

## 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
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher cannot explain 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 cannot identify research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not demonstrate understanding that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can describe some 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 identify examples of a few research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can explain the importance of using literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher sometimes 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 explain the purpose of several research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.) and attempts to incorporate them into instruction, but has varied effectiveness.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher sometimes uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language) with some effectiveness.</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 &amp; 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:

## PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2B. Vocabulary development, word knowledge, and text types			
Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher does not know how to select appropriate words for vocabulary instruction.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher cannot identify grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher cannot describe strategies to promote word learning (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes &amp; suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher cannot describe how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can explain criteria for selecting appropriate words for vocabulary instruction.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can identify grade-level appropriate strategies for building students' vocabulary.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can identify some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes &amp; suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher sometimes selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher at times is effective in using grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher at times and with varied effectiveness uses some word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes &amp; suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher sometimes draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher regularly and thoughtfully selects appropriate words for vocabulary instruction.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher competently uses a range of effective, grade-level appropriate strategies to build students' vocabulary across program languages.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher consistently and adeptly uses varied word-learning strategies (e.g., teaching parts of speech, word parts like prefixes &amp; suffixes, cognates, semantic radicals, etc.).</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher frequently and knowledgeably draws attention to how different genres/text types are constructed in each program language.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evidence and Notes:</b></p>			

## PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2C. Cross-lingual connections			
Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	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 cannot explain the importance of developing such connections to support literacy development across program languages.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is not able to explain how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher understands the need to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in the planning of some lessons.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can explain the importance of and strategies for primarily remaining in the target language while making cross-lingual connections explicit.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can explain ways to model how students can draw on cross-lingual connections to support their (bi)literacy development.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher at times attempts to incorporate cross-lingual instruction in planning a few lessons, with some competence.</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 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.</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><b>Evidence and Notes:</b></p>			

## PRESERVICE DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

2D. Biliteracy assessment			
Counter evidence	Recognizing	Developing	Excelling
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher cannot articulate the principles of biliterate writing and reading or the importance of assessing 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 just one language.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can articulate the basic principles of biliterate writing and reading, but does not design biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can explain how knowledge of language transfer can inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher can describe the principles of biliterate writing and reading but inconsistently designs effective biliteracy assessments across genres/text types.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The teacher is sometimes effective in using knowledge of language transfer to inform interpretation of assessment data and guide future instruction.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</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><b>Evidence and Notes:</b></p>			