

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
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not utilize approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher resists the notion that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher often tries to use literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language) and is somewhat effective.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher regularly and effectively uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).</p>

Evidence and Notes:

INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2B. Vocabulary development, word knowledge, and text types			
Lacking	Emerging	Demonstrating	Excelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not know how to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not utilize grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary. <input type="checkbox"/> 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.). <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is not able to draw students' attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher occasionally attempts to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction, but struggles to do so well. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher at times tries to utilize grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary, but is rarely effective. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher often, but inconsistently, selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher at times is effective in using grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary. <input type="checkbox"/> 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.). <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher sometimes draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language and is at times effective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher regularly and thoughtfully selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher competently uses a range of effective, grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary across program languages. <input type="checkbox"/> 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.). <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher frequently and knowledgeably draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.
Evidence and Notes:			

INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2C. Cross-lingual connections			
Lacking	Emerging	Demonstrating	Excelling
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not incorporate cross-lingual instruction in lesson planning.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher resists using strategies to help students learn to draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher occasionally attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in lesson planning, but is often ineffective due to developing competence.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher unnecessarily uses a great deal of English (or other L1) during occasional attempts to make cross-lingual connections explicit.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher often attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in planning lessons, demonstrating some competence in doing so.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> When appropriate, the teacher sometimes effectively models how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher consistently and competently incorporates cross-lingual instruction in planning some lessons (when appropriate).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher exclusively (or primarily) remains in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> When appropriate, the teacher frequently and capably models how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their biliteracy development.</p>
<p>Evidence and Notes:</p>			

INSERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2D. Biliteracy assessment			
Lacking	Emerging	Demonstrating	Excelling
<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher observes student reading and writing development without taking into account that students are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can articulate the basic principles of biliterate writing and reading, but struggles in attempts to design biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher infrequently (and often ineffectively) attempts to use knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher regularly and capably designs effective biliteracy assessments that reflect the principles of biliterate reading and writing across multiple genres/text types.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher regularly and skillfully uses knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>
<p>Evidence and Notes:</p>			