# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

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

The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher demonstrates a lack of understanding of how language and content can be integrated in lesson and unit planning or resistance to integrating language and content in planning.<br><br>☐ 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 understands the importance of integrating language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning but has difficulty applying that understanding in practice.<br><br>☐ The teacher experiments with a few 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) but attempts are typically not effective. | ☐ The teacher makes frequent attempts to integrate language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning.<br><br>☐ The teacher often tries to plan some language-focused activities (e.g., noticing, awareness, and practice activities that are contextualized in meaningful content) and is somewhat effective. | ☐ The teacher regularly and competently integrates language-focused and content-focused instruction in curricular planning.<br><br>☐ 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**:

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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher cannot or does not write language objectives that are appropriate for students.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot distinguish between content-obligatory and content-compatible language objectives and is not able to write them.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not differentiate language objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics. | ☐ The teacher sometimes attempts to write developmentally and contextually appropriate language objectives.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ Attempted language objectives sometimes lack function, grammatical feature, vocabulary, or descriptions of discourse level or type.<br><br>☐ The teacher has some trouble distinguishing content-obligatory from content-compatible language objectives.<br><br>☐ The teacher's attempts to differentiate objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics are rarely, if ever, effective. | ☐ The teacher often tries to write developmentally and contextually appropriate language objectives.<br><br>☐ The teacher's language objectives align with content objectives, are sometimes written clearly, and can be assessed relatively easily.<br><br>☐ The language objectives often include function, grammatical feature, vocabulary, and descriptions of discourse level or type, but may be missing a key aspect (e.g., function) or may not accurately link components (e.g., vocabulary may not correspond to feature).<br><br>☐ The teacher can usually (but not always) distinguish between and accurately write both content-obligatory and content-compatible language objectives.<br><br>☐ The teacher attempts to differentiate objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics, but lacks confidence and is only somewhat effective. | ☐ The teacher writes language objectives that are consistently developmentally and contextually appropriate for students.<br><br>☐ The teacher's language objectives regularly align with content objectives, are written clearly, and can easily be assessed.<br><br>☐ The teacher's language objectives consistently include clearly and accurately linked functions, grammatical features, vocabulary, and descriptions of discourse level or type.<br><br>☐ The teacher's language objectives regularly and accurately reflect both content-obligatory and content-compatible language.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully differentiates objectives for a range of proficiency levels and learner characteristics. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE 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**

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not differentiate formative or summative assessments in either language for different learner groups.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use assessment data to inform target features and content for future instruction.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot articulate the purpose for or examples of performance assessments.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not attempt to design performance assessments. | ☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to differentiate formative and summative assessments for different learner groups.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently tries to incorporate different ways to assess student content understandings and language development and is rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to design and implement performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development but is rarely effective. | ☐ The teacher often attempts to differentiate formative and summative assessments for different learner groups, and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently tries to incorporate different ways to assess student content understandings and language development and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher often uses assessment data to inform target features/functions and content for future instruction, but appears uncertain and lacks some confidence in doing so.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently designs and implements some performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development, but is not consistently effective. | ☐ The teacher effectively and consistently differentiates formative and summative assessments for different learner groups.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses different ways to assess student content understandings and language development.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher adeptly designs and implements multiple performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development. |

**Evidence and Notes:**

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## 1D. Culture integration throughout the curriculum

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not support the promotion of identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation as part of the curriculum.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ 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 occasionally attempts to design activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation, but struggles to do so effectively.<br><br>☐ The teacher usually plans culture-related activities as stand-alone culture lessons rather than integrating them into the regular curriculum.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally 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, but often struggles to ensure they are cognitively and linguistically appropriate for students.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently attempts to include family and community cultural knowledge and assets in planning and is rarely, if ever, effective. | ☐ The teacher often plans activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation with some competence.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently tries to integrate these activities into the regular content curriculum but has varied effectiveness and may resort to planning culture-related activities as stand-alone lessons.<br><br>☐ 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 and is more capable of ensuring that they are appropriate for students' cognitive and linguistic levels.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes includes 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully weaves these activities throughout the content curriculum as appropriate.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly includes family and community cultural knowledge and assets in planning in ways that empower learners. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## STRAND 2: TEACHING FOR BILITERACY DEVELOPMENT

The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not utilize approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.<br><br>☐ The teacher can neither articulate nor use research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).<br><br>☐ The teacher resists the notion that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language). | ☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to approach literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language, but is not usually effective.<br><br>☐ 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.), makes infrequent attempts to incorporate them into instruction, but is rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher understands the importance of using literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language), but struggles to incorporate this understanding in practice. | ☐ The teacher often attempts to approach literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language, and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ 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.), frequently attempts to incorporate them into instruction, and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher often tries to use literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language) and is somewhat effective. | ☐ The teacher consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and effectively uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language). |

**Evidence and Notes:**

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not know how to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <br><br> ☐ The teacher does not utilize grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary. <br><br> ☐ The teacher does not implement strategies to promote word learning (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). <br><br> ☐ The teacher is not able to draw students' attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language. | ☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction, but struggles to do so well. <br><br> ☐ The teacher at times tries to utilize grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary, but is rarely effective. <br><br> ☐ The teacher can identify some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.), but struggles to apply this understanding in practice. <br><br> ☐ The teacher can explain some ways that different genres/text types are constructed in each program language. The teacher infrequently tries to use strategies for drawing students' attention them and is not often effective. | ☐ The teacher often, but inconsistently, selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <br><br> ☐ The teacher at times is effective in using grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary. <br><br> ☐ The teacher at times is somewhat effective in using some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes & suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.). <br><br> ☐ The teacher sometimes draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language and is at times effective. | ☐ The teacher regularly and thoughtfully selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <br><br> ☐ The teacher competently uses a range of effective, grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary across program languages. <br><br> ☐ 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.). <br><br> ☐ The teacher frequently and knowledgeably draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language. |

**Evidence and Notes:**

## 2C. Cross-lingual connections

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not incorporate cross-lingual instruction in lesson planning.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot identify opportunities for cross-lingual connections and does not appear to understand the importance of developing such connections to support literacy development across program languages.<br><br>☐ The teacher resists using strategies to help students learn to draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development. | ☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in lesson planning, but is often ineffective due to developing competence.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times attempts to take advantage of opportunities to draw students' attention to cross-lingual connections to support vocabulary and literacy development across program languages, but misses many opportunities to do so during instruction.<br><br>☐ The teacher unnecessarily uses a great deal of English (or other L1) during occasional attempts to make cross-lingual connections explicit.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes tries to model how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development, but struggles to do so effectively. | ☐ The teacher often attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in planning lessons, demonstrating some competence in doing so.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher usually 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.<br><br>☐ 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).<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher exclusively (or primarily) remains in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit.<br><br>☐ When appropriate, the teacher frequently and capably models how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their biliteracy development. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

| 2D. Biliteracy assessment | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lacking** | **Emerging** | **Demonstrating** | **Excelling** |
| ☐ The teacher lacks the knowledge or ability to design biliteracy assessments that reflect the principles of biliterate writing and reading and resists or isn't able to assess biliteracy across a range of genres/text types.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data.<br><br>☐ The teacher observes student reading and writing development without taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language. | ☐ The teacher can articulate the basic principles of biliterate writing and reading, but struggles in attempts to design biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently (and often ineffectively) attempts to use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally tries to observe student reading and writing development while taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in just one language, but rarely is able to do so effectively. | ☐ The teacher often attempts to design effective biliteracy assessments that reflect the principles of biliterate reading and writing across genres/text types, and at times is effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently tries to use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction, but lacks some confidence and competence in doing so.<br><br>☐ The teacher usually attempts 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 some confidence and skill in doing so. | ☐ The teacher regularly and capably designs effective biliteracy assessments that reflect the principles of biliterate reading and writing across multiple genres/text types.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.<br><br>☐ 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**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## STRAND 3: MAINTAINING A LINGUISTICALLY-RICH LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

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

### 3A. Visual language scaffolds

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not display useful and curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom.<br><br>**OR**<br><br>☐ The teacher displays scaffolds that are confusing, lacking in clear purpose, and/or not specific to the nature of the instructional language.<br><br>☐ If any scaffolds are displayed, the teacher does not model how students can use them appropriately. | ☐ The teacher occasionally tries to display useful and curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom, but often in ways that are disorganized, unclear, and/or not specific to the instructional language.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently attempts to refer to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production.<br><br>☐ 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 displays some basic curriculum-related words, phrases, and written scaffolds throughout the classroom, but at times in ways that are disorganized, unclear, and/or not specific to the instructional language.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes refers to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production.<br><br>☐ The teacher often attempts to model how students can use classroom scaffolds to support their learning, but is inconsistent in doing 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully refers to displayed language to enhance content learning and facilitate language production.<br><br>☐ 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**:

# Inservice DLI-Specific Formative Assessment of Teaching

| 3B. Target language use | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lacking** | **Emerging** | **Demonstrating** | **Excelling** |
| ☐ The teacher struggles to expose learners to accurate, proficient, and appropriately complex oral and written language input. Input is often inaccurate and lacks complexity.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not communicate clear and consistent target language use expectations for students.<br><br>☐ The teacher usually accepts non-target language use from students, even though students are capable of target language production. | ☐ The teacher makes some attempts to expose learners to accurate, proficient, and appropriately complex oral and written language input but struggles do so consistently.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes unnecessarily uses the non-target language while teaching although is beginning to acknowledge the importance of remaining exclusively (or primarily) in the target language.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes attempts to communicate clear target language use expectations for students but struggles to utilize strategies to appropriately scaffold students' target language use.<br><br>☐ The teacher often communicates mixed messages (e.g., telling students to use the target language while inconsistently accepting use of the non-target language). | ☐ The teacher usually exposes learners to mostly accurate, sufficiently proficient, and somewhat complex oral and written language input.<br><br>☐ The teacher often uses the target language exclusively (or primarily) while teaching, but may infrequently use the non-target language unnecessarily.<br><br>☐ The teacher mostly communicates clear expectations for students to remain in the target language exclusively (or primarily), but is not always consistent.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently employs a few strategies and routines to support student use of the target language, but needs to develop a wider range 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.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently communicates clear expectations for students to remain in the target language exclusively (or primarily).<br><br>☐ The teacher effectively employs numerous strategies and routines to support all students' consistent use of the target language. |
| **Evidence and Notes**: | | | |

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## STRAND 4: SCAFFOLDING FOR STUDENT COMPREHENSION
The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not modify teacher talk to be responsive to students' needs and abilities.<br><br>**OR**<br><br>☐ The teacher over-scaffolds, such as using overly simplified language with secondary students.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use body language or facial expressions to support comprehension.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use developmentally appropriate strategies or adjust them over time. | ☐ The teacher infrequently tries to modify teacher talk to scaffold student comprehension, such as changing speed or intonation, but attempts are typically stilted.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally tries to use body language and facial expressions, but attempts appear artificial.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times makes attempts to include other verbal discourse strategies like paraphrasing and cognates, but does so awkwardly or ineffectively.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally tries to utilize scaffolding techniques, but they are not always appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher struggles to adjust scaffolding strategies over time. | ☐ The teacher often and somewhat capably modifies teacher talk (speed, intonation, repetition, etc.) so that it is appropriate for students' ages and abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly attempts to include other verbal discourse strategies like paraphrasing and cognates, and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly uses body language and facial expressions, and often is effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently utilizes scaffolding techniques that are usually, but not always, appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher demonstrates some skill at adjusting scaffolding strategies over time. | ☐ The teacher masterfully and consistently modifies teacher talk (speed, intonation, repetition, etc.), as appropriate for students' ages and abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently and competently includes other verbal discourse strategies like paraphrasing and cognates.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and purposefully uses body language and facial expressions to support comprehension.<br><br>☐ The teacher uses strategies that are consistently appropriate for students' ages and cognitive and linguistic abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher adjusts strategies intentionally over time as students grow and develop. |

**Evidence and Notes:**

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not utilize routines (like think-pair-share) that ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not make use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not attempt to use boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not pair/group students in thoughtful ways to scaffold their comprehension. | ☐ The teacher occasionally, and with limited effectiveness, incorporates predictable routines (like think-pair-share) and structured activities within lessons in an effort to provide for predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently makes use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently and inconsistently uses examples of boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally tries to organize students in groupings and cooperative activities that will scaffold student comprehension. | ☐ The teacher often but with varied effectiveness incorporates routines (like think-pair-share) to ensure predictability and facilitate comprehension in the classroom.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes makes use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding.<br><br>☐ The teacher is occasionally effective in using clear boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher makes frequent use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently and competently uses clear boundary markers between activities to facilitate classroom management.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly pairs/groups students systematically and in various arrangements to scaffold their comprehension. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not utilize instructional tools that support learning, such as props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, or language-rich visuals.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use graphic organizers or other scaffolds to support student comprehension.<br><br>**OR**<br><br>☐ 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, but struggles to use them effectively in the classroom.<br><br>☐ The teacher attempts to use instructional tools that are appropriate for students' ages and abilities, and is rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher understands the importance of removing or modifying scaffolds over time to promote student growth, but struggles to apply this understanding in practice. | ☐ The teacher often attempts to incorporate some instructional tools to support learning, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals, and is somewhat effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes is effective in using instructional tools that are appropriate to students' ages and abilities.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently and skillfully uses instructional tools that are appropriate to students' ages and abilities.<br><br>☐ The teacher intentionally removes or modifies scaffolds when necessary to promote student growth. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

## STRAND 5: SCAFFOLDING FOR STUDENT PRODUCTION

The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not use different questioning techniques to elicit more student language production and as a result typically elicits only one-word or short phrase answers.<br><br>☐ The teacher nearly exclusively uses the Initiate-Response-Evaluation (IRE) sequence during classroom instruction, reacting to student responses with evaluative comments.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not use wait time effectively. | ☐ The teacher tries to use some different questioning techniques to elicit more student language production, but attempts are more random than strategic and are rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to use 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, but lacks skill in doing so.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently makes effective use of wait time during classroom interactions. | ☐ The teacher frequently (but not consistently) and with some skill uses different questioning techniques to elicit more student language production.<br><br>☐ The teacher 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.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently makes effective use of wait time during classroom interactions. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

| 5B. Procedural Scaffolding –grouping strategies and classroom activities and routines to support student language use and development | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lacking** | **Emerging** | **Demonstrating** | **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.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not design activities to promote learning from and with peers in both interpersonal and presentational modes for either speaking or writing.<br><br>☐ Teacher talk strongly dominates instruction, and the teacher does not group students.<br><br>☐ 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 infrequently attempts to utilize activities and routines (think-pair-share, learning centers, cooperative learning) to promote student-student interaction and independent student production; however, most instruction relies on teacher talk.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times tries to design activities to promote student production in either the interpersonal or presentational modes (for either speaking or writing), but lacks skill in doing so.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes makes use of interactive groupings (dyads, cooperative groups), but does not consistently organize pairs or groups thoughtfully.<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently or inadequately reviews necessary language (features/functions/ genres) needed to carry out activities in the target language. | ☐ The teacher is sometimes effective in using 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times can effectively design activities that encourage students to produce language in both interpersonal and presentational modes (for both speaking and writing) to foster learning from and with peers.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently makes use of interactive groupings (dyads, cooperative groups), and demonstrates some ability to organize pairs and groups thoughtfully.<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently and sometimes effectively 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.<br><br>☐ 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).<br><br>☐ The teacher frequently uses a variety of thoughtfully organized interactive groupings (dyads, cooperative groups) to promote student language production.<br><br>☐ 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not use print or multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support or facilitate language production, such as posting formulaic language "chunks" or providing key phrases to support small group interaction.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not model appropriate use of resources. | ☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to use print and multimedia resources related to instructional activities to support and facilitate language production (such as providing key phrases to support small group interaction) but is rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally teaches formulaic language "chunks" but fails to post them as reminders for students to use these scaffolds.<br><br>☐ The teacher attempts but struggles to effectively use scaffolds that elicit sustained, academic oral and written language (like sentence starters or frames and graphic organizers to support content learning and language development).<br><br>☐ The teacher infrequently models appropriate use of resources and struggles to do so effectively. | ☐ The teacher often and somewhat effectively 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).<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes attempts to teach formulaic language "chunks" and sometimes posts them as reminders for students to use these scaffolds (as developmentally appropriate).<br><br>☐ 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).<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes (but with varied skill) 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).<br><br>☐ The teacher teaches formulaic language "chunks" effectively and posts them as reminders for students to use these scaffolds (as developmentally appropriate).<br><br>☐ 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).<br><br>☐ The teacher's consistent and adept modeling prepares students to use such scaffolds as resources. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## STRAND 6: TEACHING FOR LANGUAGE AND CONTENT INTEGRATION
The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher emphasizes content teaching nearly exclusively.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not identify language (features, functions, genres) that coincide with the lesson's content and regularly misses opportunities for language instruction.<br><br>☐ The teacher does not prepare language objectives and lacks awareness of the importance of sharing language objectives with students in language they can understand.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot identify pedagogical techniques that can be used to model and elicit specific language structures or functions.<br><br>☐ 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 at times attempts to shift attention between content and language, but attempts seem forced or awkward.<br><br>☐ The teacher notices and occasionally attempts to take advantage of opportunities to teach language (features, functions, genres) and clarify linguistic misconceptions in relation to content.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times tries to communicate language objectives to students in student-friendly terms, but struggles to do so well.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times attempts to model and elicit specific language structures and function but is rarely effective.<br><br>☐ The teacher's focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) is occasionally contextualized within content instruction, but is more often separated from content. | ☐ The teacher sometimes is able to shift student attention between content and language when appropriate.<br><br>☐ The teacher is somewhat effective in taking advantage of opportunities to teach language (features, functions, genres) and clarifying linguistic misconceptions in relation to content.<br><br>☐ The teacher is somewhat effective at communicating language objectives to students in student-friendly terms.<br><br>☐ The teacher often and sometimes capably models and elicits specific language structures and functions.<br><br>☐ The teacher's focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) is usually, but not consistently, contextualized within content instruction. | ☐ The teacher habitually and seamlessly shifts student attention between content and language in natural ways as appropriate.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher clearly and consistently communicates language objectives to students in student-friendly terms.<br><br>☐ The teacher consistently and competently models and elicits specific language structures and functions.<br><br>☐ The teacher's focus on language (grammar, syntax, discourse features) is regularly contextualized within content instruction. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher cannot describe or identify developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback types to promote students' language proficiency. <br><br> ☐ The teacher either does not provide corrective feedback or uses it in ways that do not encourage student uptake and repair. <br><br> ☐ Teacher feedback does not distinguish between form/function and meaning and is typically ambiguous or confusing to students. | ☐ The teacher infrequently tries to use some developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback (CF) types to improve students' language proficiency, and often struggles to select CF strategies that are appropriate and/or misses opportunities to provide CF. <br><br> ☐ The teacher makes some attempts to use corrective types that encourage student uptake and repair, but is rarely effective. <br><br> ☐ The teacher attempts but usually struggles to distinguish feedback on language from feedback on content. | ☐ The teacher at times uses some developmentally and contextually appropriate corrective feedback (CF) types to improve students' language proficiency, but with some frequency misses opportunities to provide CF. <br><br> ☐ The teacher uses several corrective feedback types that encourage student uptake and repair. <br><br> ☐ The teacher sometimes 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. <br><br> ☐ The teacher uses many corrective feedback types that encourage student uptake and repair. <br><br> ☐ The teacher effectively, clearly, and consistently provides feedback that distinguishes a focus on language from a focus on content. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

## STRAND 7: SUPPORTING DIVERSE LEARNERS

The teacher effectively and appropriately supports diverse learners by differentiating instruction, maintaining high expectations, and promoting equitable classroom dynamics.

### 7A. Differentiated instruction and assessment

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher seems unaware of the need to differentiate instruction according to students' language proficiencies, readiness, exceptionalities, or interests.<br><br>☐ The teacher emphasizes ability grouping alone as a way to differentiate instruction.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to use some flexible grouping strategies to differentiate instruction (such as pairing students with similar or different proficiency levels, etc.).<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times and with some skill uses some flexible grouping strategies to differentiate instruction (such as pairing students with similar or different proficiency levels, etc.).<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ 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.).<br><br>☐ 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**:

## 7B. Maintaining rigor and high expectations for students of all linguistic and cultural backgrounds

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | 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).<br><br>☐ 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 occasionally attempts to use strategies that reflect high learning, language use/ development, and behavioral expectations for *all* students.<br><br>☐ The teacher is at times is effective in supporting students in meeting those expectations.<br><br>☐ The teacher understands the importance of leveraging students' "funds of knowledge" and encouraging parent/family involvement and engagement, but struggles to do so. | ☐ The teacher frequently (but not consistently) and somewhat knowledgeably uses strategies that reflect high learning, language use/development, and behavioral expectations for *all* students.<br><br>☐ The teacher usually (but not regularly) is effective in supporting students in meeting those expectations.<br><br>☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and effectively supports students in meeting those expectations.<br><br>☐ The teacher regularly and capably leverages students' "funds of knowledge" and actively works to promote parent/family involvement and engagement. |

**Evidence and Notes**:

## 7C. Equitable classroom dynamics

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher does not see the relationship between the societal and institutional dominance of or preference for English (or other majority language) and target language use and development or social status in the classroom.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot describe and does not use inclusive pedagogical practices.<br><br>☐ The teacher may employ practices that position some students as more knowledgeable than others or that promote inequities in classroom discourse. | ☐ The teacher occasionally tries to respond 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, but lacks knowledge and confidence in doing so.<br><br>☐ The teacher at times attempts to employ inclusive pedagogical practices that position *all* students as knowledgeable and capable in the classroom and that promote equitable classroom discourse, but is rarely effective. | ☐ The teacher sometimes and somewhat capably 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher is somewhat effective at employing 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.<br><br>☐ 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**:

# INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

| STRAND 8: SERVING AS AN ADVOCATE FOR STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS |
|---|
| The teacher 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

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher's behaviors suggest a belief that students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities cannot succeed in DLI programs.<br><br>☐ The teacher may argue for exiting these students from the DLI program solely on the basis of their exceptionalities. | ☐ The teacher is beginning to develop some knowledge about students with disabilities, language delays, and other exceptionalities in DLI programs, but may hesitate to advocate them due to lack of knowledge and/or confidence.<br><br>☐ The teacher can articulate the importance of making exit decisions about exceptional learners on a case by case basis but lacks knowledge of research evidence to support arguments. | ☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher sometimes attempts to support arguments on a case by case basis with appropriate research evidence, but lacks some confidence and/or knowledge. | ☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher confidently and skillfully uses research evidence to support arguments on a case by case basis. |

**Evidence and Notes:**

## 8B. Serving as an advocate for programs

| Lacking | Emerging | Demonstrating | Excelling |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The teacher demonstrates little understanding of the goals or outcomes of the school's program model.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot identify practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model.<br><br>☐ The teacher cannot correctly answer common questions about the program model or other issues from other teachers, district personnel, parents, or the community at large. | ☐ The teacher has some understanding of the goals and outcomes of the school's program model but struggles to clearly communicate them to parents and other stakeholders.<br><br>☐ The teacher can identify some practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model but does not how to go about advocating them.<br><br>☐ The teacher may attempt to respond to common questions about the program model or other issues from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large, but clearly lacks knowledge and confidence. | ☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher understands somewhat and tries to advocate some practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model.<br><br>☐ The teacher is somewhat knowledgeable and comfortable in giving answers to common questions about the program model or other issues from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large. | ☐ 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.<br><br>☐ The teacher fully understands and effectively advocates practices and policies that demonstrate a commitment to the program model.<br><br>☐ The teacher is very knowledgeable and comfortable in giving accurate, convincing answers to common questions about the program model or other issues from other teachers, district personnel, parents, and the community at large. |

**Evidence and Notes:**

**Summary of areas for future focus:**

**Other feedback:**