaboration, to elicit academic and/or more precise language, push student thinking, and extend student discourse. ☐ The teacher can explain the value of effective use of wait time during classroom interactions.	☐ The teacher sometimes and with varied effectiveness uses different questioning techniques to elicit more student language production. ☐ The teacher makes attempts and at times is effective in using Initiate-Response-Follow-Up (IRF) sequences by prompting for clarification, precision, or elaboration; eliciting academic and/or more precise language; pushing student thinking; and extending student discourse. ☐ The teacher sometimes makes effective use of wait time during classroom interactions.	☐ The teacher consistently, strategically, and skillfully uses different questioning techniques to elicit more student language production. ☐ The teacher regularly and effectively uses Initiate-Response-Follow-Up (IRF) sequences by prompting for clarification, precision, or elaboration; eliciting academic and/or more precise language; pushing student thinking; and extending student discourse. ☐ The teacher consistently makes effective use of wait time during classroom interactions.

Evidence and Notes:

5B. Procedural Scaffolding – grouping strategies and classroom activities and routines to support student language use and development

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher rarely engages students in interactive activities or groupings to encourage student interpersonal or presentational oral production, relying mostly on whole class instruction or individual work. ☐ The teacher does not design activities to promote learning from and with peers in both interpersonal and presentational modes for either speaking or writing. ☐ Teacher talk strongly dominates instruction, and the teacher does not group students. ☐ The teacher's behaviors suggest a belief that input is more important and/or that interactive activities are too logistically challenging to implement.	☐ The teacher can articulate that student production can be facilitated through activities and routines (think-pair-share, learning centers, cooperative learning); however, most instruction relies on teacher talk. ☐ The teacher is able to describe the importance of developing activities to promote student production in either the interpersonal or presentational modes (for both speaking and writing) and to foster learning from and with peers. ☐ The teacher can describe different types of interactive groupings and what factors may be considered in deciding how to group students. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of reviewing necessary language (features/functions/ genres) needed to carry out activities in the target language.	☐ The teacher at times uses activities and routines (think-pair-share, learning centers, cooperative learning) that promote independent student production and student-to-student interaction rather than relying more so on teacher talk. ☐ The teacher sometimes designs activities that encourage students to produce in both interpersonal and presentational modes (for both speaking and writing) to foster learning from and with peers. Yet the teacher has varied effectiveness and sometimes struggles to manage some of the activities well. ☐ The teacher sometimes makes use of interactive groupings (dyads, cooperative groups), but does not consistently organize pairs or groups thoughtfully. ☐ The teacher infrequently or inadequately reviews necessary language (features/functions/ genres) needed to carry out activities in the target language.	☐ The teacher regularly and competently uses activities and routines (think-pair-share, learning centers, cooperative learning) that promote independent student production and student-student interaction. ☐ The teacher frequently and skillfully designs activities to foster learning from and with peers in both interpersonal and presentational modes (for both speaking and writing). ☐ The teacher frequently uses a variety of thoughtfully organized interactive groupings (dyads, cooperative groups) to promote student language production. ☐ The teacher consistently and capably reviews language (features/functions/genres) needed to carry out activities in the target language.

Evidence and Notes:

5C. Instructional Scaffolding – use of print and multimedia resources to support student language use and development

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher does not use print or multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support or facilitate language production, such as familiar language "chunks". ☐ The teacher assigns basic written tasks/assignments that are not scaffolded and that do not require students to produce sustained, academic oral or written discourse. ☐ The teacher does not model appropriate use of resources.	☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of using print and multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support and facilitate language production (such as providing key phrases to support small group interaction). ☐ The teacher can describe formulaic language "chunks" that would be appropriate to teach learners. ☐ The teacher can identify scaffolds that elicit sustained, academic oral and written language (like sentence starters or frames and graphic organizers to support content learning and language development), but fails to provide students with such scaffolds. ☐ The teacher can explain why modeling appropriate use of resources is important, but struggles to do so.	☐ The teacher sometimes and with varied effectiveness uses print and multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support and facilitate language production (such as providing key phrases to support small group interaction). ☐ The teacher at times teaches formulaic language "chunks" with some effectiveness and may post them as reminders for students to use these scaffolds (as developmentally appropriate). ☐ The teacher at times and somewhat capably provides students with scaffolds to elicit sustained, academic oral and written language (like sentence starters or frames and graphic organizers to support content learning and language development). ☐ The teacher occasionally models appropriate use of resources.	☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses a range of print and multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support and facilitate language production (such as providing key phrases to support small group interaction). ☐ The teacher teaches formulaic language "chunks" effectively and posts them as reminders for students to use these scaffolds (as developmentally appropriate). ☐ The teacher regularly and competently provides students with scaffolds to elicit sustained, academic oral and written language (like sentence starters or frames and graphic organizers to support content learning and language development). ☐ The teacher's consistent and adept modeling prepares students to use such scaffolds as resources.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 6: TEACHING FOR LANGUAGE AND CONTENT INTEGRATION
The teacher candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional practices to attend to students' language development and improve proficiency.

6A. Language alertness – instructional practices that intentionally bring attention to language during content instruction

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher emphasizes content teaching nearly exclusively. ☐ The teacher does not identify language (features, functions, genres) that coincide with the lesson's content and regularly misses opportunities for language instruction. ☐ The teacher does not prepare language objectives and lacks awareness of the importance of sharing language objectives with students in language they can understand. ☐ The teacher cannot identify pedagogical techniques that can be used to model and elicit specific language structures or functions. ☐ The teacher does not pay attention to language in the classroom OR the teacher teaches language as a separate subject, unrelated to subject-matter content.	☐ The teacher can identify examples of shifting student attention between language and content. ☐ The teacher can identify some opportunities to teach language (features, functions, genres) and clarify linguistic misconceptions in relation to content but does not take advantage of them. ☐ The teacher can explain the rationale for communicating language objectives to students in language they can understand. ☐ The teacher can identify pedagogical techniques that can be used to model and elicit specific language structures and functions, but does not apply them in practice. ☐ The teacher is able to explain why focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) should be addressed in contextualized ways within content instruction.	☐ The teacher occasionally shifts student attention between content and language, but attempts can seem forced or awkward. ☐ The teacher is sometimes effective in taking advantage of opportunities to teach language (features, functions, genres) and clarifying linguistic misconceptions in relation to content. ☐ The teacher at times communicates language objectives to students in student-friendly terms. ☐ The teacher at times and somewhat capably models and elicits specific language structures and functions. ☐ The teacher's focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) is sometimes contextualized within content instruction, but the teacher misses opportunities to bring students' attention to language.	☐ The teacher habitually and seamlessly shifts student attention between content and language in natural ways. ☐ The teacher regularly and actively looks for and takes advantage of opportunities to teach language (features, functions, genres) in effective ways and to clarify linguistic misconceptions in relation to content. ☐ The teacher clearly and consistently communicates language objectives to students in student-friendly terms. ☐ The teacher consistently and competently models and elicits specific language structures and functions. ☐ The teacher's focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) is regularly contextualized within content instruction.

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

6B. Corrective feedback – strategies include recasts or prompts like metalinguistic clues or clarification requests

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher cannot describe or identify developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback types to promote students' language proficiency. ☐ The teacher either does not provide corrective feedback or uses it in ways that do not encourage student uptake and repair. ☐ Teacher feedback does not distinguish between form/function and meaning and is typically ambiguous or confusing to students.	☐ The teacher can identify some developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback types to improve students' language proficiency. ☐ The teacher can explain the importance of and may make infrequent attempts to use corrective feedback that encourages student uptake and repair, but is rarely, if ever, effective. ☐ The teacher can articulate why it is important to distinguish feedback on language from feedback on content.	☐ The teacher uses some developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback types to improve students' language proficiency, but at times struggles to select corrective feedback strategies that are appropriate and/or misses opportunities to provide corrective feedback. ☐ The teacher uses a few corrective feedback types that encourage student uptake and repair. ☐ The teacher at times provides feedback that distinguishes a focus on language from a focus on content, but occasionally provides feedback that is ambiguous or confusing to students.	☐ The teacher skillfully and regularly uses a range of developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback types to improve students' language proficiency. ☐ The teacher uses many corrective feedback types that encourage student uptake and repair. ☐ The teacher effectively, clearly, and consistently provides feedback that distinguishes a focus on language from a focus on content.

Evidence and Notes:

Preservice DLI-Specific Formative Assessment of Teaching

Strand 7: Supporting Diverse Learners			
The teacher candidate effectively and appropriately supports diverse learners by differentiating instruction, maintaining high expectations, and promoting equitable classroom dynamics.			

7A. Differentiated instruction and assessment			
Counter evidence	**Recognizing**	**Developing**	**Excelling**
☐ The teacher seems unaware of the need to differentiate instruction according to students' language proficiencies, readiness, exceptionalities, or interests. ☐ The teacher emphasizes ability grouping alone as a way to differentiate instruction. ☐ The teacher is unable to identify or describe appropriate strategies to differentiate instruction and assessment.	☐ The teacher can explain the importance of differentiating content, instructional processes, and student products according to students' language proficiencies as well as readiness, exceptionalities, and interests. ☐ The teacher can explain why flexible grouping strategies are effective for differentiating instruction (such as pairing students with similar or different proficiency levels, etc.). ☐ The teacher can describe various strategies to differentiate instruction and assessment (e.g., differentiated language objectives, student choice, leveled texts, tiered activities and assessments), but is not able to use them in teaching.	☐ The teacher sometimes and with varied effectiveness differentiates by content, instructional processes, and/or student products according to students' language proficiencies as well as readiness, exceptionalities, and interests. ☐ The teacher attempts to use some flexible grouping strategies to differentiate instruction (such as pairing students with similar or different proficiency levels, etc.). ☐ The teacher at times employs appropriate strategies to differentiate instruction and assessment (e.g., differentiated language objectives, student choice, leveled texts, tiered activities and assessments), but not always effectively.	☐ The teacher consistently and effectively differentiates by content, instructional processes, and student products according to students' language proficiencies as well as readiness, exceptionalities, and interests. ☐ The teacher regularly and capably uses a range of flexible grouping strategies to differentiate instruction (such as pairing students with similar or different proficiency levels, etc.). ☐ The teacher regularly and competently employs appropriate strategies to differentiate instruction and assessment (e.g., differentiated language objectives, student choice, leveled texts, tiered activities and assessments).

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

7B. Maintaining rigor and high expectations for students of all linguistic and cultural backgrounds			
Counter evidence	**Recognizing**	**Developing**	**Excelling**
☐ The teacher has low learning, language use/development, and/or behavioral expectations for some learners, stemming from a deficit perspective (e.g., having low academic/language expectations for minority-language students and/or low target language use/development expectations for majority-language students). ☐ The teacher has a tendency to view students and families with a deficit perspective and does not see the importance of tapping into students' "funds of knowledge" or encouraging parent/family involvement or engagement.	☐ The teacher can describe strategies that reflect high learning, language use/development, and behavioral expectations for *all* students. ☐ The teacher can explain how to support students in meeting those expectations. ☐ The teacher understands the importance of leveraging students' "funds of knowledge" and of encouraging parent/family involvement and engagement.	☐ The teacher sometimes uses strategies that reflect high learning, language use/development, and behavioral expectations for *all* students. ☐ The teacher is sometimes is effective in supporting students in meeting those expectations. ☐ The teacher at times leverages students' "funds of knowledge" and occasionally encourages parent/family involvement and engagement.	☐ The teacher consistently and knowledgeably uses a range of strategies that reflect high learning, language use/development, and behavioral expectations for *all* students. ☐ The teacher regularly and effectively supports students in meeting those expectations. ☐ The teacher regularly and capably leverages students' "funds of knowledge" and actively works to promote parent/family involvement and engagement.
Evidence and Notes:			

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

7C. Equitable classroom dynamics			
Counter evidence	**Recognizing**	**Developing**	**Excelling**
☐ The teacher cannot describe how the societal and institutional dominance of or preference for English (or other majority language) might affect target language use and development or social status in the classroom. ☐ The teacher cannot describe and does not use inclusive pedagogical practices. ☐ The teacher may employ practices that position some students as more knowledgeable than others or that promote inequities in classroom discourse.	☐ The teacher can describe in general terms how the societal and institutional dominance of and preference for English (or other majority language) might affect target language use and development as well as social status in the classroom. ☐ The teacher can identify some inclusive pedagogical practices that position *all* students as knowledgeable and capable in the classroom and that promote equitable classroom discourse.	☐ The teacher sometimes responds to instances in which the societal and institutional dominance of and preference for English (or other majority language) affects target language use and development as well as social status in the classroom. ☐ The teacher makes some attempts to employ inclusive pedagogical practices that position *all* students as knowledgeable and capable in the classroom and that promote equitable classroom discourse.	☐ The teacher actively, capably, and regularly responds to instances in which the societal and institutional dominance of and preference for English (or other majority language) affects target language use and development as well as social status in the classroom. ☐ The teacher intentionally and effectively employs inclusive pedagogical practices that position *all* students as knowledgeable and capable in the classroom and that promote equitable classroom discourse.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

STRAND 8: SERVING AS AN ADVOCATE FOR STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS
The teacher candidate is an active advocate for dual language and immersion education in general and as a potential educational option for any and all learners.

8A. Serving as an advocate for exceptional learners

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher's behaviors suggest a belief that students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities cannot succeed in DLI programs. ☐ The teacher may argue for exiting these students from the DLI program solely on the basis of their exceptionalities.	☐ The teacher can describe the basic principles underlying why students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities can succeed in DLI programs. ☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of making exit decisions about exceptional learners on a case by case basis.	☐ When appropriate, the teacher sometimes and with some knowledge advocates that students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities be supported within the DLI program rather than exited. ☐ The teacher may struggle to support the arguments with appropriate research evidence.	☐ When appropriate, the teacher actively and knowledgeably advocates that students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities be supported within the DLI program rather than exited. ☐ The teacher confidently and skillfully uses research evidence to support arguments on a case by case basis.

Evidence and Notes:

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

8B. Serving as an advocate for programs

Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
☐ The teacher demonstrates little understanding of the goals or outcomes of the school's program model. ☐ The teacher cannot identify practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model. ☐ The teacher cannot correctly answer common questions from other teachers, district personnel, parents, or the community at large.	☐ The teacher has a general understanding of the goals and outcomes of the school's program model but cannot clearly communicate them to parents and other stakeholders. ☐ The teacher can identify some practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model. ☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of answering common questions knowledgeably and accurately but lacks knowledge and/or confidence and is hesitant to answer such questions from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large.	☐ The teacher has a good understanding of the goals and outcomes of the school's program model and can communicate them to parents and other stakeholders with some confidence when asked. ☐ The teacher increasingly understands and at times advocates practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model. ☐ The teacher is somewhat comfortable in giving accurate answers to common questions from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large, but may lack some knowledge.	☐ The teacher has an excellent, thorough understanding of the goals and outcomes of the school's program model and actively and confidently communicates them to parents and other stakeholders. ☐ The teacher fully understands and effectively advocates practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model. ☐ The teacher is very knowledgeable and comfortable in giving accurate, convincing answers to common questions from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large.

Evidence and Notes:

Summary of areas for future focus:

Other feedback: