

Reviewer Evaluation Form

1. Title of manuscript



2. Your recommendation

- a. accept as is
- b. accept with revisions as noted
- c. reject

3. Comments to be sent to the author(s).

- importance of the topic/issue within the thematic focus of the volume on pedagogical and structural means and models for graduate student education in light of the significant changes the FL profession is and has been undergoing;

The author makes a case for literacy-based pedagogy as a solution to four problems s/he identifies in collegiate FL instruction and in more traditional pedagogies. S/He then outlines three literacy-based lesson plans that address these problems and also show his/her pedagogical development over time and across instructional levels. The author concludes by arguing in favor of literacy-based pedagogy as a solution to issues of departmental bifurcation outlined in the 2007 MLA Report.

I like the idea of presenting a longitudinal perspective of one's own development as a teacher through use of literacy-based pedagogy. I don't think the author goes far enough in describing this development, however, or in linking this development to the challenges s/he identifies regarding traditional vs. literacy-based approaches (e.g., cognitive demands, registers/discourse, etc.). Because this is a volume focused on graduate student professional development, the author should focus on just that: his/her development over time, and how this development is linked to literacy-based pedagogy and to overall professionalization.

- suggestions for improving the manuscript;

Please see above and also specific comments in the manuscript. Overall, the manuscript lacks coherence and cohesion and needs to be better developed in order to make the author's goals and arguments stronger.

- quality of consideration of the relevant literature;

This is a significant weakness in the paper. Because the author does not clearly or completely outline literacy-based pedagogy, the arguments s/he makes regarding longitudinal development and overcoming obstacles to instruction are not as convincing. In addition to more clearly defining literacy, the author should also define and exemplify the four curricular components and design of meaning. In addition to citing Kern (2000) when outlining this pedagogical approach, the author should at the very least make reference to the following:

- Cope, C. & Kalantzis, M. (2009). 'Multiliteracies': New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies*, 4(3), 164-195.
- Kalantzis, M. & Cope, B. (2005). *Learning by design*. Melbourne: Victorian Schools Innovation Commission.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Swaffar, J. K., & Arens, K. (2005). *Remapping the foreign language curriculum: An approach through multiple literacies*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.

In addition, the author might consider referencing work on graduate student teacher development as a way to support some of the arguments made in the article and to make stronger conclusions about the links between literacy-based instruction, graduate student professional development, and the MLA report. A couple of ideas to get started include:

- Allen, H. W. & Negueruela-Azarola, E. (2010). Professional development of future professors of foreign languages: Looking back, Looking forward. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 377-395.
- Byrnes, H. (2001b). Reconsidering graduate students' education as teachers: It takes a department! *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 512-530.
- Maxim, H. H. (2005). Enhancing graduate student teacher development through curricular reform. *ADFL Bulletin*, 36, 15-21.
- Rankin, J., & Becker, F. (2006). Does reading the research make a difference? A case study of teacher growth in FL German. *Modern Language Journal*, 90, 353-372.

- research design, procedures, and statistics (if applicable);

N/A

- clarity of writing, including tables, figures, and examples;

There are numerous typos and sentence fragments throughout the paper. There are also several places throughout where ideas are unclear. I've indicated some of these in the manuscript. The manuscript does not consistently use APA style.

- appropriateness of conclusions drawn;

See comments in the manuscript. Overall, I think the paper would benefit from a stronger focus on pedagogical development and on overall conclusions regarding development over time with respect to implementation of the literacy-based pedagogy and how this contributes to the author's overall professional development as a graduate student. S/He can still talk about curricular issues as they relate to the MLA report, but they can be framed more specifically in terms of graduate student professionalization

- contribution of the article to the profession.

At this point, the article is not adequately developed or argued to be able to make a significant contribution to discussions on graduate student professionalization, literacy-based pedagogy, or calls for change as represented in the MLA report. With careful revisions, however, the paper can make a contribution to discussions on these issues.

4. Do you wish to receive copies of the other consultants' critiques?

No

5. Confidential remarks to the editors (optional)

It appears that the author is a non-native speaker of English. S/He would benefit significantly from having a copy editor read his/her future work before sending it for consideration.