

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Capstone Portfolio

Tianyi Chu

Vanderbilt Peabody College

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Abstract

This paper, inspired by my summer internship, my practicum experience, and my learning at Peabody College, reflects my teaching philosophy of being a qualified teacher, practical experience inside and outside the campus, as well as implications that will guide my future teaching. In this paper, I comprehensively and critically analyze my learning and implement artifacts from four professional knowledge areas, keeping consistent with the eight TESOL Domains. At the end of this paper, I discuss my teacher identity, remaining challenges, and several effective solutions as a reference for my future classes.

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Table of Contents

Teaching Philosophy	1
Professional Knowledge Area 1: Learner	9
TESOL Domain 4: Identity and Context.....	10
Artifact A	10
TESOL Domain 6: Learning.....	12
Artifact B	13
Professional Knowledge Area 2: The Learning Contexts.....	15
TESOL Domain 2: Instructing.....	16
Artifact C	16
Professional Knowledge Area 3: Curriculum.....	19
TESOL Domain 1: Planning	20
Artifact D	20
TESOL Domain 7: Content.....	23
Artifact E.....	24
Professional Knowledge Area 4: Assessment.....	25
TESOL Domain 3: Assessing	26
Artifact F.....	26
Applications to Practice: Implications and Future Considerations	29
TESOL Domain 8: Commitment and Professionalism	29
Implications from my learning and practice experience	30
Future Challenges	32
How I Will Continue to Develop	33
References.....	36
Appendix 1.....	39
Appendix 2.....	42

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Appendix 3.....	45
Appendix 4.....	46
Appendix 5.....	48
Appendix 6.....	51
Appendix 7.....	57
Appendix 8.....	60
Appendix 9.....	64
Appendix 10.....	67

Teaching Philosophy

"Sit straight, take notes, and follow all the teacher's instructions." Whenever I recall my high school life, my class advisor's words always linger in my mind. As a Chinese student, I seemed to be accustomed to accepting traditional deductive teaching methods throughout most of my school life before entering college. Actually, back then, I had no idea about any teaching method or pedagogy. Although I was faintly conscious of the drawbacks of this traditional classroom and tried to defend my own learning style, most of my efforts did not work, and I was blamed by the class advisor because of my adolescent rebellion. Since then, I became lost and confused about whether I should challenge traditional teaching methods. Fortunately, the situation changed after I entered the college, especially after coming to the U.S. I got an opportunity to learn pedagogy systematically, and I began to gradually explore a new educational system which is quite different from that in China.

In this two year program, I realized the importance of putting teaching theories into practice and gradually built my own teaching philosophy, mainly through three experiences: an internship in Shanghai, the curriculum at Peabody, and the practicum experience at John Overton High School. In the beginning, each of them seemed like unrelated experiences, but after analyzing and summarizing, I surprisingly found out that these three experiences share some similarities in essence and could be combined together as a foundation for my teaching philosophy.

Last summer, I went back to China and started my internship at a private international high school called World Leading Schools Association (WLSA) in Shanghai. On the one hand, this school shares similarities with other regular high schools in China. For example,

students need to complete the required courses in three years. Meanwhile, their test scores are also highly valued. On the other hand, the differences between these two types of schools are conspicuous, which may be due to the nature of WLSA. WLSA is not in the public education system so that it does not need to follow the guidelines proposed by the local government strictly. Since students at this school aim to study abroad after graduation, the curriculum design is more similar to the Western educational system, which means that the learning atmosphere there is more flexible, and students have more space to select their preferred courses. Generally speaking, based on my observation, this school pays more attention to students' comprehensive development rather than only focusing on their academic performance.

This internship influenced me a lot and pushed me to think about my teaching philosophy for my future classes. As I mentioned in my independent study paper, I was deeply impressed by WLSA's efforts to engage students, parents, and school personnel in a community. For example, I played the role of an advisor when attending one-on-one interviews held by the principal. Students with their parents were invited to a conference room and encouraged to share their family background, strengths, weaknesses, personal experiences, and learning goals. During this process, I was able to comprehensively learn about a student as a unique individual rather than understand him or her from their entrance test scores. This experience reminded me of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP). Different from teacher-centered teaching methods, CRP is a student-centered approach, which stresses that students' unique cultural strengths should be identified and valued to promote their language and academic achievement (Richards, Brown, & Forde, 2007).

In order to implement CRP, I believe the first step is to constantly seek ways to deepen my understanding of my students. Gay (2010) held the view that culturally responsive caring is an essential part of the educational process. Teachers should care *for* students rather than care *about* students. Caring about students only shows the concern of their state of being, while caring for students is a combination of teachers' concern, compassion, commitment, responsibility, and action (Gay, 2010). Therefore, to care for my future students, I will use formal and informal assessments to investigate students' sociocultural backgrounds. In terms of formal assessments, each student in my class will be invited to finish a questionnaire. They will be required to provide their basic personal information. For informal assessments, I will continue using the form of one-on-one interviews used by WLSA to dig into my students' backgrounds at the beginning of a new semester. During this process, I will take into consideration not only students' academic performance but also their physical and mental health, family background, and previous schooling experience.

Additionally, I was inspired by the warm-up activity on the first day of the Parent, School, and Community class at Peabody. Before the first class, we were asked to bring an artifact that conveys a story about ourselves. The artifact could be a picture, object, or map. I still remember that I brought a decoration which is related to Buddhism and shared my family story related to this decoration. Another activity we did in class involved each of us drawing a picture of our family or culture. Instead of directly telling our classmates the meaning of this picture, we invited them to guess the meaning first. During this process, I was deeply moved by one of my classmates who told us the historical development of a primary school founded by his grandparents in Brazil. In this way, I not only came to understand a different

educational system in Brazil and my classmate's family stories, but also had a deeper understanding of his learning target and future goals. Consequently, I believe these two activities can also be used in my future classes to facilitate the interactions between my students and me, as well as learn about their funds of knowledge (Moll. et al., 1992) step by step.

Apart from exploring students' background knowledge, parents' engagement also plays a crucial role during the process of exploring students' funds of knowledge. Research shows that family social capital exerts stronger effects on academic achievement than does school social capital, which indicates that parents' engagement is a critical element in improving students' performance. Thus, The school and teachers should create more opportunities and encourage parents to actively attend school meetings or extracurricular activities (Dufura, Parcel, & Troutman, 2013). One of the approaches I would prefer to use in the future is to learn students' family social capital through home visits. Since students may be more relaxed and comfortable at home, they may demonstrate more authentic self-images. Furthermore, students' performance and characteristics under their parents' description may be quite different from that in class. In addition, home visits provide an opportunity to engage parents in their children's school life and build a bridge between parents and teachers.

In addition to building a relationship with students and their families, understanding their background knowledge, and utilizing their prior knowledge in class, engaging students in class and improving their language and content proficiency is also of great significance. Based on my summer observations, although the curriculum design is more flexible in private international schools, the universal phenomenon is that teachers often play the role of the

authority and lecture students. They prefer to use deductive teaching methods rather than inductive pedagogy to convey new knowledge to students. Because of this, students unconsciously become passive listeners rather than active participants. During my summer internship, I noticed that in an English class, the teacher spent the whole lesson giving students explicit instructions, explaining grammar rules. Although some students were able to listen carefully and take notes, others could not concentrate on the teacher's instructions and nearly fell asleep in class. Additionally, in-class exercises were all form-focused multiple-choice questions without any open-ended questions. This teaching method would gradually take away students' interests and motivation in learning both language and content. For the purpose of changing this current phenomenon, I will introduce Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) to my future classes.

CLT is a teaching approach that not only emphasizes language structure like vocabulary or grammar but also focuses on what people do with the forms of speech when they want to communicate with others (Littlewood, 1981). Celce-Murcia (2001) used an interesting analogy to explain this concept. As football fans, our interest lies not in football itself, but the strategies that the players use to punt, pass, and fake their way along the field. The model proposed by Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrell (1995) shows that learners' communicative competence is composed of discourse, linguistic, actional, sociocultural, and strategic competence. Discourse competence, surrounded by the other four competences, is regarded as the core of this model. It requires learners to make their conversation coherent, cohesive, and well-organized in spoken or written form. In the other four competences, it is necessary for learners to possess not only the knowledge of morphology, syntax, phonology, lexicon,

and orthography but also encourages them to develop the ability to use language to negotiate with partners, solve problems, and finally, achieve their pragmatic goals.

To help students achieve these goals, Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) will be used in my class. TBLT, which is an offshoot of CLT, is also a student-centered teaching approach. It aims at organizing activities to help students complete meaningful tasks by using authentic texts. Students need to use communicative skills to discuss and negotiate with their partners to solve real-world problems (Ellis, 2003). In this process, teachers will play the role of a facilitator to inspire students' thinking. I regard the Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) as a useful tool to design a lesson. IPA can be divided into three parts: interpreted task, interpersonal task, and presentational task. The interpreted task focuses on finding authentic texts for students to interpret. Compared to the materials in the textbook which are deliberately designed for language learners, authentic texts can be retrieved from Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, or other social media and resources created by native speakers. After finishing the interpreted task, students will have a general idea about what they will learn in the following class. The next part is the interpersonal task. The communication initiated from this task belongs to two-way spontaneous interaction. For example, collaborative learning strategies like Think-Pair-Share (TPS) and Jigsaw can involve students in group activities and facilitate spontaneous interactions among students. Also, an information gap activity is beneficial for students to exchange information. This type of activity provides different information for students in a pair or a group, which requires them to listen, memorize, negotiate, and even critique each others' opinions to complete a task together. During this process, students will develop not only their speaking and listening skills but also their

higher-order thinking. The last part of the IPA is about the presentational task. This part can be a spoken or written task or a combination of these two. Students need to explain, compare, or contrast the learning materials. At the end of the class, students' performance will be evaluated by themselves and by the teacher. As a teacher, I will develop a rubric to assess their performance. Meanwhile, students' self-assessments are also an effective way to promote their metacognitive awareness. Apart from understanding what they have done in class, they will also know why they should do it in this way. The research shows that students who develop metacognitive awareness will have a better performance than those who do not, especially for those low-performance students (Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). This proves that the importance of cultivating students' ability to self-reflect cannot be ignored.

Apart from CRP and CLT, scaffolding will play an essential role in my future teaching. My practicum experience also confirmed my idea to continue using scaffolding to develop my lesson plans and give instructions in class. For example, the videotape of my first lesson showed that since I neglected to utilize students' background knowledge and to break down tasks into several small pieces to give them comprehensive input, students became lost and confused during my instruction. Therefore, in the second and third class, I tried to select teaching materials closely related to students' personal experience or daily life, consciously adjust the sequence of my tasks, and give instructions to my students step by step. There is no denying that my third lesson achieved much more success. I chose the theme "romantic partner and friend" as a hook for my third lesson. Also, a romantic song called "Lost in Paradise" was used to teach them how to write a simile and a metaphor. Finally, students were required to use a simile or a metaphor to describe their ideal romantic partner or best

friends after class. I found that surprisingly, no student slept in class, and all of them were highly engaged in every activity. I could see the light shining in their eyes during the whole process. At the end of this class, although I did not require them to complete the assignment in class, all the students were willing to stay in the classroom and finish writing a simile or a metaphor to describe their ideal romantic partners or best friends. When they were leaving the class, many of the students started to sing this song with their classmates. This successful experience showed the real power of effective scaffolding and pushed me to think about my future goals in this area.

Generally, I believe that these two teaching philosophies, including CLT and CRP, can be placed under a broad framework: scaffolding. Scaffolding, instead of being a simple word for help, is a special kind of support that assists learners in moving toward new skills, concepts, or levels of understanding. It aims at providing temporary assistance by helping students build new knowledge based on their previous knowledge and increasing their autonomy (Gibbons, 2002). From my perspective, this lesson reflected several main elements for scaffolding mentioned by Hammond & Gibbons (2005). Hammond & Gibbons proposed that no matter from a macro perspective or micro perspective, teachers should consider learners' prior knowledge and personal experience first. Then, they will be able to use different teaching skills such as semiotic systems, mediational texts, recapping, and recasting to create a student-centered class to help students build new knowledge on their previous understanding.

Thus, we can see that the essence of scaffolding is consistent with CRP and CLT, and I will use scaffolding as a guideline to implement CRP and CLT. These three parts are closely

related to each other so that we cannot take away one part from the others. Take my internship experience in Shanghai as an example. Under the framework of scaffolding, imagine that we take away the CRP part, which means that teachers pay no attention to students' sociocultural and linguistic background knowledge, or their prior schooling experience. Under this situation, teachers have to teach students based on their assumptions and imagination, and students will gradually lose their interest in learning. Now imagine another situation. We keep the CRP and take away CLT this time, which means that teachers only emphasize the importance for students to memorize vocabulary or grammar rules, and to practice the learning content repeatedly. Indeed, some of the schools in China still use this teaching method these days. The results show that many students dislike learning English by mechanical memorizing, which may cause students to lose interest. More seriously, even if students are able to memorize all the required vocabulary or grammar rules, they may not know how to use this knowledge in authentic contexts. At this time, language learning has become a tool for testing students rather than a key for entering a new world. Therefore, these two thought experiments prove that scaffolding, CRP, and CLT cannot be separated during the teaching and learning process. Through combining these three elements together, I will be able to create a supportive student-centered classroom.

Professional Knowledge Area 1: Learner

This professional knowledge area is composed of two domains, which focuses on both learners' identity and context and their learning process. TESOL domain 4 requires teachers to understand learners' backgrounds and how the learners' identity influences their learning, as well as be able to utilize the information in the teaching process. Meanwhile, the TESOL

domain 6 requires teachers to be clear about the knowledge of language acquisition. This professional knowledge area is of great significance because it stresses a learner-centered pedagogy. It is also consistent with my teaching philosophy, which stated that different from teacher-centered teaching methods, CRP is a student-centered approach, which stresses that students' unique cultural strengths should be identified and valued to promote their language and academic achievement (Richards, Brown, & Forde, 2007).

TESOL Domain 4: Identity and Context

TESOL domain 4 emphasizes teachers' understanding of the importance of who learners are and how their communities, heritages, and goals shape learning and expectations of learning. Meanwhile, teachers should recognize the importance of how context contributes to identity formation, and therefore, influence learning. Thus, they will be able to use this knowledge of identity and settings in planning, instruction, and assessing. This domain is closely related to three main theories mentioned in my teaching philosophy. The first one is CRP. As I wrote, learning students' background information is the first step to care about students as well as individualize instructions in future classes. Secondly, figuring out students' identity and context has a profound impact on implementing CLT, which is also a student-centered teaching approach. Finally, in order to better scaffold for students, understanding and utilizing their background knowledge cannot be neglected because scaffolding pays attention to helping students build new knowledge on their previous knowledge, including their personal experience and academic proficiency.

Artifact A

The first part of the final analysis project based on my practicum at John Overton High

School (Appendix 1) aimed to investigate and assess my participant Andrew's sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds. As I mentioned in this paper, "Apart from investigating students' language development, their biopsychosocial and education history are of great significance as well (Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2007)." This shows my understanding of the importance of learners' identity and context. Therefore, I developed my own questionnaire by combining the template of the student language interview and Herrera's identity survey. Through the interview and investigation, I gained Andrew's basic background information. My paper demonstrated that Andrew, a seventeen-year-old boy, had a complicated immigrant experience and family story. He immigrated from Guatemala to the U.S. eight months ago. His father died in his hometown, and his mother moved to California and married another man. Now, he lived with his uncle in Nashville. Apart from interviewing Andrew, I also chose the sociocultural checklist (Collier, 2002) to qualify his acculturation level. Understanding his sociocultural background laid a solid foundation for my future lesson plans, individualized instructions, and assessments.

Additionally, through talking with Andrew, I generally understood his learning motivations and goals. As I discussed in the paper, different from all the other students in the class, he showed high motivation. He greeted me and sat beside me to introduce himself and ask me questions on the first day we met. In addition, he began to talk about his personal experience, academic performance, and future goals spontaneously. Moreover, my mentor Karen highly recommended him to be my interviewee because although he only stayed in the U.S. for eight months, he had already become the highest-level student in his class at that time. This made me decide to choose him as my participant. From the conversation between

Andrew and me, I also figured out the causes of his super-high motivation and expectations of learning. This conversation also convinced me that context had a considerable impact on students' learning. In my paper, I demonstrated three reasons shaping Andrew's learning and expectations of learning. Firstly, he treasured the opportunity to study in a peaceful country because he just escaped from a country full of war. Secondly, he told me that he had two career plans. Since he had the experience of learning nursing in his hometown, he planned to enter a college and continue learning nursing in the future. He also said that in case he could not successfully enter a college, he wants to be a Spanish-English translator. No matter which one he wanted to realize in the future, he believed that it is necessary to maintain a high GPA and improve his English proficiency at school.

These examples in the first part of my final analysis project showed my understanding of the importance of learners' identity and context, as well as how the context influences learning. This knowledge paved the way for my future planning, instructing, and assessing at John Overton High school. Although I achieved a lot of useful knowledge about Andrew's personal information, I have to admit that I did not pay too much attention to how context contributes to identity formation. It means that I need to take more effort to explore how Andrew's life in his hometown shaped him. The next time, I will add more questions such as "What are the most memorable things in your culture" or "What do you think about your culture" to encourage my students to share more about their own culture.

TESOL Domain 6: Learning

Domain 6 requires teachers to draw on their knowledge of the language to understand the processes by which learners acquire a new language in and out of classroom settings and

facilitate students' language learning. This domain is also crucial because knowing the essence of language and learning processes is the foundation for teaching and promoting students' language acquisition.

Artifact B

The final case study in the linguistic class (Appendix 2) described my interviewee Xiaoming's oral and written language abilities in terms of phonology, semantics, grammar (including morphology and syntax), and pragmatics. Back then, Xiaoming was a first-year graduate student learning architecture at Suzhou University in China. I chose him to be my interviewee because we were high school classmates, and now he is still one of my best friends. This means that we know each other well and share a similar educational background, especially our English learning experiences. This paper was composed of five parts: introduction to Xiaoming, description of his oral and written language proficiency, assessment of his current stage of second language acquisition, a specific instructional plan for him, and a critical reflection of the whole process. This paper also reflected one part of my teaching philosophy. In the scaffolding part, I emphasized the importance of drawing attention to students' prior knowledge and experience and the selection of tasks as critical elements in a model of scaffolding. It means that teachers should consider students' existing knowledge of English and the language demands of specific key learning areas (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005).

In the introduction part, I briefly introduce Xiaoming's English learning experience and how his learning process was influenced by sociocultural factors (Appendix 2-1). I pointed out several essential elements that may impact Xiaoming's learning style and goals. For

example, I mentioned that although Xiaoming began to learn English from the third grade, which means that he has been learning English for more than 13 years, he told me that he had difficulty speaking English fluently. Additionally, he mentioned the traditional teaching method in China is more deductive rather than inductive, which makes students quiet listeners instead of active participants. Taking this background information into account, I was able to relate it to Xiaoming's learning process and performance.

In the second part (Appendix 2-2), I analyzed Xiaoming's English language proficiency from different dimensions. For example, when doing the phonology analysis, I not only focused on his pronunciation but also suprasegmentals like stress, intonation, and prosody proposed by Florez (1998). The evaluation of Xiaoming's semantics ability was based on the depth and breadth of his receptive and expressive knowledge (González-Fernández & Schmitt, 2017). Furthermore, I also assessed his pragmatic ability according to Grice's Maxims (The Ohio State University, 2016) by creating several real-life scenarios. In this way, I fully utilized the knowledge of language and adult language learning to give Xiaoming a comprehensive assessment to pave the way for giving him specific instructions in the following sections.

After summarizing Xiaoming's performance and placing him between level 3 and 4 according to the standard of the Language Acquisition Chart (Phillips Galloway, 2018), I developed specific instructions for him (Appendix 2-3). For instance, considering Xiaoming's difficulty of distinguishing the similar vowels like /i/ and /ɪ/ caused by the differences between Chinese and English phonetic system, I suggested for him to use the IPA chart to figure out the difference in the manner and place of articulation between these two languages.

In addition, since Xiaoming did not have a clear awareness of using connectives, I also encouraged him to add more connectives in each paragraph.

However, although I tried to give Xiaoming some practical recommendations, these suggestions were still too vague and broad to be implemented in his future learning. For example, in terms of teaching Xiaoming the usage of connectives, I should have developed a more detailed instructional plan. For instance, I can invite him to make a comparison between two texts. The first one lacks connectives, while the second one adds connectives in the appropriate places. By doing so, Xiaoming would develop an awareness of using connectives. Furthermore, I should have provided a wordlist for him, which includes oral and academic connectives. In this way, Xiaoming would be able to choose suitable connectives in different settings.

Professional Knowledge Area 2: The Learning Contexts

After having a deep and comprehensive understanding of our learners, the next step is to consider how to give them instructions. As teachers, we need to thoroughly think about utilizing students' information to create supportive environments to improve their content and language learning simultaneously. Thus, the importance of professional knowledge area 2 cannot be ignored because we should recognize the fact that learning is not just a mental activity that happens in a vacuum. Instead, many interacting factors codetermine students' learning efficiency. Therefore, teachers should consider how to engage learners in class and facilitate their learning from different perspectives.

TESOL Domain 2: Instructing

TESOL domain 2 points out that teachers should create supportive environments that engage all learners in purposeful learning and promote respectful classroom interactions. From my perspective, this domain is closely related to the scaffolding part of my teaching philosophy. As I mentioned, after understanding students' sociocultural background knowledge, teachers should give specific instructions to fill in the gap between their prior knowledge and new content. Thus, scaffolding is a useful tool for teachers to add support for students to enhance their learning by systematically building on their personal experience or background knowledge. Furthermore, scaffolding aims at providing temporary assistance by helping students building new knowledge based on their previous knowledge and increasing their autonomy (Gibbons, 2002).

Artifact C

The final video paper based on my practicum at John Overton High School analyzed the videotape of my three lessons from a macro perspective and a micro perspective. Additionally, at the end of this paper, I did a reflection to think about my strengths, weaknesses, improvement, and plans for my future teaching. My scaffolding can be seen through the whole dynamic teaching process.

Under the framework of scaffolding proposed by Hammond & Gibbons (2005), I would like to discuss how my final video paper illustrates TESOL domain 2 from two aspects. The first aspect is about using students' sociocultural backgrounds to create a welcoming and comfortable atmosphere to reduce the degree of the affective filter and help them prepare for

my class, while the second one focuses on utilizing their previous knowledge to help them learn the new content through my instructions and peer scaffolding.

From the first aspect, in the macroanalysis part, I mentioned that in order to help students combine their personal experience with learning content, I intentionally invited them to share their travel experiences over fall break (Appendix 3). The fact showed that although students kept silent for a while at first, after several minutes, the class atmosphere changed, and students became more active. They were not only willing to share their travel but also talk a lot about their immigrant experiences. At the end of this activity, I summarized students' answers and integrated their life experience with the poem "The Road Not Taken." During this process, students became more relaxed when facing a new teacher. I believed that this warm-up activity created a warm and supportive atmosphere for my students.

Additionally, the final reflection part of this paper comprehensively represented my efforts to help students build new knowledge on their personal experience. I chose the theme "romantic partner and friend" as a hook for my third class and a romantic song called "Lost in Paradise" to teach students similes and metaphors. Students' reactions showed that these two teaching materials were highly connected to their experiences and successfully stimulated their interests. As mentioned earlier, students were highly engaged in my class. At the end of this class, most of them were able to write a simile or a metaphor. Some of the students could even memorize the lyrics of this song. I think this experience is important to mention because it proved the efficiency and necessity of creating a supportive environment by integrating students' personal experience with new knowledge. Students' interests and motivation are stimulated in this way (Appendix 4).

These two examples were aligned with my teaching philosophy. On the one hand, they stress the importance of building a bridge between teachers and students, as well as students' personal experience and new content. On the other hand, they show that I am a teacher who cares for students. My care was not limited to concern about students' state of being, but also includes a combination of concern, compassion, commitment, responsibility, and action (Gay, 2010).

For the second aspect, I want to discuss how the microanalysis part of my video paper demonstrated my moment-to-moment instructions, as well as the peer scaffolding that happened among students (Appendix 5). Firstly, as I talked, the design of four multiple-choice questions was in a progressive sequence. The first two questions were more concrete so that students were able to find out the answer by directly citing evidence from the poem. However, the last two questions were more abstract, which required students to explore the narrator's inner world by building their own unique understanding of the poem. The sequence of the four questions is important to mention because it represented my scaffolding, moving from a lower level to a higher level to facilitate the development of my students' higher-order thinking ability.

This part also demonstrated my efforts to encourage students to become active learners rather than passive listeners (Savignon, 2001). I wrote, "Instead of correcting their grammatical mistakes or making a judgment on their answer, the only thing I kept doing was to turn to different students and ask them why." Consistent with the CLT theory in my teaching philosophy, focusing on getting learners actively engaged in group activities to learn new knowledge through exchanging information with group members, I tried to play a role as

a facilitator or a guide rather than the authority who always keeps talking. Peer scaffolding happened spontaneously in this process. Students argued and negotiated with each other in Spanish and English. To persuade their partners, they pointed out the evidence from the poem. The result showed that this process facilitated both their content and language development. This example not only showed that I was able to engage all learners in purposeful learning, but I also promoted active classroom interactions.

Although I was able to facilitate active interactions in class, I have to admit that my paper did not represent my ability to promote respectful classroom interactions, which means that students may not have known how to have a respectful academic conversation. This problem was also mentioned at the end of my final video analysis. I pointed out that most of the time, when I let my students do a group discussion, they seemed to have no idea about the rules of doing a group discussion. This might be caused by the fact that students had not been taught how to initiate or stop a conversation and show respect to each other simultaneously. Since then, I realized the importance of the concept "rules" proposed by Evertson and Harris (2003), which told me that "rules" refers to students' relationship with others, time, space, and materials, which plays a critical part in classroom management. To resolve this problem, at the end of my video paper, I decided to use the lesson activities for developing core conversation skills (Zwiers & Crawford, 2011) to make classroom rules and realize the goal of promoting respectful classroom interactions.

Professional Knowledge Area 3: Curriculum

Creating a welcoming and supportive classroom decreases the level of learners' affective filters, while developing a good lesson plan and intentionally select teaching content are also

of great significance. Therefore, on the one hand, the professional knowledge area related to curriculum stresses the importance of making and adjusting plans to meet learners' goals according to their language proficiency. On the other hand, it requires teachers to facilitate students' language and content learning simultaneously. Students are expected to use language in a real-life scenario, complete tasks, and solve problems. The importance of this professional area cannot be neglected because curriculum planning plays a core status in the whole teaching process. To some degree, it determines whether teachers can successfully convey the language and content knowledge to students and whether the knowledge can be understood and used for communicative purposes by the learners efficiently.

TESOL Domain 1: Planning

TESOL Domain 1 requires teachers to plan instruction to promote learning and meet learner goals, as well as modify plans to assure learner engagement and achievement. This domain plays a vital role in teaching because a comprehensive and detailed lesson plan will lay a solid foundation for in-class instructions. The lesson plans allow teachers to consider how to offer guidance in their minds so that they can make adjustments to meet students' demands before implementing the plans in a real class.

Artifact D

My three lesson plans during the practicum at John Overton High School reflected my progress in developing detailed plans to prepare for giving instructions in class and meeting learner goals. Additionally, through talking with my director Nicole, I adopted her suggestions and made some adjustments to each of my lesson plans to better meet my learners' levels and requirements.

Before developing a lesson plan, I believed that the most important thing is to learn my students' language proficiency and background knowledge. Therefore, I interviewed my mentor Karen to obtain students' necessary information, including their home countries, learning experience, and English language proficiency. The introduction part of my lesson plans stated that "This lesson plan is based on the English Language Development (ELD) program at John Overton High School. There are 19 students in class whose language proficiency is 2.4-3.4 according to the WIDA standard. They have been in the U.S. from one year to five years. Their native languages are Spanish, Arabic, Nepali, and other African languages." This information helped me to develop more individualized and specific lesson plans to promote learning and meet learners' goals. This part of my lesson plans also reflected my thoughts in my teaching philosophy. Among all the requirements for teachers to enact CRP proposed by Gay (2010), I reached the standard of knowing culturally diverse students thoroughly, both personally and academically, to develop my curriculum.

My lesson plans also clearly represented my theme, standards, supplementary materials, content objectives, and language objectives. The latter two are important to mention because they not only set a clear goal for students and me but also emphasized the significance of using language to complete tasks related to learning content knowledge and improving communicative skills. For example, in my first lesson plan (Appendix 6), the content objectives included knowing how to distinguish and find a direct object or a subject complement in a sentence, and knowing how to use these two components in writing. Meanwhile, the language objectives required students to understand how to describe a real-life scenario, the skills of discussing and negotiating with partners, and how to use their own

language to write a short essay. Under the framework of the WIDA standard, these specific objectives intend to develop students' grammatical competence, discourse competence, and sociocultural competence at the same time, which is also consistent with my teaching philosophy.

Furthermore, before implementing my plans, I was accustomed to discussing with my director Nicole and asking for her opinions. Take my second lesson plan (Appendix 6) as an example. After sending it to Nicole, she gave me detailed feedback and inspired me to think about the practicality of my ideas. For instance, she raised several questions for each step, such as "How will you introduce the lesson objectives to the students", "How will the students share with the whole class? Will each have a turn, or do you mean just a few will share", or "Could you have your own example ready to share, or think aloud for them so they can hear how you think about combining the poem and their own experience." After taking all her suggestions into account, I polished my lesson plan. For example, I added "let the students think independently first and then share their personal experience with their shoulder partners by asking the question" and "Let the students work in small groups and encourage them to figure out the main theme of this poem" to clarify the instructions for group work. Additionally, in order to avoid causing confusion and ambiguity, I added the modeling part into my lesson plan to make it more concrete and practical. Consequently, by sharing and discussing each of my lessons with Nicole, I gradually found a suitable approach for my class. The students' performance in class created the necessity for modifying teaching plans.

I believe that this artifact shows that I not only reached the requirement of planning instruction to promote learning and meet learner goals, but I also was able to modify plans to

assure learner engagement and achievement by collaborating with other teachers. Although some teachers are willing to work independently, it is becoming more popular for teachers to work as a team nowadays. Teachers' collaboration will have a positive impact on staying consistent, supporting each other, exchanging ideas, providing feedback, and building trust (Nelson, 2014). Thus, as a candidate who lacks teaching experience, I was able to polish my teaching skills step by step through communicating with my director and mentor.

TESOL Domain 7: Content

The last TESOL domain focuses on developing teaching plans from a macro perspective. It requires teachers to build a general framework for a class and be able to polish their lesson plans to adapt to learners' needs. Compared to TESOL domain 1, this domain makes demands on teachers from a micro perspective. Teachers should understand that that language learning is most likely to occur when learners are trying to use the language for genuine communicative purposes. Additionally, teachers need to realize that the content of the language course is the language that learners need in order to listen, to talk about, to read, and write about a subject matter or content area. Also, this domain also requires teachers to design their lessons to help learners acquire the language they need to successfully communicate in those areas.

Generally, TESOL domain 7 stresses that teachers should have an awareness of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the ability to put this theory into practice in class. This is consistent with my teaching philosophy, which also emphasized the critical role of using CLT in my class.

Artifact E

The rationale of my lesson plans (Appendix 7) showed my ability to understand that language teaching should be placed in an authentic context for communicative purposes, as well as that teaching language and content should happen simultaneously.

Savignon (2001) pointed out that the CLT approach regards students as active learners rather than passive learners. It means that students will not only learn the language itself; they will also learn how to utilize language in both academic and daily settings. They will achieve the ability to cooperate, negotiate and solve real-life problems. This point was not only contained in my teaching philosophy but also reflected by my first lesson plan. In my rationale, I wrote, "although the language objective in this class is to learn direct objects and subject complements, the students are also expected to be able to work in pairs or small groups, think about specific questions, and figure out the answer together." Therefore, in this process, students' communicative and collaborative abilities would be developed at the same time. Also, the activity that requires students to describe a real-life scenario at the end of this class aimed to combine reading, writing, speaking, and listening together to facilitate students' communicative skills.

The design of this class was also aligned with five communicative competences proposed by Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell (1995), including discourse competence, actional competence, linguistic competence, sociocultural competence, and strategic competence. My rationale comprehensively supported my teaching plan according to these communicative competences and proved that my class design met the standard of these competencies. For instance, I mentioned, "During this process, students' actional (functional) competence will

also be developed because students will not only learn the language but also need to use language to address real-life tasks. In addition, to make their statement and explanation comprehensible as well as to understand others better, they need to paraphrase or ask clarification questions during the discussion."

Although I had already developed the awareness of teaching language in an authentic context and was able to facilitate students to use language to learn content knowledge as well as develop communicative skills, there was a problem existing in my class. I found that even though my students were placed at the same level, the gaps still lived among them. It means that some students were able to talk about daily topic fluently, while others had difficulty expressing their opinions in English. Thus, when I implemented CLT approach in class and tried to facilitate group discussions, based on my observation, the relatively high-level students in a group might play a dominant role, while others might stay quiet during the whole discussion. Language became a barrier for the latter ones so that they were not able to be active participants. When designing lesson plans for my future class, I need to take this problem into account and figure out a solution to address this problem.

Professional Knowledge Area 4: Assessment

Compared to the professional knowledge areas mentioned before, this area is most likely to be ignored by teachers. Although most of the teachers share the common sense that developing a teaching plan and giving instructions in class play central roles in the teaching process, sometimes they overlook the functions of assessment. Assessment happens at any time and any place, which can not only be used to evaluate students' academic success but also to find out their strengths and weaknesses, becoming a reference for their future learning.

Therefore, this professional knowledge area requires teachers to recognize the importance of assessment, use various tools to assess students from different aspects, and facilitate students' future learning according to the results. The significance of this area cannot be neglected because the assessment is not only able to deepen teachers' understanding of learners' academic performance but also enable teachers to explore learners' sociocultural background, and finally, pursue the equity of education.

TESOL Domain 3: Assessing

TESOL domain 3 requires teachers to recognize the importance of gathering and interpreting information about learning and performance to promote the continuous intellectual and linguistic development of each learner. Also, teachers should be able to use knowledge of student performance to make decisions about planning and instruction "on the spot" and for the future. Meanwhile, teachers should involve learners in determining what will be assessed and provide constructive feedback to learners, based on assessments of their learning.

Artifact F

The final analysis paper of my practicum at John Overton High School demonstrated my assessment of my participant Andrew from different dimensions. This paper was composed of four parts. By using various assessments and rubrics, I assessed my participant Andrew's English language proficiency in a relatively comprehensive way. Andrew, a 17-year-old boy, was a recent immigrant who arrived in the U.S. 8 months ago. Although he had only been in this country for a short time, his high motivation for learning both language and content knowledge strongly attracted me and made me determine to choose him as my participant. In

the first part of this analysis project (Appendix 1), I paid attention to investigating his sociocultural background through formal and informal assessments. Meanwhile, I also assessed school and classroom contexts according to the criteria proposed by Herrera, Murry, & Cabral (2007). In the second part, I designed an oral assessment of Andrew's English language proficiency and made a comparison between the results of this assessment and the WIDA SCREENER and WIDA ASSESS (Appendix 8). Then I moved to the third part, which aimed to assess my participant's reading and writing ability by using the materials provided by my mentor. Finally, the last part represents my instructional recommendations for Andrew and assessment plans for my future classroom.

Aligned with my teaching philosophy which stressed that teachers should care for students rather than caring about students (Gay, 2010), in order to build a bridge between the teacher and students, the first step is to seek ways to deepen my understanding of my students constantly. Thus, to care for my students, both formal and informal assessments will be used to investigate students' sociocultural background. The first part of my final analysis project represented this idea. I wrote, "Based on the informal conversation and formal interview between Andrew and me, I was deeply impressed by his complicated personal experience and family background," which illustrates that instead of only regarding Andrew as an English language learner, I tried to treat him as a unique individual first. By doing so, I learned a lot about his immigrant experience, family background, previous schooling experience, the process of learning English, and the goals for future learning. This useful information laid a solid foundation for my teaching and assessments in the following steps. When developing teaching plans and giving students instructions in the next few months, I always considered

students' background knowledge and combined them with my teaching content.

The following two parts reflected my comprehensive assessments of Andrew's oral and written language ability. Inspired by the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which not only emphasizes language structure like vocabulary or grammar but also focuses on what people do with the forms when they want to communicate with others (Littlewood, 1981), I created an authentic assessment and invited Andrew and another student to use language to solve a real-life problem under the WIDA framework used by the school. This is consistent with my teaching philosophy, which pointed out that teachers can use Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), an offshoot of CLT, to organize activities to help students complete meaningful tasks by using authentic texts. In this process, students need to use communicative skills to discuss and negotiate with their partners to solve real-world problems (Ellis, 2003). During the whole process, I made efforts to create a welcoming and comfortable atmosphere so that students would not be influenced by their affective filters. By using the rubric adapted from WIDA, I evaluated Andrew's oral language proficiency for linguistic complexity, language forms and conventions, and vocabulary usage. Through comparing the assessment results with my mentor, the consensus between us proved that my assessment was relatively reliable and valid.

In the third part, I chose the authentic materials such as Andrew's daily logs and responses to four questions to assess his reading comprehension and writing abilities. By using the 6-Trait Scoring Rubric to assess his writing and another rubric developed by myself to evaluate his reading comprehension skills (Appendix 9), I successfully found several patterns of his mistakes from macro and micro perspectives. According to the results of the

assessment, in the final part, I gave Andrew individualized instructional recommendations and developed a general assessment plan for my future class (Appendix 10), which is consistent with the TESOL domain 3 that teachers should be able to use knowledge of students' performance to make decisions about planning and instruction "on the spot" and for the future. For instance, to help Andrew improve his oral and written language, from a macro perspective, I recommended for him to pay attention to the use of connectives, how to convey main ideas, and how to adequately cite evidence and examples. From a micro perspective, he was suggested to focus on word choice, sentence variety, and grammatical rules like morphological changes. Meanwhile, I not only pointed out these mistakes but also developed detailed instructions and provided practical learning tools for Andrew.

Although I achieved the requirement of gathering and interpreting information about students' performance, giving immediate feedback to learners, and developing plans for future teaching, I did not reach the goal of involving learners in determining what will be assessed. During the process of developing an assessment, Andrew was more like a passive receiver rather than an active participant. I played the role of a dominator when choosing the materials and designing rubrics based on his sociocultural background and language proficiency. In future classes, I will increase interactions with students, listen to students' opinions, and determine the assessment content together.

Applications to Practice: Implications and Future Considerations

TESOL Domain 8: Commitment and Professionalism

After discussing my teaching philosophy and analyzing the artifacts from four different professional knowledge areas, the final part of this paper will focus on discussing

implications and future considerations, which means that I will summarize my takeaways, consider the remaining challenges, and try to figure out possible solutions. I will also connect the TESOL Domain 8 with this part, which emphasizes that teachers should continue to grow in their understanding of the relationship of second language teaching and learning to the community of English language teaching professionals, the broader teaching community, and communities at large, and use these understandings to inform and change themselves and these communities.

Implications from my learning and practice experience

If asked to use three words to describe my teacher identity, I would choose "collaborative," "practical," and "supportive." Although these words seem like vague and broad ideas and all of them are important for promoting a student-centered education, they are especially important in demonstrating my teaching philosophy because they respectively correspond to the three elements of my teaching philosophy: CRP, CLT, and scaffolding.

The word "collaborative" demonstrates my goal of becoming a teacher who is not only willing to collaborate with colleagues but also with students and parents to form an entire community. Firstly, the importance of investigating students' background knowledge cannot be ignored. During this process, students and their parents are involved simultaneously so that teachers can get a more in-depth and comprehensive understanding of their students. Afterwards, teachers will be able to use these resources for planning and instructing. This idea is also aligned with the core of CRP, which stresses the necessity of caring for students, as well as creating a student-centered class and utilizing their unique cultural and linguistic strengths to promote their language and academic achievement (Richards, Brown, & Forde,

2007). My internship experience in Shanghai proved the importance of engaging students and parents in a community. The interview involving the teachers, students, and their parents provided more opportunities for mutual understanding. Besides, collaborations between colleagues are also of great significance. One of my artifacts shows that I kept adjusting my lesson plans to meet the real-class situation and students' requirements with the support from my director Nicole and mentor. As a teacher candidate, I could not continuously improve my teaching skills without my colleagues' help. Therefore, "collaborative" is a word representing the multi-directional cooperation between teachers, students, parents, and the whole community.

The second word is called "practical", which is consistent with CLT. In order to change the phenomenon that many schools in China still prefer to adopt the test-oriented teaching method to push students to achieve good marks, CLT is an innovative approach to break this tradition. Instead of supporting the mechanical memorization of vocabulary and grammar rules, CLT encourages students to use their language knowledge in a practical way. During my internship in the WLSA, some students came and asked me full of confusion: "I have been learning English from kindergarten for more than ten years, but why can't I communicate with native speakers fluently?" Obviously, the students admitted by the WLSA had high performance in the entrance examination, which demonstrated their solid foundation of vocabulary and grammar knowledge. However, because they did not actually use the language in an authentic conversation, they had never put the knowledge into practice. Therefore, I believe that it is important to be a teacher who pays more attention to teaching students meaning-focused rather than form-focused content in a communicative way.

The last word "supportive" reflects my philosophy of scaffolding students. Mariani (1997) argued that the most effective classrooms are those where there is both high challenge and high support for students. Being a supportive teacher does not mean letting students stay in their comfort zone where little learning would happen. It means that I will push students a little bit to face challenges and work within the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). As I did in my class at John Overton High School, I scaffolded my students both in a macro and micro dimension, as shown in my video analysis paper. From a macro perspective, I mainly focused on the structure of the whole class and increased the level of difficulty according to students' sociocultural and linguistic background knowledge. While from a micro perspective, I shifted my attention to scaffold students by giving moment-to-moment feedback to facilitate their content learning and higher-order thinking. In this way, I will be a facilitator to guide students to explore the unknown world.

Future Challenges

As I pointed out in the TESOL Domain 3 and 7, there are two main challenges for my future teaching. In terms of TESOL Domain 7, based on my observation at John Overton High School, although students sitting in the same classroom were assumed to have similar English language proficiency, the differences between individuals could not be neglected. Although the reliability and validity of the placement tests were high, students' performances on the test were also influenced by their emotions, motivation, and environment (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). Therefore, the results of the placement test cannot guarantee students' uniformity. For example, a girl who was a newcomer in my class kept silent while other group members were engaging in a heated discussion. In this group, the relatively high-level

students in this group played a dominant role. Imagine that over a period, the gap between students becomes more noticeable, and the relatively low-level students lose the motivation for future learning. Thus, this part is worth further discussion in the next section.

In TESOL domain 3, I realized that I did not reach the requirement of involving students in co-determining the assessment material. In order to encourage students to become active participants instead of passive listeners, teachers should engage students in decision-making about as many aspects of the assessment as possible, including the timing, the design, and the assessment criteria to increase students' motivation and a sense of participation. In this way, students will regard themselves as co-constructors of the assessment who share equal status with the teacher. However, a common phenomenon is that teachers always act as an authority, and students are usually in a passive position. This challenge will also be addressed in my future teaching process.

How I Will Continue to Develop

One of the most effective solutions to solving the problem mentioned in the TESOL Domain 7 is to differentiate students. In my future class, the gaps between students cannot be avoided. The SIOP model (2010) inspired me to find out solutions from three perspectives. The first one is to cluster my students into homogeneous small groups based on their English language proficiency, giving them the same task. I will start with the group of students who need the most support to provide a foundation for their later work. Then I will move to the medium level group and facilitate their learning. The highest level group will be encouraged to solve the problem independently.

In addition, creating leveled questions is also a useful approach to differentiate students. In my class, I will modulate the forms of questions I ask my students according to their levels of language proficiency. For example, for lower-level students, I will modify the language of a question into a simplified version and give higher-level students the original version. However, the higher-order thinking required by this question is the same among different groups of students. By doing so, I can provide comprehensible input for each student and develop their higher-order thinking ability as well.

Finally, I will keep facilitating peer scaffolding. Since the advanced learners may have more language or content knowledge, these higher-level students can play the role of teachers and explain the meaning to their classmates. In this way, advanced learners achieve the opportunity for output, while lower-level learners' input is strengthened.

To solve the problem mentioned in the TESOL Domain 3, I was inspired by my own experience in high school, which made me think about a new way to co-determine the assessment materials. When I was in the 11th grade, the teacher who taught language arts asked each student to design their own test paper. Instead of giving us specific and detailed requirements, she only gave us a range of test contents. One week later, the teacher asked us to find a partner to exchange our paper, bring it back home, and complete the paper. At that moment, the assessment became an exciting activity to share our work with friends rather than to take a high-stakes test. This activity successfully stimulated all the students' interests. Meanwhile, students got familiar with the previous knowledge during the process of reviewing learning content and developing test items. In my future teaching, although I will

not always invite my students to create their own assessments, they will still be encouraged to participate in the discussion of designing assessments and give constructive feedback to me.

Since to some degree, the situations in my future class depend on different student groups and specific teaching contents, I cannot develop a comprehensive plan for everything. However, I still can prepare for future conditions by thinking about current challenges and trying to figure out solutions. In this way, I will be more confident to face and solve various types of problems that might arise in my class.

References

- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). Language assessment: principles and classroom practices. Pearson Education, pp. 31-37.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). "Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Framework with Content Specifications.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Teaching English as a Second or foreign Language. 3rd Edition, Heinle & Heinle Publisher, Boston. pp13-28.
- Collier. C. (2002). Sociocultural Checklist. Cross Cultural Developmental Education Service.
- Dufura, M. J., Parcel, T. L., & Troutman, K. P. (2013). Does capital at home matter more than capital at school? Social capital effects on academic achievement. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 31, 1–21.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2010). *Making Content Comprehensible for Secondary English Learners: The SIOP Model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evertson, C. M., & Harris, A. H. (2003). COMP: Creating conditions for learning (6th ed.). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Florez, M. C. (1998). Improving adult ESL learners' pronunciation skills. National Center for ESL Literacy Education. Retrieved October 18, 2018 from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED427553>.
- Moll. L.C., et al. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.

- Gay, G. (2010). The Power of Culturally Responsive Caring. *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 47-75. New York & London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching ESL children in the mainstream classroom. Portsmouth US: Heinemann.
- González-Fernández, B., & Schmitt, N. (2017). Vocabulary acquisition. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 280-298). New York: Routledge.
- Hammond, J. & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. J. Hammond and P. Gibbons (Guest Editors) Special Issue: Re-thinking ESL Pedagogy: Socio-cultural Approaches to Teaching and Learning. *Prospect*, 20(1): 6–30.
- Herrera, S., Murry, K., & Cabral, R. (n.d.). (2007). Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Language Files: Materials for an Introduction to Language and Linguistics. (2016). S.I: Ohio State University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Communicative language teaching: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, C. A. (2014). Collaboration: Keys to Common Core Success. A new survey sheds light on keys to successful implementation of Common Core State Standards. *AMLE magazine*.

Phillips Galloway, Emily. (2018). Language Acquisition Chart.

Richards, H., Brown, A., & Forde, T. (2007). Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy. National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems.

Savignon, S. J. (2001). Communicative Language Teaching for the Twenty-First Century.

Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language. pp. 13-28.

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*, 65, 470–497.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.

Edited by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

Appendix 1

Part I

(a) Participant

Andrew, a seventeen-year old boy, was chosen to be my participant. Different from all of the other students in class, he showed high motivation. He came and sat besides me, and then, began to ask me a lot of questions. In addition, he was willing to share his personal experience to me. Kris also highly recommended him to be my interviewee because although he only stays in America for eight months, now he has already become the highest-level student in this class. According to his WIDA report, before enrolling in John Overton High school, his overall English proficiency was 1.50 on January 15th. After two-months learning, his overall score reached 2.30. It was hard for me to imagine what pushed him to learn so hard and so fast. Therefore, this students' high motivation and passion in learning drew my attention and caused me to chose him to be my participant.

For the purpose of investigating his cultural and linguistic background, I developed my own questionnaire by combining the template of student language interview and Herrera's identity survey. Apart from investing students' language development, their biopsychosocial and education history are of great significance as well (Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2007). Thus, I divided my questionnaire into three part. The first part is about students travel experience and family background. Based on the informal conversation and formal interview between Andrew and I, I was deeply impressed by his complicated personal experience and family background. Unlike other children who have a complete family, he said that his father died. Although his mother is also in America, she married another man and now prefers to stay in California rather than coming to Nashville. I asked him if he is living alone, he said that he is living with his cousin, who is forty-seven years old. He shares the same house with his cousin, his cousin's wife and little son. When it came to the topic that why did he choose to come to America, he told me that although he needs to undertake the risk of being sent back to his home country due to his illegal immigrant status, he still does not want to go back home. He described the daily scenario in his country Guatemala to me: people there need to be checked their identity everyday to avoid being killed. He lost the freedom in his home country. Compared to Guatemala, America is a place full of freedom and opportunities. Instead of being worried about how to survive, he said that he can go wherever he wants to go such as the state park, lake, or shopping malls. In the spare time, he preferred to watch movies or read books alone rather than playing with friends. In addition, he firmly believed that he can create and seize opportunities by studying and working hard in this country. Based on my observation, I could feel his strong depression when talking about his family and hometown, while we shifted the topic to the new life here, he began to act like a kid again and his eyes shined with enthusiasm and hope. Then I encouraged him to recall some interesting things in his culture or hometown. He became more confident and told me that he learned nursing in Guatemala. He also actively showed me how to dress a wound and inject.

In the next section, we talked around the topic about his previous schooling experience and future plan. He said that he has two plans. One is to enter a university and work in a medical center after graduating, while the other is to achieve a certificate and be an English-Spanish translator. No matter which one he wanted to realize in the future, he believed it is

necessary to maintain high GPA and improve English proficiency at school. As he mentioned before, because of the volatile situation in Guatemala, he could not receive formal and uninterrupted education. Because of the limitation of language, he could not fully describe his previous schooling experience to me. From our conversation, I could only know he learned nursing in his country. Compared to his previous schooling experience, he firmly told me that this high school is good and Kris is a qualified teacher who really cares for every student. He appreciated the chance of studying here and was not willing to go back to his hometown again. When we talked about which part is his strength, he was proud that unlike some students who need to stay in several English programs throughout high school, now he only needs to attend one ELD program. After observing and assessing his English ability, teachers believed that it is unnecessary for him to attend other English programs any more. For him, attending class with native students is an honor and recognition. However, he thought he is still unable to speak English fluently. In this process, he used the word “perfect English” frequently, which demonstrated his high expectation of “speaking like a native speaker”.

The last part focused on his language. His native language is Spanish and he nearly had no foundation in English when he arrived in America, which also could be reflected by his individual WIDA report. At school, he tried to use English to talk to everyone in order to improve his language skills. However, he told me that his classmates who speak Spanish could not understand his behavior and began to isolate him. At home, his introverted characteristic made him keep silent most of the time. When talking to his cousin’s family, he would use Spanish.

As an underage student, Andrew’s main purpose of coming to America is to escape from his country’s unstable political situation. He might have no adequate preparation before coming to a new country. For him, stress related to changes in environment, language, and schooling might cause barriers on their learning capacity. However, many teachers only pay attention to these culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students’ academic performance and neglect their personal histories (Herrera, Murry, & Cabral, 2007). Thus, to support CLD students academic and personal development, the importance of evaluating the level of acculturation and their sociocultural background cannot be neglected. In this way, teachers can develop individualized instructional plans for them. Therefore, I decided to choose the sociocultural checklist (Collier, 2002), which contains students’ acculturation level, cognitive learning style, culture and language, experiential background, and sociolinguistic development. This chart can be used to sociocultural background from various dimensions. In terms of acculturation level, Andrew belongs to a recent immigrant. He just arrived in Nashville for 8 months in order to escape from the turbulent political situation from his own country. Also, he does not interact much with majority culture peers because of his introverted characteristic. Even in the ELD class, he always feels being alienated from other classmates. Thus, his acculturation rate is 3 out of 6. Although his acculturation level is relatively high, he does not demonstrate any difficulty in cognitive learning style. He has clear and specific future plan and shows high motivation and persistence in learning. He almost has no difficulty understanding teachers’ instructions and tasks. Therefore, he gets 0 out of 6 in this part, which shows his high cognitive learning ability. The next part represents his cultural and language background. As a student from a non-English home and Spanish-speaking country, he belongs to an ethnic group different from mainstream America. Because

his father died in his childhood and his mother married another man, it is hard to make sure if his family emphasize support of family over individual effort. During our conversation, he did not show any culturally appropriate behaviors that are different from expectation of mainstream. He was polite and able to use pragmatic skills when communicating with me. Since he lives with his cousin's family and his cousin needs to work to make a living, most time he stays at home alone. Apparently, there is no support in the home for bilingual and bicultural development for Andrew. Thus, he gets 4 or 5 out of six in this part. When it comes to his experiential background, his personal experience shows high family mobility. He started from Guatemala, travelled through Mexico, and finally, arrived in Nashville, which shows high family mobility. Because of his country's volatile situation, he had limited and interrupted school attendance. Instead of entering regular educational system, he had to learn nursing. Also, his father's death and his mother's absence forced him to learn how to live independently and support himself. He has to work for six hours everyday after class. These facts show that he is in a low socioeconomic status. In addition, being exposed in a dangerous environment before coming to America and the lack of parents' care demonstrate his disrupted early childhood development. Therefore, in the part he gets 4 out of 9. When discussing his sociolinguistic development, his English proficiency ranks first in ELD class. However, because of the limitation of English, I could not ensure if he had limited academic language in native language according to his own description. In addition, different from other ELLs who rarely speak in class, he is always active in class, but remains silent after class. He stated that his classmates are more willing to speak Spanish rather than English, which makes him the one being isolated from others. Although his speaking and listening level are relatively high, his academic language is still limited. For example, I had to frequently adjust my academic language to oral one to make my speech more comprehensible for him. Thus, he gets 2 to 3 out of 8 in this section. According to Collier's standard, if the teacher has checked more than 40% of the items in any of the five areas, it indicates that the student needs intervention in this area. Therefore, the result shows that extra attentions need to be paid to Andrew's acculturation level, culture and language, and experiential background.

Appendix 2

Appendix 2-1

Participant Overview

Xiaoming, male, 21 years old, a first-year graduate student at Suzhou University in China, was chosen to be my interviewee. His major now is architecture. We were classmates in high school and he is still one of my best friends. Although his major is not English, he has been learning English for more than 13 years. Now, he is preparing for attending TOEFL test and plans to apply a PhD in America after completing the postgraduate course. In addition, because of the requirements of his major, he needs to read some English journals to prepare for the future research, which gives him many opportunities to read and write in English. He is a Mandarin Chinese speaker, but due to the impact of his parents, he speaks Wu dialect at home. To some degree, his Mandarin Chinese and Wu dialect influence each other, so during the interview, he joked that he could neither speak standard Mandarin Chinese nor standard Wu dialect. Also, because of his interest in Japanese culture, he studies Japanese on his own in the spare time. Overall, Xiaoming has a good command of Mandarin Chinese and Wu dialect. Meanwhile, he is familiar with English and Japanese.

Language Samples Collected

I collected both oral and written materials for the case study in order to evaluate and analyze Xiaoming's English proficiency from different aspects. I hold an interview with him via WeChat (one of the most popular social media in China) to get his oral samples. I was stay at home, while Xiaoming was in his dormitory. Although he shared the room with his roommate, both of us were in a quiet setting and did not be interrupted during the interview. In order to relieve his nervousness, I tried to chat with him in the beginning of our interview and encouraged him not to worry about making mistakes. Also, because of our acquaintance, most of the time he felt relaxed and comfortable. In the first part of the interview, we talked about Xiaoming's background information, which includes his education experience and linguistic background. Then, the second part was based on five specific situations. I played the different roles of a professor, Xiaoming's classmates and an elderly man, while Xiaoming tried to respond as he was in actual conversations. The third part was about evaluating his narrative ability. He was asked to describe what happened in comics.

Besides, I selected two writing topics from the TOEFL test in order to collect his writing samples. The first one is about why do people attend college or university, the second one is about the argument of building a large factory near the community. His writing samples were submitted to me immediately after finishing writing without any modification. Thus, the samples demonstrated his true level of English writing.

Appendix 2-2

Learner's Oral and Written Language Abilities

In this part, Xiaoming's oral and written language abilities will be evaluated from four aspects: phonology, semantics, grammar and pragmatics. The phonology analysis, which is based on the conversation between us, not only focuses on Xiaoming's pronunciation, but also pay attention to some suprasegmentals (Florez, 1998) like stress, intonation and prosody. The analysis of semantics is based on the depth and breadth of his language, the receptive and

expressive knowledge (González-Fernández & Schmitt, 2017), the usage of content or function words and the TTR of his oral and written samples. In the next section about grammar, I will analyze Xiaoming's abilities of morphology and syntax by using MLU and evaluating the word order and the usage of connectives. Also, I will make a global grammar assessment at the end of this section. In the last section, his pragmatic abilities will be evaluated according to Grice's Maxims in order to explore his competence of using English in real scenario.

Part III: Assessment of Learner's Stage of English Acquisition

According to the standard of the Language Acquisition Chart (Phillips Galloway, 2018), Xiaoming's overall English ability is between Level 3 and Level 4. In some areas, Xiaoming shows high intermediate fluency, while in other areas, Xiaoming only shows low intermediate fluency. Because of his learning process and the influence of social factors, Xiaoming shows high-level academic language ability. He has many opportunities to read and write in English from elementary school to university. Also, because he is preparing for the TOEFL test, he always focuses on the learning of academic articles and vocabulary. Based on the previous assessment, he told me that his vocabulary is around 8000, which is between the standard of Level 3 and Level 4. The research shows that in order to communicate orally in basic, everyday informal situations, it needs around 2000-3000 vocabulary to comprehend 95% of the content, while 6000-7000 vocabulary is needed to understand 98% of the content. The standard for writing is much higher (around 9000-ward families). Although it seems that Xiaoming's vocabulary totally meets the requirement of daily communication, he did not show high-level fluency during the interview. However, he demonstrated relatively high skills in academic writing. His writing samples show the skillful use of attributive clauses and sentence variety, which shows high complexity. Also, he seldom made grammatical mistakes, but in the transcripts of his oral English, I can find at least one grammatical mistake in each long sentence. Besides, in terms of his writing, Xiaoming is able to combine his argument with specific examples, which not only represents his ability of description, but also demonstrates his persuasive ability. Compared with his writing, however, sometimes his description of a particular scenario is unintelligible and ambiguous. For example, he did not know how to describe a woman's behavior in the task of narrative. He also asked me how to express a word or a phrase in English several times. Furthermore, although he could understand most of my questions, sometimes he asked me to repeat the questions again or explain it in Chinese because of the limitation of comprehension. Overall, he demonstrates the English ability between Level 3 and Level 4, which means that he is able to use the knowledge learned to skillfully read and write, especially in academic settings. He can also communicate with people in daily settings, but because of the lack of being exposing to real English environment, sometimes he could not fully understand my questions and make intelligible responses.

Based on the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM), Xiaoming gets 3 points in comprehension, which means that he can understand most of what is said at slower-than-normal speed with repetitions. During the interview, Xiaoming asked me to repeat the questions several times in order to help him understand the questions. In terms of fluency, he gets 4 points. His speech in everyday conversation and academic topics are generally fluent, but sometimes he needs more time to search for the correct manner of expression. In our conversation, Xiaoming sometimes did not know how to express a word or a phrase in English, so he had to ask me for help. Besides, because he had to answer my questions in a relatively

short time, compared to writing, he did not have enough time to think about the word choice. Also, because of the lack of deep understanding of some words, Xiaoming used inappropriate words occasionally. I notice that when we were talking about academic topics, Xiaoming performed better than in daily settings, which shows that he is more familiar with academic vocabulary. Thus, Xiaoming gets 4 points in vocabulary. In pronunciation section, he also gets 4 points, which means that his pronunciation is always intelligible. However, due to the similarities between Chinese and English pronunciation system, Xiaoming was influenced by the negative transfer of mother tongue. Despite of some minor errors, I could totally understand his expression most of the time. His grammar is between 3 points and 4 points. When it involved academic topics, he seldom made grammatical mistakes. However, when we talked about daily topics, especially the role play game in real scenario, he made more mistakes. Thus, I will give him 3.5 points in this section. Overall, he will get 4 points according to the standards of the SOLOM.

Appendix 2-3

Specific Instructional Plan

Phonology

Because of Xiaoming's well-developed suprasegmental awareness, he needs to maintain the strengths of intonation and prominence. I also suggest that he should pay more attention to the correct usage of stress for the reason that sometimes the misuse of stress will make the language unintelligible. Apart from prosody, he needs to focus on the similar vowels in Chinese and English. The transfer of mother tongue may both facilitate and hinder the development of learning the second language. It is important for Xiaoming to distinguish the similar vowels like /i/ and /I/. I suggest that he can use IPA to figure out the differences of the manner and the place of articulation between Chinese and English. When it involves the phonemes which are unique in English, he needs to spend huge amount of time on practicing these phonemes. Because Xiaoming is 21 years old, it is hard for him to change the habit of pronunciation. According to critical period hypothesis, age of acquisition is an important factor in setting limits on the development of native-like mastery of a second language (Patsy M. Lightbown & Nina Spada, 2017), especially on pronunciation. Compared to children, adults are more rigid and faced with more challenges in order to speak like native speakers, although they have more linguistic knowledge than children and have already developed metalinguistic awareness. Therefore, I believe it is necessary for Xiaoming to invest more time in practicing these vowels which are pronounced differently in Chinese. Finally, I also recommend him to find some audio books online, try to read them and tape his own speaking. Then he can compare his pronunciation with the standard pronunciation, find out his weaknesses and correct them.

Appendix 3

Macroanalysis

At the beginning of this class, I led all the students to read content and language objectives to help them have a general idea about what they would in the following class. Then in the warm-up activity, because they just finished their fall break and went back to school again, I encouraged them to share their travel experience with shoulder partners. During this process, I played the role of a facilitator to keep the conversation moving. After their discussion, I used my own experience of traveling to a park and climbing a mountain as a hook to introduce the new content. I mentioned that during my travel, I encountered the situation that there were two paths in front of me and I was not sure which one should I choose. This experience was connected with the main theme of the poem *The Road Not Taken*. In the next step, students watched an animated YouTube video related to this poem twice. For the first time, they only needed to watch the video, while in the second time, they were required to pay more attention to the poem itself and underline all the unfamiliar words. In this process, I walked around to collect students' unfamiliar words. After watching the video, I wrote all the new vocabulary on the whiteboard and explain the meanings to students in order to help them better understand the poem. According to their language proficiency and literacy ability, in the next part, I broke down the whole poem into small pieces and used an online tool named CommonLit to guide students to explore the main idea of each paragraph. Through this activity, students who kept silent started to actively engage in class and had high motivation to express their opinions. Meanwhile, their comprehension of each paragraph laid a foundation for understanding the whole poem. Therefore, in the next activity, they were required to work in small groups and think about the following question "what the road 'symbolize' in this poem" and provide strong evidence to support their ideas. In this next section, due to the time limit, instead of writing a short essay in class, students were asked to regard it as their homework. Finally, I led students to read the content and language objectives again and asked them to do self-reflection by using the checklist. They needed to submit the checklist to me as an exit ticket.

Appendix 4

Final Self-Reflection

SIOP feature 7 and 8 proposed the concepts explicitly linked to students' background experience and previous knowledge. Teachers are required to recognize students' diverse sociocultural backgrounds and give instructions according to their different situations. It is aligned with the Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) mentioned in my teaching philosophy, which stated that different from teacher-centered teaching method, CRP is a student-centered approach, which stresses that students' unique background should be identified and valued to promote their language and academic achievement (Richards, Brown, & Forde, 2007).

Therefore, in order to achieve this goal, each time when I developed the lesson plan, I would discuss with my mentor to find out whether the teaching materials and instructions match students' language proficiency and cognitive level. From my perspective, when considering students' background knowledge, teachers should not only focus on their English proficiency and previous knowledge but also pay attention to their cultural background and personal experience. In terms of the former one, I believe I kept taking efforts to build new knowledge based on the foundation of students' previous knowledge. For example, in the first lesson, my content objective was to teach them how to distinguish direct objects and subjects. Since students had already known the differences between action verbs and linking verbs, I encouraged them to explore the different functions of the component behind these two types of verbs. By scaffolding students in this way, they were able to figure out the grammatical rules on their own. In the second lesson, when introducing the new vocabulary to students, I also tried my best to use the words familiar to students to give them explanations. Indeed, students' facial expressions and their following performance in class proved that my scaffolding was effective. Most of the students were able to explore the grammatical rules by themselves and understand the meaning of new words after my explanation.

However, I found that my first lesson totally neglected integrating students' personal experience with teaching content. The video showed that although I tried to use group discussions to engage students in my class, some of them felt sleepy and did not concentrate on my class. Therefore, in the second class, I did some adjustments. The warm-up activity at the beginning of this class invited students to freely share their travel experience during the fall break. Unexpectedly, after one-minute silence, only four to five students were willing to share their travel experience in front of the whole class. After communicating with students, I surprisingly found out that some of them did not know the meaning of the word "travel". Apart from these students, those who knew the word "travel" did not travel to any place during the fall break maybe because of their socioeconomic status. Therefore, although before the class, my expectation was that students will be excited and actively share their personal experience with their classmates, the results demonstrated that this topic was not closely related to students' daily life. If I can teach them this lesson again, I will ask them to share their immigrant experience rather than the travel experience on vacation.

The first two lessons helped me to realize the important role of involving students' background knowledge related to their personal experience. Inspired by the activity in method class, I chose the theme "romantic partner and friend" as a hook for my third lesson.

Also, a romantic song called “Lost in Paradise” was used to teach them how to write a simile and a metaphor. Finally, students were required to use a simile or a metaphor to describe their ideal romantic partner or best friends after class. Surprisingly, I found that no student slept in class and all of them were highly engaged in every activity. I could see the light shining in their eyes during the whole process. At the end of this class, although I did not require them to complete the assignment in class, all the students were willing to stay in the classroom and finish writing a simile or a metaphor to describe their ideal romantic partners or best friends. When they were leaving the classroom, many of the students started to sing this song with their classmates. This successful experience showed the real power of linking teaching content with students’ background experience and pushed me to think about my future goal in this area.

Appendix 5

Microanalysis

Analysis of Moment-to-Moment Interactions

The transcript shows that at the beginning, I read the question and four options for students. As I mentioned in the macroanalysis, according to WIDA ACCESS, students' language proficiency ranges from 2.4 to 3.4. Compared to listening and speaking, their reading and writing proficiency is relatively lower. Therefore, I gave them auditory support to help them understand the meaning of this question. Also, realizing the fact that students may not understand the word "dilemma" in the question, I explain this word by using simple words like "dilemma means someone has difficulty to make a choice". After reading and hearing the question, some students directly shouted out the answer A or B without any explanation, which reflected the fact that at this time, they did not realize that the goal of this activity is to help them deepen their understanding of the poem by pushing them to provide evidence. Thus, I kept asking questions like "why" or "why you choose A" to push them to provide evidence. The transcript shows that student A told me "because he lost", and student B agreed with student A's answer by repeating the sentence "yes, he lost". These two students used a phrase from the option rather than sentences from the poem to answer my question. Although I encouraged them to explain their choice, they still did not understand at all. In order to give each student a chance to express their opinions, I turned to student C and encouraged her to answer my question. Since she only told me she would choose B, I also asked her "could you tell me why you choose B" to develop her higher order thinking. Compared to student A and B, she used a long sentence to provide evidence for her answer: "because after looking at the way, he doesn't know which way have to go." Although this sentence contained a grammatical mistake, I did not point it out by considering that this activity is more meaning-focused rather than form-focused. Instead of producing accurate words, phrases, or sentences, students were more expected to focus on the main idea of each paragraph and develop the ability of providing evidence. Obviously, after hearing student C's explanation, student B showed disagreement with her answer by repeating her previous sentence: "no, he gets lost in the forest." Maybe because of the limitation of academic language in English, they argued with each other in Spanish. This process showed students' awareness of peer support. To some degree, it met the language objective the students can use collaborative learning to communicate with each other in a group discussion. However, the simple phrases or sentences instead of strong evidence used by students made me realize that although students gradually understood the purpose of this activity and approached to the content and language objectives, I still needed to focus on developing their awareness of citing evidence in the following class. Since I could not speak Spanish, I could only guess the meaning of their speech according to their gestures or expressions. After a minute, the expression on their faces told me that they reached a consensus after argument and negotiation. Therefore, I asked them whether they want to change their answer. They answered me they will choose B instead of A. Before showing students the correct answer, to get the whole class engaged in this activity, I required students to raise their hands and vote for the correct answer. By doing so, all the students were super excited. After noticing that both A and B were not the correct answer, students split in half and began to discuss option C

and D spontaneously. In this process, I found that instead of using evidence from the poem or provide their own explanations, they argued with each other only by using sentences like “it’s not C, it’s D!”. This phenomenon represented that although I kept asking why to facilitate their higher order thinking, they still did not develop the awareness of cite evidence to support their ideas. At this time, I should had seized this opportunity to continue asking students why questions. However, maybe due to the time limit or nervousness, I skipped this step and directly jumped to the next question. Since the new words in the second question had been taught before, I did not provide extra explanations for students. This time there was no controversy among students, so I guided them to think about why they chose B. It seemed that students were still immersed in the excitement of getting the correct answer, student A told me “because I’m so smart!”. “Yes, all of you are so smart!”. I smiled at them and utilized this chance to ask them “since you are so smart, could you find some evidence in the second paragraph to support your answer?”. They started to point out the sentences in the text and discuss with their group members. During this discussion, I heard that they not only cited a sentence from the poem like “it was grassy and wanted wear” but also restated the sentence by using their own words, which demonstrated that they achieved the goal of understanding the meaning of new vocabulary. After the group discussion, I did not give them the standard explanation because my purpose was not to let them find out the “correct” answer but to strengthen their reading comprehension ability and higher order thinking through academic conversations. If the first two questions were designed for students to find evidence and restate it from the poem, the third one put forward a higher request. It asked students to explore the man’s internal world in the poem. By scaffolding students in this way, I expected them to deepen their understanding step by step. However, I did not realize that this question contains too many words unfamiliar to students. After reading and hearing my question, most of them were confused and asked me to explain the words to them. Therefore, I tried to come up with some comprehensible words used for explanations based on their prior knowledge. For instance, I said, “the word triumphant is like if you win a game, you will feel happy and get a sense of achievement”. Also, I tried to link the unfamiliar word “suspicious” with the word “doubt” that we learned in the first half of this lesson to help them review the new knowledge. However, some of them still could not understand these words and began to ask their group members. Compared to me, their group members may use gestures or simpler words to make the explanation more comprehensible, which perfectly demonstrated the benefits of peer scaffolding and achieved my second language objective. After understanding the meanings of four options, student A told me “he’s not happy at all. So the answer should not be C” spontaneously. Then I turned to student D and E, who always kept silent in the first half of this activity, and asked them “why you choose A”. Surprisingly, student D stated that “because at first, the man feels confused. And then he feels like it would be better is he chooses the second road. So he is not sure if he can come back to the first road again.” Instead of directly citing evidence from the poem, she revoiced the content in her own words, and then made a summary. Meanwhile, student E also combined her understanding with the content in the poem. I believe that from this moment, students gradually moved to the goal of understanding the main theme and metaphor of this poem. When it came to the last question, the transcript represented that student C also used a whole paragraph to explain her choice. She not only cited sentences from the poem but also revoiced it and add an explanation to

support her idea. Since then, I believed students had achieved the ability of citing evidence from the text, restating the evidence, and giving their own explanation. Besides, they almost reached the goal of understanding the main theme and metaphor of this poem, as well as understanding the meanings of new vocabulary and being able to communicate and negotiate with partners through collaborative learning.

Appendix 6

Lesson Plan 1

Introduction This lesson plan is based on the English Language Development (ELD) program in John Overton High School. There are 19 students in class, whose language proficiency is 2.4-3.4 according to WIDA standard. They have been in the U.S. from one year to five years. Their native languages are Spanish, Arabic, Nepali, and other African languages.		
Date: 09/23/2019		Grade/Class/Subject: ELD program
Unit/Theme: Simple Steps to Sentence Sense- Step four: direct object and subject complements		Standards: WIDA Students are able to use grammar rules to help them determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text.
Content Objective(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Know the definition of direct object and subject complements. ➤ Know how to distinguish and find the direct object or subject complement in a sentence. ➤ Know how to use both direct object and subject complements in writing. 		
Language Objective(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Students know how to describe a real scenario in daily life. ➤ Students can work in pairs or in small groups to discuss and negotiate questions together. ➤ Students can use their own language to write a short passage according to pictures. 		
Grammar <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Direct object ➤ Subject complements 		Supplementary Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PPT ➤ Handouts: one type of handouts include six pictures and six short sentences, which will be used at the beginning of this class; the other one is about SAM's toolbox so that students can use the toolbox to do independent learning and group discussion. (See appendix)
SIOP Features		
Lesson Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Adaptation of Content ✓ Links to Background ✓ Links to Past Learning ✓ Strategies incorporated 	Scaffolding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modeling ✓ Guided practice ✓ Independent practice ✓ Comprehensible input 	Grouping Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Whole class ✓ Small groups ✓ Partners ✓ Independent
Integration of Processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Reading ✓ Writing ✓ Speaking 	Application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hands-on ✓ Meaningful ✓ Linked to objectives 	Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Individual ✓ Group ✓ Written

✓ Listening	✓ Promotes engagement	✓ Oral
<p>Lesson Sequence</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Divide students into 5 small groups. At the beginning of this class, handouts will be given to each group. The contents on the handout will also be represented on the PowerPoint. 2. In the first activity, students need to fill out the blanks of each sentence together and speak out their answers (the word in each blank is a verb). Meanwhile, the teacher writes down the complete sentence on the whiteboard. This process will last for 5 minutes. These sentences are excerpted or rewritten according to the textbook to be consistent with students' language proficiency level. 3. The teacher will ask students to review the previous knowledge by using a small activity. Since the students have learned prepositional phrases, subject and verb in last two weeks, they are required to cross out the prepositional phrases (step 1), underline the verb twice (step 2), and underline the subject once (step 3). Then they will negotiate and determine their final answer through a two-minutes group discussion, and next, tell their answer to the whole class. (Think-Pair-Share) 4. In the next step, students still need to cooperate in their groups and try to classify all the verbs into two categories: linking verb and action verb. SAM's toolbox containing the examples of linking verbs will be given to them to help them classify these words. This process will last for 3-5 minutes. After the group discussion, each group will be invited to provide explanations for their answer (higher order thinking). 5. Let the students think about the functions of the words following linking verbs and action verbs. For example, in the sentence "Jack took a picture of the mountain", "took" is an action verb, and "picture" is an object following the action verb. In another sentence "The ice cream tastes cold and sweet", "taste" is a linking verb according to SAM's toolbox, and the function of "cold and sweet" is to describe the subject "ice cream". They are still allowed to discuss with their group members. After 3-5 minutes discussion, they need to provide strong explanations for their answer. 6. Next, teacher will summarize the results of group discussion and explain grammar rules about direct object and subject complements. (3 minutes) 7. Final activity: work in pairs. Step 1: one student describes the scenario according to the first picture. Step 2: the other student write down the sentences. Step 3: work together and circle out direct objects and subject complements. Step 4: students exchange their role and move to the second picture. Repeat the steps 1-3. (5-10 minutes) 8. Invite students to do a self-reflection: give each student a small ticket and ask them to write down their reflections. They will use this ticket as a permit to leave from classroom. (3 minutes) <p>Reflections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In this class, the teacher tries to scaffold students through using their background knowledge. During the process of using previous knowledge to learn new contents, independent, pair, and group work will be combined to facilitate their collaborative, negotiating, and deep-thinking ability. In this situation, learning language itself is not 		

the only target, the ultimate goal should be using language to communicate with others and complete tasks, which is aligned with the philosophy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Also, students are allowed to use their first language when they do not know the expressions in English.

- During the class, although there is no formal test, the teacher will keep using informal observation to assess students. Their performance will be evaluated based on WIDA, which is consistent with the school's assessment standard.

Lesson Plan 2

Teacher: Tianyi Chu	Date: 10/14/2019	Grade/Class/Subject: ELD class
Unit/Theme: Reading Comprehension (poem: <i>THE ROAD NOT TAKEN</i>)		Standards: WIDA
Content Objective(s): 1. Students can understand the main theme of this poem 2. Students can understand the metaphor in this poem 3. Students can connect their personal experience with this poem		Language Objective(s): 1. Students can understand the meanings of new vocabulary 2. Students can use collaborative learning to communicate and negotiate with each other 3. Students can write a short essay related to the poem and their personal experience
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: 1. YouTube Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iY9KZKms-j0 2. https://www.commonlit.org/en/texts/the-road-not-taken 3. Handout 4. Exit tickets		
SIOP FEATURES		
PREPARATION	SCAFFOLDING	GROUP OPTIONS
✓ Adaptation of content	✓ Modeling	✓ Whole class
✓ Links to background	✓ Guided practice	✓ Small groups
✓ Links to past learning	✓ Independent practice	✓ Partners
✓ Strategies incorporated	✓ Comprehensible input	✓ Independent
INTEGRATION OF PROCESSES	APPLICATION	ASSESSMENT
✓ Reading	Hands-on	✓ Individual
✓ Writing	✓ Meaningful	✓ Group
✓ Speaking	✓ Linked to objectives	✓ Written
✓ Listening	✓ Promotes engagement	✓ Oral
LESSON SEQUENCE: The whole structure of my lesson plan is based on IPA. It can be divided into three parts: interpreted, interpersonal, and presentational. 1. Since there are 19 students in class, they will be divided into 5 groups. The teacher will give each student a handout, including the poem called <i>The Road Not Taken</i> . 2. At the beginning of this class, the teacher will write the content and language objectives on the whiteboard. Then the teacher will lead students to read these objectives aloud. (1 minute)		

3. Warm-up activity: let the students think independently first and **share** their personal experience **with their shoulder partners** by asking the question: *do you experience the situation that you do not know how to make choices?* Give them an example of my own experience. (3 minutes)
4. Next Step, they will watch an animated YouTube video related to the poem. The teacher will play the video again. At the second time, they will be asked to listen to the video and mainly focus on underlining the unfamiliar words. **They don't need to discuss the content and the theme of the poem in this step.** (3 minutes)
5. After watching the video, I will explain the meanings of the key words to them in order to help them better understand the poem. (3 minutes)
6. Considering their English language proficiency, I will use <https://www.commonlit.org/en/texts/the-road-not-taken> to guide them analyze the meaning of each paragraph. The relevant questions are listed on the website. (5 minutes)
7. Let the students **work in small groups** and encourage them to figure out the main theme of this poem. They will be asked to think about following questions:
Using evidence from the text, explain what the "roads" symbolize in this poem.
After the group's discussion, each group will be invited to do a short presentation.
I will model an example for my students:
For example, the sentence "two road diverted in a yellow wood" reminds me of my life. Sometimes I encounter the situation that I can only choose one from two options...You can also choose a specific sentence to provide evidence to your idea.
Sample answer: *In the poem - 'The Road Not Taken', the road symbolizes our life. The poet says that the path that we don't choose in our life is 'the road not taken'. He describes his feelings about that choice that he had left in the past. The path which we have chosen, decides our future, our destination. The important message that the poet wants to give is that the choice that we make has an impact on our future and if we make a wrong choice, we regret it but cannot go back on it. So, we must be wise while making choices.*
(Discussion: 3 minutes; presentation: 3-5 minutes)
8. Finally, they will be asked to combine their personal experience with this poem. They need to write down a short paragraph.
I will share my own experience first: *Several years ago, I was admitted by Vanderbilt and New York University simultaneously. I had to make decisions... (3-5 minutes)*
9. The teacher will lead students to read the objectives again.
10. Self-reflection: the teacher will give each of student a ticket to let them reflect whether they meet the objectives or not. They will use this as exit ticket. (1 minutes)

REFLECTIONS:

1. In the warm-up activity, I try to combine students personal experience with the new learning content. I want to stimulate their interests by utilizing their background knowledge. Meanwhile, this part is closely related to the final part (writing a short paragraph).

2. In order to give students extra support, considering their English language level, I will explain the meanings of new vocabulary to them.
3. By using multimodal visual support, I will use animated YouTube video to give them a general understanding about this poem at the beginning of this class.
4. Since the students are not able to fully understand the whole poem, I will use guide questions to facilitate their learning and deepen their understanding.
5. When thinking about the main idea of this theme (what's the meaning of "roads"), they need to provide evidence to support their ideas, which will be beneficial for their higher order thinking development.
6. Finally, their writing skills will be practiced in the last part.
7. By writing the exit ticket, their metacognitive awareness will be developed.

Template adapted from Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2008), Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP® Model.

Appendix 7

Rationale

1. How does this lesson align with the CLT approach?

- CLT approach regards students as active learners rather than passive learners. It means that students will not only learn the language itself, they will also learn how to utilize language in both academic and daily settings. They will also achieve the ability of using to cooperate with each other and negotiate and solve real-life problems. Although the language objective in this class is to learn direct objects and subject complements, the students are also expected to be able to work in pairs or in small groups, think about specific questions, and figure out the answer together. In this process, their communicative and collaborative abilities will be developed. Also, the activity at the end of this class combines reading, writing, speaking, and listening together to facilitate students' communicative skills.

2. To what extent are the content and language objectives clear and productive in helping students learn? Which features of communicative competence can learners develop in this lesson?

- The language objectives clearly point out what students should learn in this class. This lesson is about direct object and subject complements so that students should first know the definition of these two grammatical components. Then they need to know how to distinguish and find out these two concepts in a sentence. Furthermore, they are expected to know how to use and find out the direct objects and subject complements in their own writing. Also, the content objectives clearly show the requirements besides learning grammar rules. Students need to learn communicative and writing skills as well.
- This class is also aligned with five communicative competences proposed by Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell (1995). In terms of discourse competence, during the pair work and group discussion, students need to know how to give each group members opportunities, facilitate conversations, change topics, express their opinions, cooperate, and finally, end the discussion. Meanwhile, during this process, students' actional (functional) competence will also be developed because students will not only learn the language, but also need to use language to address real-life tasks. In addition, in order to make their statement and explanation comprehensible as well as better understand others, they need to paraphrase or ask clarification questions during the discussion. Besides, because this class focuses on teaching students grammar, their linguistic competence will inevitably be regarded as an important part. The teacher will use inductive teaching method to stimulate students to explore grammar rules on their own. Their metacognitive awareness will also be strengthened. Considering students' different cultural and linguistic background, students will be allowed to use their native languages when they do not know the expressions in English when doing the group discussion, which is related to sociocultural competence.

3. How does the lesson plan set up environments, questions, and tasks that have

strong potential for engaging learners in meaningful, rigorous high order thinking?

- As mentioned before, instead of directly telling students grammar rules, I prefer to use inductive teaching method. It means that students will be encouraged to explore the rules on their own through working in small groups. They need to build new knowledge based on their previous grammar knowledge by negotiating and cooperating with each other. After sharing their answers, each group also need to provide strong evidence to support their idea. They will be engaged in meaningful and higher order thinking by playing the role of active participants rather than passive listeners. Their metacognitive will also be developed because they are pushed to think about reasons behind the grammar rules. For instance, students will be asked to provide explanations after classify linking verbs and action verbs. They also need to think about the functions of the words following linking verbs and action verbs. In a word, students will think on a level that is higher than memorizing facts or repeat the things told by others.

4. How does the lesson allow for opportunities for investing, activating, bridging, and building background knowledge?

- Firstly, at the beginning of this class, students will attend a small activity to fill in the blanks. The sentences designed according to the textbook are not complicated and easy to be understood. This is an opportunity for students to search for suitable words by using their vocabulary knowledge. Secondly, when they are circling the subject and verb in each sentence, they will utilize the knowledge learned in the last two weeks. Last two weeks, they have already learned the definition of verb and subject and how to find out these two components in a sentence. Thus, they will bring their previous grammar knowledge to class and using it to explore new rules. The final activity also provides chance for students to build a bridge between old and new knowledge. They are required to combine vocabulary and new grammar knowledge together to describe a real-life scenario.

5. How are activities in the lesson plan sequenced and designed to scaffold tasks that challenge students to develop new disciplinary and linguistic skills.

- Since the students have already known the definition and use of subject and verb, it is not hard for them to find out all the prepositional phrases, subjects, and verbs in sentences. However, according to the scaffolding theory, it is not enough if I only require them to use the previous knowledge. For the purpose of facilitating them to learn new knowledge, I designed a task to link their old knowledge to new one. For example, after circling all the subjects and verbs, they need to further explore different categories of these verbs: which one belongs to linking verb and which one is an action verb. Furthermore, in order to help them distinguish direct objects and subject complements, I plan to invite them to think about the functions of the words following each verb. In this way, I scaffold students and push them to explore the new knowledge step by step. Each time they only need to do a little bit deep thinking based on their background knowledge. However, at the end of these activities, they will find that they are able to deeply understand the differences between direct objects and subject complements. During this process, their communicative skills will

also be improved because they need to negotiate in their groups. They will also be able to describe a real-life scenario in oral and written language at the end of this class.

6. Which of WIDA's 10 principles are evident in the lesson plan? How?

- Principle 5: when selecting contents, students' cultural and linguistic background were taken into account first. According to their WIDA assessment reports, I selected comprehensible learning materials for the students.
- Principle 6: class activities intentionally integrate multiple modalities, including oral, written, visual modes. PowerPoint and handouts belong to visual support. The tasks designed for students help them develop reading, listening, speaking, and writing simultaneously.
- Principle 7&10: during the group discussion, students need to negotiate with group members. In this process, their skills of facilitating conversations, changing topics, expressing their opinions, cooperating, and ending the discussion will be developed. Then, they need to interpret and present different perspectives. Besides, some of the tasks are based on real-life scenario. Therefore, students will be able to use the language to address real-life problems.
- Principle 8: by using inductive teaching method, students will be encouraged to explore grammar rules spontaneously. They need to build new knowledge through using previous knowledge. Also, they are required to provide strong explanation to support their ideas. In this way, students' metacognitive and metalinguistic awareness will be developed.

Appendix 8

Oral Language Assessment

Participant's Level of English Language Proficiency (ELP)

Two students including my participant were invited to attend my oral assessment. The oral assessment was based on a real-life scenario (Appendix 1). Considering students' language proficiency, I provided visual aids to help them better understand the goal of this activity. Before starting the assessment, I spent 10 minutes to chat with the students in order to create a relaxing and welcoming environment. Since we had met several times and become familiar with each other, the two students were quite relaxed at the beginning of this activity. During this period, CC came and began to observe our assessment. Firstly, although I had learned a lot about their personal information and experience, they were required to introduce themselves again to CC. After their brief self-introduction, I asked them to choose an emoji to describe their feelings. My participant Andrew chose a smiling face, while the other girl named Cathy chose a cute face. Then, they were given a handout and asked to imagine that their friend Frank, a 17-year-old boy, plans to visit Nashville next weekend so that they need to help him develop a two-day travel plan based on their personal experience and the information provided below. I provided them with eight famous tourist attractions in Nashville with descriptions or pictures. After discussion and negotiation, they finally picked five places for Frank based on his interests and preference. During this process, they consistently provided reasons to support their choices. As a teacher, I played the role of a guide and facilitator. When they did not know how to make a decision, I would give them some suggestions or ask them some questions to keep the conversation moving. At the end of this activity, I asked them to use an emoji to describe their feelings again. My participant Andrew pointed a wink face to express a combination of nervous and happy, while the girl chose a nervous face because CC came to observe this assessment and kept taking notes during the whole process.

Since the school uses the WIDA standard to assess students' English proficiency, I decided to continue using WIDA to do this oral assessment. I combine WIDA's reading and listening rubric with speaking and writing rubric to form my own rubric. The rubric was still classified into three categories: linguistic complexity, language forms and conventions, and vocabulary usage. Students' level in linguistic complexity depends on if they can produce rich descriptive discourses with complex sentences and provide cohesive, organized, and related ideas across content area. In terms of sentence dimension, their ability will be evaluated according to their use of grammatical structures and sentence patterns. Students who reach level 5 need to be able to use a variety of complex sentence grammatical structures matched to the purpose and use a broad range of sentence patterns based on specific situations. Students' vocabulary ability will be assessed according to their use of content language and word choice. Those who are at level 5 can use technical and abstract content-area language and words or expressions conveying precise meanings. Students' overall oral language proficiency is the average of these three categories.

According to the rubric (Appendix 2), Andrew's oral English level is between level 3 (developing) and level 4 (expanding). In terms of linguistic complexity, he achieves level 4, which means that he is able to connect discourse with a variety of sentences. In addition, he

can provide expanded related ideas characteristic of particular content areas. When he was asked to explain which area he wants to improve, he answered “everything”. Then he provided abundant evidence to support his statement. He told me that “everyone says he is amazing and impressed due to his huge improvement in 8 months after coming to America, but he never wants to stop and give up”. He stated that although his listening and speaking are relatively good, his reading and writing still have a large space to be improved. Apart from learning English, he tried to learn Karen, a language spoken by a small group of people in Thailand. He comprehensively explained the differences between Karen and Korean and told us his motivation for learning this language. During the discussion about the travel plan, he combined evidence with his personal experience. For example, he said that he decides to choose the Radnor Lake State Park because he went there before and swam in the lake. It reminded him of his experience in childhood. When he was in his country, he lived close to a river and went swimming every day with his mom. In addition to the state park, he also suggested Frank visit Vanderbilt university. He held the view that as a high-school student, Frank might want to apply for a university after graduation. Through this trip, he could learn more about education in this university. Besides, due to Frank’s interests in art and history, he suggested Frank go to Tennessee State Museum as well because of paintings and other exhibitions there. Generally, according to his performance, although he did not match the requirement of level 5, which requires rich descriptive discourse with complex sentences and well-organized ideas across content area, he was able to use connectives like “because”, “although” and clauses to link short sentences together and make his speech logical and well-organized. His relatively rich descriptive language provided evidence to support and strengthen his opinions. Therefore, his oral language proficiency in linguistic complexity meets the criteria of level 4.

From the aspect of sentence dimension, he reaches level 3, which means that he is able to use simple and compound grammatical structures with occasional variation and sentence patterns across the content area. In the part of the self-introduction, the sentence variety and complexity are higher than the rest of his speech. He used long sentences linked by connectives like “and”, “but” or “because” and switched between different stances like “they say”, “I say”. Also, when he stated his personal experience of swimming in the lake and his country, he used narrative language to vividly describe how did he learn swimming. For example, he said “When I was in my country, I lived close to a river, and that’s why I learned when I was a little kid. I went to the lake every day and swim with my mom”. In these two parts, instead of repeating the same grammar structure, he reflected the ability of using simple and compound grammatical structures. However, when talking about the reasons why he chose a certain picture, he showed limited sentence structures and low grammar complexity. He repeated using “I take” and “He can learn more about” to begin sentences. Sometimes he just directly put some words together, which made his speech not that intelligible. Furthermore, although most of the time he could use the correct tenses like present tense and past time, there were still some small mistakes existing in his speech. Therefore, I will place his language forms and conventions at level 3.

His vocabulary usage also reaches level 3. As I mentioned before, when doing the self-introduction and talking about personal experiences, the vocabulary complexity was relatively high. However, when providing reasons to support his ideas, he demonstrated

limited vocabulary. For instance, he repeated using the word “take” to replace the words unfamiliar to him like “select” or “choose”. Sometimes his speech paused due to the lack of vocabulary. What impressed me was that he did not know the word “museum” and asked me how to read the word. He asked me “how to spell the word” instead of “how to pronounce the word”, which showed that he could not correctly distinguish the word “spell” and “pronounce”. Overall, when it came to the daily or academic topics that are familiar to him, he was able to use specific even some technical content-area language related to science or biology. However, his language ability was limited by vocabulary when we mentioned the topics he had never met before. This result shows that Andrew meets the criteria of level 3 and some requirements of level 4 but still cannot reach level 4. Therefore, his vocabulary usage is still at level 3.

WIDA Assessment

My participant Andrew took WIDA SCREENER on January 15th this year. He could not speak English when he arrived in Nashville. The assessment result showed that his overall score was 1.50. His speaking score was 2.00, while his listening, reading, writing were only 1.00. According to the WIDA rubric, he could only use single words to represent ideas. In terms of linguistic complexity, he could only use single words or chunks of language to represent his ideas. His formulaic and phrase-level grammatical structures might cause ambiguity and be unintelligible for listeners. Therefore, he was placed in a low-level English Language Development (ELD) program. After two months, he attended the WIDA ACCESS test. However, the report showed that his overall English proficiency reached 2.30, which was slightly higher than the Emerging level. Both his speaking and writing were up to 2.80 (approach Expanding level), while his listening was 2.50 (between Emerging and Developing stage) and reading was 1.80 (slightly lower than Emerging level). In a relatively short period, his overall English language proficiency was largely improved. After two months of learning, for his speaking and writing, he could use short even some expanded sentences with emerging complexity and express multiple related ideas across content areas considering his linguistic complexity. For language forms and conventions, he could use simple and compound grammatical structures with occasional variation and change sentence patterns across content areas. In terms of vocabulary usage, he was able to use different expressions in different content areas. For his listening and reading, he could understand short sentences and emerging expressions of ideas written by formulaic grammatical structures and general content words and expressions.

Comparison and Contrast

As I discussed before, the WIDA ACCESS repost showed that his overall English proficiency reached 2.30, which was slightly higher than the Emerging level. Both his speaking and writing were up to 2.80 (approach Expanding level), while his listening was 2.50 (between Emerging and Developing stage) and reading was 1.80 (slightly lower than Emerging level). Compared to the result of my oral assessment, his improvement is impressive. Now his oral language ability is between level 3 and level 4, which means that instead of only using simple and limited vocabulary and grammatical structures, he is able to use relatively complex structures and connective to organize his speech and express cohesive ideas. Meanwhile, he can use both simple and compound grammatical structures rather than formulaic structures. His sentence variety and word complexity have also been largely

improved. His teachers noticed this point and told him that now he only needs to attend a high-level ELP class. Now he is able to learn all the subjects with native students and achieves a relatively high GPA in class. The comparison and contrast between these two assessments show Andrew's obvious and amazing progress. This huge progress may be caused by several reasons. According to the previous interview, Andrew told me that he has strong motivation because he believes that education can change his life. He wants to enter a college or be a translator in the future. Rather than going back to his home country which is under a turbulent situation, he prefers to stay in Nashville. Both entering a college and being a translator require high English proficiency, which becomes the strongest motivation to push him for further study. Therefore, apart from completing all the homework and doing part-time work after school, he insists on reading books for two hours every day, which impresses me a lot. Besides, he mentioned that because no one speaks English at home, he seizes the opportunities of talking with teachers and classmates at school. Although most of the students in the English Language Development (ELD) class prefer to speak their native language rather than English, he still insists on talking with them in English, which causes his isolation from other students in class. After balancing the importance of improving English proficiency and building an interpersonal relationship, he still chooses the former one. Therefore, the first element is his strong motivation and hardworking. The second element causing the obvious difference is that compared to WIDA ASSESS, a formal test, the oral assessment is more relaxing and informal. Before the assessment, I had already built a close relationship with the two students, especially my participant Andrew. In addition, I created a comfortable and welcoming environment at the beginning of the assessment, which can be proved by students' choice of emojis. Both of them chose a cute and smile face. In this way, students' affective filter was relatively low, which improved their performance during this activity. Furthermore, compared to the WIDA ASSESS, I can directly get more information from students so that I will have a more comprehensive and deep understanding of my participants.

Appendix 9

Task Level	Understanding	Interpretation	Connections
Level 5	Exhibits a level of comprehension that extends beyond the literal, to the personal, critical and/or evaluative responses.	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the complexity of the text through detailed elaboration and extension of the text with sophisticated ideas, insights and reflections. There are no errors in text-based facts.	Cites strong evidence, makes a variety of strong connections to other experiences, texts, concepts, issues and/or cultural settings.
Level 4	Exhibits a level of comprehension that reflects extensions that are more literal or personal.	Demonstrates confident, coherent and adequate understanding and interpretation of the text through some elaboration and extension. There are no major errors in text-based facts.	Cites evidence, makes connections to personal experiences, other texts and/or background knowledge.
Level 3	Exhibits a level of comprehension that consists primarily of literal responses to the texts.	Demonstrates a limited understanding and/or interpretation of the text. There may be errors in text-based facts.	Cite a few evidence, makes connections between other experiences and texts that are disjointed, fragmented, limited and not integral to the text.
Level 2	Exhibits a level of comprehension that consists of disjointed, incomplete or irrelevant responses by using relevant copied text.	Demonstrates an attempt to respond with very limited evidence of understanding of the text. There may be errors in text-based facts.	Makes only distant connections to the text, using sketchy details.
Level 1	Exhibits no comprehension of the texts.	Demonstrates no attempt to respond to questions and uses no evidence to support opinions.	Shows no relationship to task and text. Papers are illegible or irrelevant copied text.

100 Cristofer
 this Star won't go out 1B

Esther Earl

Esther a very young girl is a normal girl how every body have a parent's She is a girl very nice, smart fun funny sweet is a normal girl but one day when she was twelve years old living in France. Esther started to feel herself bad and there she was diagnosed with metastatic papillary thyroid cancer P. 29-49

100 Cristofer
 this star won't go out 1B

Esther
 Wayne & Lovi Earl Parents.

Esther: is a young girl wonderful, happy, sweet & nice. is a normal girl she have a sickness forever but she feel normal girl.

Page #9-59

this Star won't go out Cristofer
 100 1B
 Esther Earl

ON page 47-51 in this star won't go out some important things happen she was so excited because her parent's have married 23 or 4 years together. although she is sick with cancer she is really happy for her parents. also she was celebrating the French Mom's Day is very happy and she loves her mom she think that is amazing

6-Trait Scoring Rubric	
<p>VOICE</p> <p>4 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>3 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>2 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>1 The writer seems indifferent, uninvolved, or alienated from the topic, audience or purpose. As a result, the paper reflects more than one of these problems:</p> <p>1. The writer does not address the audience or purpose.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use a direct, conversational style.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of sentence structures.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of punctuation.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of paragraph structures.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical devices.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical strategies.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical techniques.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical devices.</p>	<p>WORD CHOICE</p> <p>4 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>3 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>2 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>1 The writer uses a limited vocabulary, resulting in a flat or overused style. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>1. The writer uses a limited vocabulary.</p> <p>2. The writer uses a flat or overused style.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p>
<p>SENTENCE FLUENCY</p> <p>4 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>3 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>2 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>1 The writing is choppy and lacks rhythm and cadence. Sentences are poorly constructed and lack variety in structure.</p> <p>1. The writing is choppy and lacks rhythm and cadence.</p> <p>2. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>3. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>4. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>5. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>6. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>7. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>8. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>9. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>10. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p>	<p>ORGANIZATION</p> <p>4 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>3 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>2 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>1 The organization is unclear and lacks a clear focus. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>1. The organization is unclear and lacks a clear focus.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p>

6-Trait Scoring Rubric	
<p>IDEAS</p> <p>4 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>3 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>2 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>1 The paper is unclear and lacks a clear focus. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>1. The paper is unclear and lacks a clear focus.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p>	<p>CONVENTIONS</p> <p>4 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>3 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>2 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>1 The writer demonstrates a limited grasp of standard writing conventions. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>1. The writer demonstrates a limited grasp of standard writing conventions.</p> <p>2. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>3. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>4. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>5. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>6. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>7. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>8. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>9. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>10. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p>

6-Trait Scoring Rubric	
<p>VOICE</p> <p>4 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>3 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>2 The writer speaks directly to the reader in a way that is individual, compelling, and engaging. The writer "talks with critics," not to them and respects the audience and the purpose for writing.</p> <p>1 The writer seems indifferent, uninvolved, or alienated from the topic, audience or purpose. As a result, the paper reflects more than one of these problems:</p> <p>1. The writer does not address the audience or purpose.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use a direct, conversational style.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of sentence structures.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of punctuation.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of paragraph structures.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical devices.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical strategies.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical techniques.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of rhetorical devices.</p>	<p>WORD CHOICE</p> <p>4 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>3 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>2 Words convey the intended message to a precise, interesting, and natural way. The words are powerful, and engaging.</p> <p>1 The writer uses a limited vocabulary, resulting in a flat or overused style. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>1. The writer uses a limited vocabulary.</p> <p>2. The writer uses a flat or overused style.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of word choices.</p>
<p>SENTENCE FLUENCY</p> <p>4 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>3 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>2 The writing has an easy flow, rhythm and cadence. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive and creative thinking.</p> <p>1 The writing is choppy and lacks rhythm and cadence. Sentences are poorly constructed and lack variety in structure.</p> <p>1. The writing is choppy and lacks rhythm and cadence.</p> <p>2. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>3. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>4. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>5. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>6. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>7. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>8. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>9. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p> <p>10. The writing is poorly constructed and lacks variety in structure.</p>	<p>ORGANIZATION</p> <p>4 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>3 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>2 The organization is logical and clear. The writer uses a variety of organizational strategies to create a clear and compelling argument.</p> <p>1 The organization is unclear and lacks a clear focus. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>1. The organization is unclear and lacks a clear focus.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use a variety of organizational strategies.</p>

6-Trait Scoring Rubric	
<p>IDEAS</p> <p>4 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>3 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>2 The paper is extremely clear and focused. Relevant examples and details enrich the overall theme.</p> <p>1 The paper is unclear and lacks a clear focus. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>1. The paper is unclear and lacks a clear focus.</p> <p>2. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>3. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>4. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>5. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>6. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>7. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>8. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>9. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p> <p>10. The writer does not use relevant examples and details.</p>	<p>CONVENTIONS</p> <p>4 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>3 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>2 The writer demonstrates a great grasp of standard writing conventions (e.g., spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, usage, paragraphing) and uses conventions effectively to enhance readability. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>1 The writer demonstrates a limited grasp of standard writing conventions. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>1. The writer demonstrates a limited grasp of standard writing conventions.</p> <p>2. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>3. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>4. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>5. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>6. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>7. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>8. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>9. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p> <p>10. Errors tend to be so minor that they do not distract the reader from the content.</p>

Reading Response - Character Analysis

Name: Cristoforo Savoy
Book: 18

Write 2-3 sentences about a chosen character each day. Cite evidence using a quote and page number.

Day 1 - How does your character interact with people? How do others treat him/her? How do you know this?

Day 2 - How does your character treat others? How do you know this?

Day 3 - Make a connection: My character reminds me of... because...

Day 4 - Write an opinion about your book. Why do you like it or not like it? Use evidence to support your response.

Title of Book: This Star Won't Go Out Author: Esther Earl

Date	Character Analyzed	Daily Response
4/11/19 Page 55-62	Esther Earl	Esther Earl her life is going ok now and he is so happy however she know that have cancer and she talk with her parent that she feel like she is depressed, Evidence "I just want someone to ask how I really feel." she hurt inside no matter how happy I am when I talk to you I get so depressed
4/11/19 Page 68-85	Esther Earl	Esther Earl is very sincere I know this because she say "Hey, I don't want to grow up. It's so hard. This show that she say the true to other person about her feelings."

4/11/19 Page 55-62	Esther Earl	My character reminds me because she is really sincere like me and she like to talk with others people and she is really happy with her life however she have a disease she is happy with herself and I am happy how my life is
4/11/19 Page 68-85	Esther Earl	Esther Earl is very honest I know this because my character say "What are my difficulties? Hmm, first of all, and definitely most difficult I have cancer, and I'm sick, second, our money and income stuff is tight in a bomb, third it may not be, I never really hear about money stuff, this show that she is honest with the people and she is proud of herself."

Appendix 10

Instructional Recommendation

According to Andrew's oral, reading, and writing assessment, the results demonstrated a gap between his oral and written language. According to the WIDA rubric, he was placed between level 3 and level 4, which shows that although the word choice, grammatical mistakes, and sentence variety in his oral language still need to be paid attention to, he was able to use connectives to make his speech more cohesive, provide detailed information to support his ideas, use simple and compound grammatical structures with occasional variation and sentence patterns. However, in terms of his written language represented in the reading and writing assessment, I was surprised to find out that although he knew how to express his meaning in oral language, he had difficulty transferring the oral language to written language. This was represented in both his reading and writing assessment. This phenomenon is aligned with the result reflected from the acculturation assessment. From the sociocultural checklist (Collier, 2002), we can see he got 0 out of 6 in terms of his cognitive learning style, which shows that his language proficiency could not match the level of his cognitive awareness. Based on my observation, his performance in and after class fully showed his high motivation for study, active interaction with teachers, high perseverance in completing tasks and nearly no difficulty with understanding and applying cause and effect. Thus, instructions should be provided to give extra support for his written language and to facilitate the development of his oral and written language simultaneously.

From a micro perspective, I believe attention should be paid to teaching Andrew grammar and vocabulary. In terms of teaching grammar knowledge, two general approaches should be combined together. Although whether the deductive teaching or inductive teaching is more efficient remains a controversial topic, I will take away both of their benefits and apply them in my participants' learning process. The research showed that using an explicit-inductive approach to grammar instruction will improve students' linguistic accuracy of target form in an enjoyable and student-centered way (Dhiorbháin & Duibhir, 2017). Therefore, based on my assessment, since Andrew had difficulty using the correct form of the third person singular, I will give inductive instructions first to guide him summarize the grammatical rules independently. Before the class, I will collect all the sentences with this type of grammatical mistakes. In class, I will use a T-chart and write down these sentences like "She have a sickness", "She feel normal", and "Everybody have parents" on the left side, while on the right side, I will show him the correct form of these sentences such as "She has a sickness", "She feels normal", and "Everybody has parents". In this way, my participant will be invited to figure out the differences between these two columns. After he tells me his summary, I will then give him a more explicit and comprehensive explanation of this grammatical rule to deepen his understanding and strengthen his memory. By integrating inductive teaching with deductive teaching, Andrew will not only learn grammar rules in a more relaxing environment but also develop the metalinguistic awareness by exploring the rules on his own.

Besides, in order to strengthen his vocabulary knowledge, especially morphological changes and word choice, the first thing is to develop his metalinguistic awareness. Firstly, his writing demonstrated his lack of knowledge in distinguishing the different parts of speech

of the same word like “love” and “lover”. He wrote “lover” in the sentence “She lover her mom” instead of using the verb “love”. For teaching him morphological changes, I will first explain that words, like people, have families, often with related meanings (Goodwin, Lipsky, & Ahn, 2012). Then I will list several related words belonging to the same word family and let him circle out the based word. Finally, I will explain the differences between these similar words and stress the importance of using them appropriately. Before doing this, my participant may not have this awareness. However, by doing so, he will recognize that although these words look similar, it would cause ambiguity and unintelligibility sometimes if he misuses them. For teaching him word choice, considering that he kept using some words in both oral and written language such as “take”, I will provide him with a word list including similar words or phrases that can be replaced by each other. For example, the list will help him to understand that he can use “choose” or “select” rather than keeping using the same word “take” in different situations. However, before doing so, the first thing is still to raise his awareness of using various words in different conditions to make sentences more attracting and colorful. In this process, I still prefer to combine inductive teaching with deductive teaching to improve his ability of appropriately using vocabulary.

From a macro perspective, I will mainly focus on teaching Andrew the importance of using connectives to make articles more cohesive and how to cite evidence to support his main idea. For the purpose of teaching Andrew how to make his oral and writing language more cohesive, although Andrew had already demonstrated the awareness of using simple connectives, I still want to stress the importance of appropriately using connectives by giving him two writing samples. One is totally lack of connectives, while in the other sample, connectives are placed in the suitable areas to make the writing more logical and organized. In this way, I hope I can illustrate the importance role of using connectives to Andrew. In the second step, I will give him a word list including common and academic connectives and help him distinguish the different types of connectives used in different conditions. For example, the connectives such as “although”, “however” or “meantime” are usually used in oral language, while “albeit”, “despite”, “finally” are more likely to be used in academic writing (Crosson & Lesaux, 2013). Based on his assessments, I found that I need to pay more attention to improving his ability of using connectives related to academic settings. Thus, I will suggest him to use his own writing such as his daily logs to add connectives in suitable places. By doing so, he will not only deepen his understanding of using connectives in both speaking and writing but also learn how to use them appropriately.

In order to give him instruction in how to develop a clear main idea and cite evidence to support his opinion, I will use the models proposed by Zwiers & Crawford (2011). Although these models were designed for facilitate the development of students’ academic conversation, I believe it can also be applied to improve my participant’s academic writing. I will give him a form, which requires him to write down the main idea first, and then cite evidence not only from the text but also related to other texts, his personal experience, others’ life and the whole world (Appendix 13).

Assessment Plans for Future Classroom

My assessments for Andrew inspired me to develop assessments for my future classroom. My target students in the future will be high school students in a private international high school in Shanghai. Thus, the first step is to constantly seek ways to

deepen my understanding of my students. Gay (2010) held the view that culturally responsive caring is an essential part of the educational process. Teachers should care for students rather than care about students because the latter one only shows the concern of students' state of being, while caring for students is a combination of teachers' concern, compassion, commitment, responsibility, and action. To care for my students, formal and informal assessments will be used to investigate students' sociocultural background. On the one hand, Each student will be invited to finish a questionnaire and attend a one-on-one interview at the beginning of a new semester. I will not only pay attention to their academic performance, but also focus on their physical and mental health, family, and previous schooling experience. On the other hand, on the first day of school, students will be asked to bring an artifact to the class that conveys a story about themselves. The artifact can be a picture, object or map. Instead of directly telling others the story behind this artifact, this student can invite the teacher or classmates to guess the meaning of it first. Then this student will tell others his or her personal experience related to this artifact. This activity will increase the interaction between teacher and students, and thus, make the whole class more familiar with each other.

For daily and weekly assessments, I prefer to use formative assessment rather than summative assessment to evaluate students in the process of forming their competencies and skills with the goal of helping them to continue that growth process (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). In terms of the daily assessment, I will use a checklist to evaluate each student's in-class performance. For example, the evaluation form can be divided into several columns, including listening skills, note-taking skills, public-speaking skills, pronunciation skills and class participation. Students will be placed into different levels such as excellent progress, satisfactory improvement, needs progress, and unsatisfactory progress (Appendix 14). When students are doing the group discussion, I will walk around the classroom to see which level do they reach and put a check mark in each column. Thus, I will learn each students' learning progress in a more detailed and comprehensive way. Besides, everyday students will get a checklist to do self-evaluation as an exit ticket. They need to evaluate whether they have achieved the class objectives and where do they need to pay more attention to. By doing so, their metacognitive awareness will be developed.

When designing weekly assessments, I decide to collect students' portfolios, including their essays in draft and final form, reports and outlines for presentations, artwork or photos, daily logs, notes on lectures, and checklists including self- and peer assessments (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). In this process, students will recognize that each piece of work is of great importance so that they will develop intrinsic motivation, responsibility, and ownership. Meanwhile, I will get more opportunity to learn about my students' internal world rather than only focusing on their academic performance.

For the quarterly assessment, I prefer to use summative assessment to measure or summarize what a student has grasped and typically occurs at the end of a relatively long term. The final assessment is composed of four parts: reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and the WIDA rubric will be used to place students at different levels because nowadays, increasing number of international high schools in China has begun to use this global standard to keep consistent with other countries, especially the U.S. Considering my students' language proficiency is relatively high and they are preparing for studying abroad, the assessment materials for reading and writing will be derived from the SAT or other

authentic articles. When assessing their listening and speaking skills, I will continue using the oral assessment similar to the one mentioned in this paper to let students work in a small group and solve problems in a real-life scenario. In this way, I can not only evaluate their language proficiency from various perspectives like grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency but also understand their pragmatics ability such as how to start or stop a conversation, listen to others' opinions, and keep the conversation moving. The summative assessment can be regard as a milestone for their previous study and a mirror for their future study as well.