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.

PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

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: