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Why DLI-Specific Rubrics?

• The quality of teaching matters. It has consistently been identified as the single most important school-based factor in student achievement (e.g., Rivkin et al., 2005; Rowan et al., 2002).

• Although many rubrics exist to assess preservice teacher performance, they are generic in nature.

• DLI is different from mainstream content teaching or from language teaching on its own. It requires a particular knowledge base and pedagogical skill set (e.g., Guerrero & Lachance, 2018; Howard et al., 2018; Tedick & Fortune, 2013; Tedick & Lyster, 2020).

• Therefore, with the aid of grant funding, we developed DLI-specific rubrics for formative assessment of preservice DLI teacher candidate performance and inservice DLI teacher development. We also developed a self-assessment rubric for inservice teachers.
Workshop Agenda

- Overview of the development of the rubric
- Description of the rubric design
- Pause for questions/comments
- Presentation on recommend usages and our vision for the rubric
- Pause for questions/comments
- Smaller breakout rooms to discuss possibilities for this rubric in your context

Rubric development

- 4 year-development process led by Diane Tedick & Cory Mathieu
- Focus on skills and knowledge specific to DLI teaching
- Fortune’s (2014) checklist; many sources/research literature; input from DLI experts
- Several studies informed the content & explored usage
Rubric development

- A cycle of piloting-feedback-revision
- Several studies informed the content & explored usage
- Fortune’s (2014) checklist; many sources/research literature; input from DLI experts
- Focus on skills and knowledge specific to DLI teaching
- 4 year-development process led by Diane Tedick & Cory Mathieu

Survey study with first draft of the rubric:
- 60 practitioners (30% response rate)
- 57 DLI experts/specialists (79% response rate)
Rubric development

• 4 year-development process led by Diane Tedick & Cory Mathieu
• Focus on skills and knowledge specific to DLI teaching
• Fortune’s (2014) checklist; many sources/research literature; input from DLI experts
• Several studies informed the content & explored usage
• A cycle of piloting-feedback-revision
• Rubrics and more information available at: https://dliteachingrubrics.umn.edu/

Rubric development

• Preservice rubric
• Inservice rubric
• Self-assessment rubric
• Workbook
Rubric development

• The language used in the rubrics is intended to refer to all students in these programs – minority- and majority-language learners, learners with different ethnic backgrounds, and third language (L3) learners.

• The term target language is used throughout the rubrics to refer to the expected language of instruction at any given time.

Rubric Design – 8 strands

1. Planning for the integration of language, content and culture [4]
2. Teaching for biliteracy development [4]
4. Scaffolding for student comprehension [3]
5. Scaffolding for student production [3]
6. Teaching for language and content integration [2]
7. Supporting diverse learners [3]
8. Serving as an advocate for students and programs [2]
Rubric Design: Preservice Levels

**Excelling**
- Practice has become part of teacher candidate’s daily repertoire; it’s in action, live, and at play on a consistent basis.

**Developing**
- Seeks to make practice part of their teaching repertoire but cannot apply it consistently (due to circumstance or ability).

**Recognizing**
- Has a level of awareness about practice; recognizes and understands its importance for student learning; able to describe/recognize strategies but makes few attempts to apply it.

**Counter Evidence**
- Teacher candidate’s actions impede &/or work against successful application of practice; strong sign that candidate needs coaching/education.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental Stages</th>
<th>Recognizing</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Excelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counter Evidence</strong></td>
<td>☐ The teacher cannot explain approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
<td>☐ The teacher can describe some approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
<td>☐ The teacher consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ The teacher cannot identify research-based approaches to (bil)iteracy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).</td>
<td>☐ The teacher can identify examples of a few research-based approaches to (bil)iteracy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).</td>
<td>☐ The teacher can consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ The teacher does not demonstrate understanding that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language).</td>
<td>☐ The teacher can explain the importance of using literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).</td>
<td>☐ The teacher can consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence and Notes:**

- [ ] The teacher regularly and effectively uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).
A narrow white column precedes the **Excelling** level to indicate that a preservice teacher candidate's performance is expected to be no higher than the **Developing** level.

It's possible for a TC's performance to straddle 2 (or possibly more) levels, showing their continually evolving strengths and areas of growth in a particular sub-strand.
Rubric Design: Inservice Levels

**Excelling**
- Practice has become part of teacher's daily repertoire; it's in action, live, and at play on a consistent basis; teacher is adept and confident in implementing the practice.

*Demonstrating*
- Not only understands the importance of the practice, but also makes frequent attempts to make it a part of their own teaching repertoire; many, although not all, attempts are effective.

**Emerging**
- Has a level of awareness about the described practice; seeks to make it a part of their own teaching repertoire; begins to make attempts to apply the practice, but attempts are not often effective.

**Lacking**
- The practice is not evident in the teacher’s performance, and the teacher lacks awareness of the practice and is likely practicing in ways that are counter to effective DLI 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacking</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Demonstrating</th>
<th>Excelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The teacher does not utilize approaches to literacy instruction that account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
<td>- The teacher occasionly attempts to approach literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language, but is not usually effective.</td>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td>- The teacher consistently and knowledgeably approaches literacy instruction to account for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in one language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The teacher cannot articulate nor use research-based approaches to biliteracy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).</td>
<td>- The teacher can identify examples of a few research-based approaches to biliteracy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.), makes infrequent attempts to incorporate them into instruction, but is rarely effective.</td>
<td>- The teacher can explain the purpose of several research-based approaches to biliteracy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading &amp; writing, comprehension strategies, etc.), frequently attempts to incorporate them into instruction and is somewhat effective.</td>
<td>- The teacher can confidently articulate research-based approaches to biliteracy 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The teacher resists the notion that literacy instruction in different languages needs to be authentic (specific to each program language).</td>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td>- The teacher often tries literacy instruction that is authentically (specific to each program language).</td>
<td>- The teacher regularly and effectively uses literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to each program language).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence and Notes:**

It’s possible for a teacher’s performance to straddle 2 (or possibly more) levels, showing their continually evolving strengths and areas of growth in a particular sub-strand.
**STRAND 2: TEACHING FOR BILITERACY DEVELOPMENT**

I understand the fundamental principles of biliteracy development and use a variety of effective instructional strategies that promote vocabulary and biliteracy development across a range of genres/text types.

**2A. Biliteracy instruction**

My approach to literacy instruction accounts for students who are developing biliteracy rather than literacy in only one language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacking</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Demonstrating</th>
<th>Excelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I can articulate and use research-based approaches to (bi)literacy instruction (e.g., balanced literacy, phonological awareness, guided reading, shared reading & writing, comprehension strategies, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacking</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Demonstrating</th>
<th>Excelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use literacy instruction that is authentic (specific to the program language(s) I teach).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lacking</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Demonstrating</th>
<th>Excelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What I’ve tried / What I’ve observed.**

**My goals for improvement.**

---

**DLI-SPECIFIC FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING WORKBOOK**

**STRAND 4: SCAFFOLDING FOR STUDENT COMPREHENSION**

4C: Instructional scaffolding – focus on how teachers make use of tools within instructional activities to support comprehension

- The teacher incorporates a range of instructional tools to support learning that are appropriate to students’ levels and abilities, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals.
- The teacher removes or modifies scaffolds when appropriate to promote student growth.

**Examples:**

1. In a unit on Western Expansion, students complete a Concept Ladder to organize information about the fur traders. The teacher includes a prompt on the graphic organizer asking students to write in full sentences, paying particular attention to forms of past tense verbs or other past tense markers. (Concept Ladder: http://carla.umn.edu/cobalt/modules/strategies/gorganizers/HGO/5H.pdf)

2. During a science unit on forces, the teacher brings in different objects such as levers, pulleys, and wrenches so that students can see the different types of forces at work as they learn about them.
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**DLI-Specific Formative Assessment of Teaching Workbook**

**Strand 4: Scaffolding for Student Comprehension**

4C: Instructional scaffolding – focus on how teachers make use of tools within instructional activities to support comprehension

- The teacher incorporates a range of instructional tools to support learning that are appropriate to students’ levels and abilities, such as graphic organizers, props, word walls, manipulatives, imagery, and language-rich visuals.

- My notes about this strand
- What I’ve tried/What I’ve seen
- Goals I have
- What I’d like to know more about/questions
- Resources

---

What questions do you have about rubric or workbook design?
Rubric usage

• The rubrics were designed to formatively assess DLI teacher candidates’ classroom practices during practicum experiences and formal student teaching or DLI teachers’ classroom practices.

Before using the rubric as an assessment tool, there should be formal opportunities for teacher candidates/teachers to become familiar with and to practice the kinds of strategies and practices described in the rubric levels.

• PLCs or coursework readings associated that target specific strands/sub-strands
• Professional Development offerings related to specific strands/sub-strands
• Rehearsal of skills in professional development or teacher preparation coursework
• Recording and analyzing video of instructional practice
• Peer observation and coaching
• Principal or instructional coach observation and coaching/feedback
Rubric usage

- The rubrics are best used as diagnostic, reflective, and coaching tools to
  - build awareness of areas that need development,
  - acknowledge areas in which a teacher candidate’s/teacher’s
    performance excels (based on preservice/inservice expectations), and
  - promote deeper understanding of contextual and possibly systemic
    elements that inhibit the enactment of effective DLI teaching and learning.

Rubric usage

- Examples of evidence that support a supervisor’s assessment
  should be included in writing.
- The rubric level descriptors can and should inform pre- and post-
  observation conferences or discussions between the teacher
  candidate/teacher and supervisor.
- There should be specific feedback on how a teacher
  candidate’s/teacher’s performance might improve from one level
  to the next.
Rubric as tool for professional growth

“The idea is to provide a supportive environment for teachers to openly talk about their practices, the challenges they experience as they attempt to adopt new practices, and the successes they experience as they hone their knowledge and skills. The ultimate goal, of course, is to improve student learning by improving classroom teaching” (Tedick & Lyster, 2020, p. 277).

Our Vision for the Rubric

• To be applicable and useful in a range of DLI contexts:
  • One-way second/foreign language immersion
  • Two-way bilingual immersion
  • Developmental bilingual programs
  • Indigenous language revitalization immersion

• To focus on pedagogical skills and knowledge specific to these contexts and necessary for promoting high levels of academic achievement and bilingual/biliteracy development.
Our Vision for the Rubric

• To be comprehensive

- Serving as Advocate
- Planning for Integration
- Teaching for Biliteracy
- Maintaining a Language-rich Environment
- Teaching for Integration
- Supporting Diverse Learners
- Scaffold production
- Scaffold Comprehension

Our Vision for the Rubric

• To be context-dependent

In some contexts/grade levels, Recognizing or Emerging may be all that is within the possibility for the teacher candidate in certain sub-strands. In other contexts/grade levels, developing/excelling may be possible.
Our Vision for the Rubric

• To be *formative, developmental*

Development of mastery in these pedagogical practices is a process requiring considerable time, practice, reflection, and ongoing feedback.

Our Vision for the Rubric

• To be *educative*

Our hope is that both preservice and inservice teachers will learn from interacting with the rubric.
What questions/comments do you have about recommended usage of and our vision for the rubrics?

Small Group Discussions

How might the rubrics be integrated into teacher education and K-12 DLI programs?
What possibilities do you see for the rubrics in your own context?
Thank you!

ditedick@umn.edu
mathieuc@uwgb.edu