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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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:

INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

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. ☐ The teacher cannot distinguish between content-obligatory and content-compatible language objectives and is not able to write them. ☐ 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. ☐ 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 sometimes lack function, grammatical feature, vocabulary, or descriptions of discourse level or type. ☐ The teacher has some trouble distinguishing content-obligatory from content-compatible language objectives. ☐ 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. ☐ The teacher's language objectives align with content objectives, are sometimes written clearly, and can be assessed relatively easily. ☐ 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). ☐ The teacher can usually (but not always) 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 confidence and is only somewhat effective.	☐ 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:

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.	☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to differentiate formative and summative assessments for different learner groups.	☐ The teacher often attempts to differentiate formative and summative assessments for different learner groups, and is somewhat effective.	☐ The teacher effectively and consistently differentiates formative and summative assessments for different learner groups.
☐ The teacher does not use assessment data to inform target features and content for future instruction.	☐ The teacher infrequently tries to incorporate different ways to assess student content understandings and language development and is rarely effective.	☐ The teacher frequently tries to incorporate different ways to assess student content understandings and language development and is somewhat effective.	☐ The teacher regularly and skillfully uses different ways to assess student content understandings and language development.
☐ The teacher cannot articulate the purpose for or examples of performance assessments.	☐ 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.	☐ 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.	☐ 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 does not attempt to design performance assessments.	☐ The teacher occasionally attempts to design and implement performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development but is rarely effective.	☐ The teacher frequently designs and implements some performance assessments to assess both content learning and language development, but is not consistently effective.	☐ 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. ☐ 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 occasionally attempts to design activities that promote identity development, cross-cultural awareness, and/or multicultural appreciation, but struggles to do so effectively. ☐ The teacher usually plans culture-related activities as stand-alone culture lessons rather than integrating them into the regular curriculum. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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. ☐ 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: