

Assignment:

Part C - Partnering Pedagogies Web-Enhanced Lesson – Assessment Measures Plan

Submitted by:

David E. Davis

December 4, 2016

Purdue University

Partnering with Web-based Tools for Learner Centered Environments

Fall-2016-EDCI- EDCI 56800-001

Dr. Jea H. Choi

Driving Question

Why do current language teaching methodologies de-emphasize the role of grammar and accuracy in language learning, and how can we design a teaching approach that appeals both to the individual and collective learning needs, goals, and experiences of our diverse body of ESL students?

Lesson Context and Learners

Global International Language School (GILS) teaches English as a second language (ESL). GILS intends to open in January 2017, so the owner and director of GILS, Dan Smith, has finalized the school's teaching staff.

 TEACHER A » B.A., M.A. » Teaching Experience: Public School, 3 years, Chemistry » 1 year teaching vocational English	 TEACHER B » B.A. Degree » TESOL Certificate (100 hours) » Teaching Experience: Taught English in Korea for one year	 TEACHER C » B.A. Degree » Teaching Experience: 6 years teaching ESL in local language schools	 TEACHER D » B.A., M.A./Ph.D. » Teaching Experience: Taught French language and literature for seven years in local community college	 TEACHER E » B.A. Degree » TESOL Certificate (50 hours) » Teaching Experience: Taught English in China for two years	 TEACHER F » B.A., M.A. » Teaching Experience: 4 years teaching ESL in local language schools
--	---	--	--	---	---

Teachers vary with respect to the formal ESL teacher training they have received, as well as their experience teaching nonnative speakers of English. For this reason, Dan wants to involve the teachers in the school planning process, particularly in the design and development of the ESL curriculum.

Because the teaching methodology will inform the structure of the classes, the selection of learning materials, the modes of assessment, and the curriculum outcomes, this lesson will focus on the design of a learner-centered teaching approach that will align with language learning needs of the school's target population. Having teachers work together to design the approach that will be used at all levels means they will not only learn about the main features of the different approaches used in language training but also be empowered to create the very approach that they will use to teach their students. This collaborative and creative process will generate more teacher buy-in to the program and solidify a pedagogical consistency by ensuring that all teachers are using the same approach in the classroom.

The lesson is scheduled to place on site at the school over a period of three weeks, from December 5 to December 23, 2016. Scheduling the lesson during this time will allow learners to complete it prior to the school's opening on January 4, 2017. Dan, who holds an MA in teaching English to speakers of other languages, will function as the primary facilitator of the training.

For this training lesson, the school will provide laptops to teachers, with Google Docs installed as the main work application that trainees can use to document individual work, complete different reflection activities, and use as a consolidation document for pair and group work. Laptops, which are connected to the internet, also come installed with a web whiteboard (www.awwapp.com) to make individual and team work more accessible and interactive. Other 2.0 technologies that will be available for trainees to present their work and which have been installed on the laptops are XMind, Powerpoint, Prezi and Slideshare; a YouTube channel is also available to upload videos.

Rationale for Lesson Activities and Technology Chosen

Because the primary partnering pedagogy informing this lesson is project-based learning, individual work, pair work, group work, and whole-class work activities have been designed to provide the following benefits both to learners as well as to GILS as an organization (Poell, Van der Krogt, & Warmerdam, 1998):

- connect formal and informal learning
- promote an exchange of ideas and experiences
- embed learning in the work context
- use individual learning to promote collective organizational improvement

Specifically, throughout the lesson learners are engaged in sustained inquiry activities that tie in with the overarching driving question of the training. To this end, learners are required to research, chart information, synthesize information, give presentations, discuss, build consensus, and reflect critically using shared Web 2.0 tools such as Google Docs, which allows the facilitator to monitor individual, pair, group, and whole-class work in real time. By using 21st century skills and Web 2.0 technologies in their own training, teachers will be more aware of useful classroom strategies and activities that will, in turn, help their students develop those same skills in the classroom to enhance their language learning.

Learning-Oriented Assessment

In designing assessment activities for the lesson, I followed the principles of what Carless (2007) refers to as learning-oriented assessment (LOA). LOA seeks to mitigate the irregular, nonholistic nature of formative and summative evaluation whereby producing a final metric of student achievement is the overall goal. LOA, then, makes learning the subject rather than the object of the assessment process. To this end, LOA activities are distributed throughout the lesson to avoid discrete displays of knowledge that are quickly forgotten once the lesson is over.

(Carless, 2007). For this reason, LOA activities are often aligned with authentic, real-world tasks. LOA also actively involves the learner in the assessment process, which promotes an awareness of defined standards and criteria, learning goals, and what constitutes “quality achievement” of those goals (Keppell & Carless, 2006, p. 182). Thus, LOA consists of activities that promote self-reflection and evaluation (Keppell & Carless, 2006).

Another guiding principle of LOA is that assessment should generate feedback, which can be both from the teacher and from peers, that the learner can then use to feed forward into future development. With this goal in mind, feedback must be timely and practical so learners have time to incorporate feedback into both current and future learning (Keppell & Carless, 2006). This idea of iterative feedback echoes Prensky’s (2010) complaint that in more achievement-focused assessment, feedback will often come late, at which point it becomes too detached from the learning process to be of use to the student.

Monitoring Learning

I have incorporated a variety of assessment activities throughout the lesson to monitor student learning. In this way, assessment becomes more formative and iterative, with learners more holistically engaging in the learning process throughout the lesson compared to simply focusing on what Macdonald refers to as a “big bang” assessment at the very end of the lesson (Macdonald, 2005, p. 87). Moreover, by spreading out assessment activities so they are ongoing and aligned with each learning objective, learners can apply many of the same 21st-century skills (i.e., creativity; adaptability; critical thinking; effective communication; collaboration; application of technology to acquire, organize, and present information; and reflection) on the assessment activities as they apply when working on other learning activities. In this way, all activities share a certain fidelity.

Specific formative assessment strategies that I have incorporated to monitor learning include the following:

- Self-assessment: For Prensky (2010), self-assessment is the most important type of assessment; however, it is also the most underused form of assessment. Without self-assessment, self-improvement becomes more challenging (Prensky, 2010). Forms of self-assessment that have been incorporated into the lesson include written reflections whereby learners self-check using a rubric. Reflection activities, however, are not open ended but rather incorporate prompts for the learner to avoid the issue that Macdonald (2005) references—learners tend to make judgments about what they meant to do rather than what they have actually achieved.
- Peer assessment: For Prensky (2010), the value of peer assessment is that it provides a kind of normative context in terms of both learners’ having a shared audience and

learners' being able to compare their performance with that of others in the same learning context. Formal peer assessment activities occur in the lesson in the form of evaluations of both individual and group presentations. Informal peer assessment occurs in the feedback produced during various discussions that occur throughout the lesson.

- Collaborative assessment: Collaborative assessment activities in the lesson generally follow the kind of tripartite assessment outlined by Macdonald (2005): 1) groups submit or present their work, 2) learners individually account for their contribution to the activity, and 3) individual learners write a reflection on the group process. This structure ensures that all learners in the group are held accountable for active participation in the activity.

In all assessment activities, the facilitator (who is also the school's director) plays an active role, providing both formal and informal feedback (or feed forward). Informal feedback can occur when students are working alone; in pairs; in groups; or during the discussions, where the learners, at varying points in the inquiry process, are required to share their findings with others. By monitoring and facilitating discussions, posing questions, and providing feedback, the facilitator can validate that learners are gaining a deep understanding of the subject matter.

The facilitator provides more-formal feedback in the form of comments in response to learners' written reflections. Because the reflections are maintained in the learners' Google Docs files, the facilitator can access these files online and provide timely feedback so learners can immediately use the feedback in the next stage of the lesson. Finally, the facilitator evaluates the learner in the final summative assessment, which is the live teaching session during which teachers employ the newly designed teaching approach to a classroom full of students who meet the school's target profile.

See Table 1 for specific assessment strategies aligned with learning objectives, activities, and scaffolding. Assessment strategies include when and how assessments will be carried out, as well as by whom they will be assessed.

Learning Artifacts

Because the learners for this lesson are teachers, this lesson is intended to be one of many professional development opportunities for the teachers at GILS; therefore, I have intended for the artifacts that are produced throughout the lesson to become part of a professional development portfolio (referred to as TIPS, or "Teachers in Practice") that teachers will begin during this lesson and continue to develop throughout their tenure at GILS (and hopefully beyond). To this end, learners will produce artifacts throughout the lesson as tangible products of the sustained inquiry process. These artifacts function as deliverables, both the process by

which the artifacts are created and the format in which the artifacts are delivered (i.e., using Web 2.0 tools), so the facilitator can monitor and evaluate their usefulness to ensure that learners are gaining a deep understanding of the subject matter.

Artifacts, which are produced both individually and collectively, include the following:

- **Reflections:** Learners write a reflection for each learning objective. Reflections consist of both responses to specific prompts relevant to the learning activities for that objective and aspects of activities supporting previous learning objectives. Reflections, which are maintained in the learner's Google Docs file, are self-evaluated by the learner, using a rubric, and reviewed by the instructor, who provides written feedback.
- **Lists:** Learners are required to create lists by synthesizing information, collaborating, and building consensus. The lists are used as a springboard to create other artifacts, such as checklists.
- **Checklists:** Several activities (e.g., supporting learning objective 4) support the creation of a checklist, which in turn is used to evaluate the final teaching approach design.
- **Charts:** For several activities (supporting learning objectives 1, 2, 3, and 5), learners are required to chart information based on research or discussion or both.
- **Presentations:** Learners are required to research and present information they have discovered (i.e., learning objectives 1 and 2) to other members in the lesson.
- **Video:** At the end of the lesson, learners are required to teach a live lesson while incorporating the principles of the newly designed teaching approach. The lesson will be video recorded and formally be evaluated by the facilitator.

See Table 1 for a rationale of specific artifacts and their alignment with learning objectives, activities, and scaffolding.

Assessment Instruments

I have designed the assessment to be holistic, focused on the development of 21st-century skills and knowledge; accordingly, I have used the following assessment instruments to assess learner development throughout the lesson:

- **Rubric:** Learners use a rubric (**Appendix A**) to self-evaluate their “Think-and-Ink” reflections created throughout the lesson.
- **Checklist:** Learners use checklists to self-assess both individual and group presentation work. The facilitator also uses a checklist to evaluate the learner's live teaching session at the end of the lesson. See **Appendix B** for an example of a checklist that learners use to assess their presentations.

- Feedback form: Learners use a feedback form to provide peer feedback on other learners' presentations. See **Appendix C** for an example of the form learners use to provide peer feedback.

Assessment Strategies Aligned With Objectives, Activities, and Scaffolds

The table below identifies learning objectives, skills, activities, scaffolds, and assessment strategies that support each learning objective. Activities and scaffolds for each learning objective are numbered to correspond to one another. For example, the activity “2” will align with the scaffold “2”.

Assessment strategies indicate when the assessment occurs and the type of assessment (i.e., formative or summative), how it is to be completed, by whom it is assessed, and the rationale supporting the assessment strategy.

Table 1		
<i>Assessment Strategies Aligned with Objectives, Activities, and Scaffolds</i>		
Learning Objective 1: Articulate the conditions and reasons that teacher-centered and accuracy-based language training has shifted to becoming learner-centered and fluency-based.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies
1. Activate learners for the training by showing a video clip of a teacher-centered language classroom. Have students vote (using Poll Everywhere) as to whether they felt the clip represented an effective lesson. 2. Learners reflect on their own (foreign) language learning experiences. 3. As a group, learners exchange key words, terms, and impressions from learner reflections and generate a master mind map.	Hard: 2. “Think and Ink” document. Although this activity is intended to be a free reflection to initiate the inquiry process, the document identifies the parameters of the topic, the tool to use to complete it, and restates the driving question so that learners can see how their response is relevant to the driving question. 4. “Dig Deeper” document. This document includes several guiding prompts for students to complete and provides resources for learners to use as a starting point to research the topic in activity #3.	Assessment type: Reflection (formative) When: Activity #2 How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-check using the Teacher in Practice rubric, which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator can also review learners' reflections and self-evaluations. Rationale: The initial Think and Ink reflection is intended to be open (e.g., no specific prompts). This will initiate the inquiry process by getting learners to reflect on prior language learning experiences, and it can be used as a base of comparison for the research activity learners will be undertaking in support of this activity.

4. Learners research current ESL trends and the move from a teacher-centered and accuracy-based to a learner-centered and fluency-based dynamic. 5. Learners collectively discuss and chart the conditions, reasons, and examples they found in their research in Activity 4.	Soft: 1. The video clip functions as a staging activity to activate learners for the lesson and to function as a non-example of what the final designed teaching approach should avoid promoting (Ertmer, 2006). 3. The school director leading the training will elicit and input the information learners have uncovered in their research into a mind map generated by XMind, which is projected onto a whiteboard. The director will also facilitate brainstorming to help learners connect their experiences from activity #1 to the driving questions. 5. The school director will elicit and input the conditions, reasons and examples learners share in the discussion into XMind, which is projected onto a whiteboard. The director will also facilitate the discussion to help learners connect their research findings to the driving question.	Once learners have completed their reflections, they will self-evaluate their responses using a rubric (Appendix A) that is designed both to provide descriptors of a reflective practitioner and compel learners accustomed to “engage more actively with criteria and standards” (Carless, 2007, p. 59). Learners will reference this initial reflection both when they complete the reflection for this learning objective and at their final, summative reflection at the end of the lesson on the process of designing a learner-centered teaching approach. The designated Google Docs file serves as the documentation of this assessment activity. Assessment type: Reflection (formative) When: After activity #5 How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-check using the Teacher in Practice rubric, which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator can also review learners’ reflections and self-evaluations. Rationale: This follow-up Think and Ink reflection is more structured than the previous open reflection task. This will compel learners to focus on issues specific to information they have uncovered in the research activity (#4) and discussed and charted in activity #5. In this reflection learners will articulate the reasons why teacher-centered and accuracy-based language training has shifted to becoming learner centered and fluency based. The learners will tie these conditions and reasons to their own language learning experiences as described in the first reflection assessment activity. The designated Google Docs file serves as the documentation of the assessment activity.
---	---	---

		As with the first self-reflection, after learners have completed their reflections, they will self-evaluate these reflection responses using a rubric (Appendix A) that is designed both to provide descriptors of a reflective practitioner and to help learners become accustomed to “engage more actively with criteria and standards” (Keppell, 2007, p. 59). The final artifact, which consists of both reflections, will become part of the learner’s TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio.
Investigations: What are the reasons, conditions, and ways that language instruction methodologies have moved away from a teacher-centered, accuracy-based focus to a learner-centered, fluency-based focus?		
Skills: reflecting, exploring, searching and finding, reading, watching and listening, collaborating, comparing, thinking critically		
Tools: 1) YouTube; Polleverywhere; 2) Google Docs; 3) Xmind; 4) Internet /search engines; 5) XMind		

Learning Objective 2: Synthesize the main features of the key teaching methodologies used in language training.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies
1. Assign one teaching methodology uncovered in the research for Activity 5 from the previous objective to each learner to research. 2. Learners will chart features and other relevant information about the teaching methodology they have researched. 3. Learners will present their teaching methodology to the	<i>Hard</i> 1. “Dig Deeper” document. This document provides several resources for learners to use as starting points in researching their assigned teaching methodologies. The document also provides several “how to research” tips. Learners are also encouraged to use any of the reference books that the director has set up in the GILS teacher library. 2. The same “Dig Deeper” document also contains a chart with headings that	Assessment type: Presentation (formative) When: Activity #3 How: Learners create a presentation using a Web 2.0 tool of their choice. Assessed by: 1) Learners self-evaluate using a checklist. 2) Learners provide peer feedback using a designated form found on Google Docs. Rationale: Allowing learners to give a presentation using a Web 2.0 tool will allow them to synthesize the main features of the teaching methodology they have researched. To ensure that their presentations specify the elements they need to account for in their

class using a Web 2.0 tool of their choice, should they not wish to use any of the applications that have been pre-installed on their laptops (A Web Whiteboard, PowerPoint, Prezi, and SlideShare).	functions as an advanced organizer to structure the elements that learners should be researching about each teaching methodology. 3. A presentation checklist specifies the elements that learners need to account for in their teaching methodology presentations. In addition to web tools suggested for use in creating the presentations, the checklist provides a link to a sample presentation on a methodology for learners to view as an explicit example. <i>Soft</i> 2. The director will monitor learners by reviewing their input in the “Dig Deeper” document either to reinforce what the learner has researched or, when necessary, to redirect the learner to dive deeper into the methodology to extract its main elements. 3. The director will pose questions to the class after each presentation to help learners connect the different methodologies back to the driving question. The director will also provide feedback to learners.	teaching methodology presentations, learners will assess their own presentations using a checklist (Appendix B). The facilitator can also use the checklist as well to structure feedback on the presentations. For each presentation given, learners will provide both indirect peer feedback during the discussion (scaffolding #3) and more direct feedback using a structured peer feedback form (Appendix C), which is saved in Google Docs. Assessment type: Reflection (formative) When: After activity #3 How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-check their reflections using the Teacher in Practice rubric (Appendix A), which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator can also review learners’ reflections and self-evaluations. Rationale: This assessment is more summative in nature, so this Think and Ink reflection provides structured prompts to compel learners to synthesize the features of various teaching methodologies presented compared with the information charted in the learners’ individual research activities (#2). Moreover, learners will tie these features to their own language-learning experiences as described in the first reflection assessment activity. This reflection will also prepare learners for the set of activities supporting learning objective #3. The designated Google Docs file serves as the documentation of the assessment activity. The final artifact will become part of the learner’s TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio.
---	--	--

Investigations: What are the historical moments, language foci, theories of language, theories of learning, roles of the teacher, and learning activity focus of the prominent language teaching methodologies?
Skills: Exploring, searching and finding, reading, watching and listening, thinking critically, thinking logically, synthesizing, briefing
Tools: 1. Internet, search engines; reference books, professional resources. 2. Google Docs 3. Presentation tools (PowerPoint, Visme, SlideShare, A Web Whiteboard)

Learning Objective 3: Compare and contrast the focal points of the key teaching methodologies used in language training.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies
1. As a class, collaborate to complete a matrix diagram of the primary features of each presented teaching methodology to identify both disparate and common elements. Information is charted with XMind and projected on the whiteboard. 2. Discuss specific features that make some methodologies more aligned with a teacher-centered and accuracy-based focus and others with a learner-centered and fluency-based focus. 3. As a class, vote (using the Poll Everywhere application) to determine which teaching methodology contains elements that are most amenable to language training today.	<i>Hard</i> 1. The chart from the “Dig Deeper” document for Activities 1 and 2 of the previous objective will be referenced to create the matrix diagram. <i>Soft</i> 1. Provide an example of a completed matrix diagram for learners to see how the information should be charted. 2. The director poses questions to the class as the features are being discussed to help learners connect these features back to the driving question. 4. The director writes key learner input on the whiteboard to facilitate further reflection and to connect learner choices to the driving question.	Assessment type: Reflection (formative) When: After activity #4 How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-check their reflections using the Teacher in Practice rubric (Appendix A), which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator will also review the final reflections and provide written feedback. Rationale: This Think and Ink reflection provides structured prompts to compel learners to compare and contrast the focal points of key teaching methodologies used in language training as discussed in activity #2 and to tie these features to their own language-learning experiences as described in the first reflection assessment activity. This reflection will also prepare learners for the set of activities supporting learning objective #4. Both the completed matrix diagram and designated Google Docs file serve as the documentation of the assessment activity. The final artifact will become part of the learner’s TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio.

4. Learners discuss and defend their choices.		
Investigations: What features of the prominent language teaching methodologies overlap? What features of prominent language teaching methodologies oppose each other?		
Skills: reflecting, comparing, contrasting, discussing, collaborating, negotiating, thinking critically, thinking logically		
Tools: 1. XMind (matrix diagram application); 3. Poll Everywhere (voting application)		

Learning Objective 4: Identify elements of an industry-based instructional standard that will inform the design of a coherent and pluralistic teaching approach.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies

1. As a class, read and review the ACCET accreditation standard for instruction. 2. In pairs, abstract a list of features from the ACCET standard that can be used to create a checklist of essential elements to help guide the final design of the school's teaching approach. 3. Each pair discusses its list and articulates the rationale for its choices. 4. As a class, finalize a checklist that can be used to verify that the final design of the school's teaching approach meets the ACCET standard.	<i>Hard</i> 1. Document with the complete ACCET accreditation standard for "instruction." <i>Soft</i> 2. Because this activity is intended to function as a "posthole" (Ertmer & Simons, 2006, p. 43) to get learners comfortable working in small groups, the director will monitor pairs without directly intervening. 3. When needed, the director will facilitate the discussion with questions designed to get pairs to clarify the rationales behind constructing their lists. 4. The director will facilitate consensus-building and get learners both to connect the standard back to the driving question and to lead into the next set of activities.	Assessment type: Pair collaboration (formative) When: Activity #2 How: Pairs complete their list of essential elements in a document in Google Docs shared on their laptops. Assessed by: The number of the pair's features that make it into the final checklist compiled by the class in activity #4 determines the effectiveness of the pair's list. Rationale: This assessment ensures that learners can compare the features of learner-centered teaching methodologies covered in the activities supporting learning objectives #2 and #3 and apply this knowledge to identify elements in the ACCET standard, which can be used to create a heuristic (checklist) that will inform the final design and evaluation of the teaching approach identified in the activities supporting learning objectives #5 and #6. Both the initial list created by the pairs and the final checklist (activity #4) will serve as documentation of the assessment activity.
Investigations: Is there an industry-based standard for language instruction? Why is it important to align language a school's teaching methodology with an instructional standard? Is there a single language teaching methodology that meets all of the elements of the ACCET instructional standard?		
Skills: reflecting, comparing, collaborating, cooperating, negotiating, thinking critically, thinking logically, debating, deciding, building consensus, evaluating		
Tools: 1. Google Docs; 4. XMind		

Learning Objective 5: Prioritize elements of key language training methodologies that can be incorporated into the design of a pluralistic teaching approach.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies

1. Using the matrix completed in Activity 1 supporting Learning Objective 3, in which learners chart the features of the different teaching methodologies, learners collaborate in groups of three to create a master list of features that will inform their eclectic teaching approach. 2. Groups present their lists, giving rationales for their choices. 3. Using a Venn diagram, learners collectively chart the features of both groups' lists to identify commonalities and differences. 4. Learners discuss the stated rationales and the similarities and differences between the two lists.	<i>Hard</i> 1. Final version of matrix from Activity 1, Learning Objective 3, and Google Doc with format for groups to use in creating their lists. The document features specific headers that groups use to classify the list features of their teaching approach. <i>Soft</i> 1. The director monitors groups by reviewing their lists as they are collaborating, providing feedback as needed. 2. The director poses questions to groups after each presentation to help learners connect different methodologies back to the driving question. The director also provides feedback to learners. 3. The director elicits features from each group's list and inputs them into XMind, which is projected onto a whiteboard. 4. The director writes key learner input on the whiteboard to facilitate further reflection and to connect groups' lists to the driving question, as well as to set up the next learning objective.	Assessment type: Group collaboration (formative) When: Activity #2 How: Groups create a presentation of their list of features using a Web 2.0 tool of their choice. Assessed by: 1) Groups self-evaluate using the same checklist that was used to evaluate the individual presentations in learning objective #2. 2) Learners also provide peer feedback to each group using a designated form (found in Google Docs). Rationale: Giving a group presentation using a Web 2.0 tool will allow group members to synthesize, build a consensus, and prioritize a list of features that will inform the lesson's goal of designing a learner-centered teaching approach. To ensure that their presentations specify the elements they need to account for in their teaching methodology presentations, learners will assess their own presentations using a checklist (Appendix B). Moreover, the other groups will provide peer feedback using a designated form. Assessment type: Reflection (formative) How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-check their reflections using the Teacher in Practice rubric (Appendix A), which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator will also review the reflections and provide feedback. Rationale: This assessment is based on group work, so the Think and Ink reflection provides structured prompts to compel learners to identify elements of working in a group dynamic to complete activity #1. This reflection will also prepare learners for the set of activities supporting learning objective #6.
--	---	---

		Both the completed master list and the designated Google Docs file serve as documentation of the assessment activity. The final artifact will become part of the learner's TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio.
Investigations: What features can be chosen from the main language teaching methodologies to create an eclectic teaching approach? What features are found in more current teaching methodologies as opposed to more classic methodologies? Is it more feasible to design an eclectic teaching approach, or is it more instructionally sound to use one specific teaching methodology?		
Skills: reflecting, comparing, collaborating, cooperating, negotiating, thinking critically, thinking logically, debating, deciding, consensus building, evaluation		
Tools: 1. Google Docs; 2. Presentation application (A Web Whiteboard, PowerPoint, Prezi, SlideShare); 3. XMind		

Learning Objective 6: Collaborate to finalize a coherent, pluralist teaching approach that will be used in the classroom to teach ESL to GILS's students.		
Activities	Scaffolds	Assessment Strategies
1. As a class, read and review the ESL student profiles. 2. As a whole-class group, learners will discuss, debate, and reach a consensus on a list of teaching approach features that will align with GILS's ESL student profile. 3. Learners will evaluate the finalized teaching approach to ensure that its features align with the ACCET standard for instruction.	<i>Hard</i> 1. Document with a description of the different profiles of students who will be taking ESL classes at GILS. 3. Checklist created by learners in Activity 4, supporting Learning Objective 4. <i>Soft</i> 2. When necessary, the director will pose questions to the class to facilitate the creation of the final list and input the final features of the teaching approach into XMind, which is projected onto a whiteboard. 3. The director will facilitate completion of the checklist, which has been rendered in	Assessment type: Reflection (summative) When: After activity #3 How: Learners complete the designated Think and Ink document located on their laptops in Google Docs. Assessed by: Learners self-evaluate their reflections using the Teacher in Practice rubric (Appendix A), which is provided in the Think and Ink document. The facilitator will also review the final reflections and provide written feedback, which will include directions for where learners can continue their professional development. Rationale: This Think and Ink assessment asks learners to reflect on the entire process of designing a teaching approach that can be used at GILS, so this reflection is more summative in nature. Learners are asked to respond to structured prompts to ensure that

	XMind and projected onto a whiteboard. aspects of the whole process (and project) are covered. The final reflection will be an artifact that is kept in the learner's TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio. Assessment type: Live teaching performance (summative) When: Post lesson How: Learners will teach a live lesson to a profile of the school's students employing the concepts and techniques of the newly designed teaching approach. Assessed by: The director (who is also the lesson facilitator) will evaluate the teacher, using a classroom observation form that aligns with the checklist of teaching approach features finalized in support of this learning objective and for the project. Rationale: Because the final deliverable of the lesson/project is a teaching approach that has been designed for use in GILS classrooms, the live teaching performance, which will be filmed for review, is the most effective means to assess the extent to which the learning approach will be successful. This assessment also represents a real-world application of the lesson topic, which for Carless (2007), can promote a more intense learning experience. The classroom observation will be included as an artifact in the learner's TIPS (teachers in practice) professional development portfolio.
Investigations: What features will the GILS teaching approach incorporate? Does the GILS teaching approach align with the ACCET instructional standard?	
Skills: analyzing, reflecting, comparing, collaborating, cooperating, negotiating, thinking critically, thinking logically, debating, deciding, consensus building, evaluation	
Tools: 1. Google Docs; 2. Presentation application (A Web Whiteboard, PowerPoint, Prezi, SlideShare); 3. XMind	

References

- Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: Conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(1), 57–66.
- Ertmer, P. A., & Simons, K. D. (2006). Jumping the PBL implementation hurdle: Supporting the efforts of K–12 teachers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, 1(1), 40–54.
- Keppell, M., & Carless, D. (2006). Learning-oriented assessment: A technology-based case study. *Assessment in Education*, 13(2), 179–191.
- Macdonald, R. (2005). Assessment strategies for enquiry and problem-based learning. In T. Barrett, I. Mac Labhrainn, & H. Fallon (Eds.), *Handbook of enquiry and problem-based learning* (pp. 85-93). Galway: CELT.
- Poell, R. F., Van der Krogt, F. J., & Warmerdam, J. H. M. (1998). Project-based learning in professional organizations. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 49(1), 28.
- Prensky, M. R. (2010). *Teaching digital natives: Partnering for real learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Appendix A

Self-Reflection Rubric

Driving Question: Why do current language teaching methodologies de-emphasize the role of grammar and accuracy in language learning and how can we design a teaching approach that appeals both to the individual and collective learning needs, goals, and experiences of our diverse body of ESL students?

Instructions: Use the rubric below as a framework to inform your self-reflection for given lesson activity. Once you've completed your self-reflection, self-assess your response by assigning yourself the appropriate number points for each of the criterion below based on the extent to which you feel your reflection aligns with the descriptors. Indicate the points you've awarded yourself for that criteria in the far right-hand column.

The lesson facilitator will review your self-evaluation and provide feedforward in the designated box.

Criteria	Highly Reflective Practitioner (5 pts)	Self-Aware Practitioner (3-4 pts)	Developing Practitioner (1-2 points)	Points awarded
Understanding	Clearly identifies and demonstrates a strong understanding of the main issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) covered.	Identifies and demonstrates a general understanding of many of the issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) covered.	Identifies some of the issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) covered, though may not clearly demonstrate an understanding of these issues	
Analyzing	Analysis of the issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) in relation to learner's own experiences is deep and detailed.	Analysis of the issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) in relation to learner's own experiences is somewhat deep and generally detailed.	Analysis of the issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) in relation to learner's own experiences lacks depth and/or detail.	
Synthesizing	Key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) and learner's own experiences are linked with sufficient details and examples that indicate several new directions for the learner to explore.	Key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) and learner's own experiences are linked with some details and examples that indicate some new directions for the learner to explore.	Key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) and learner's own experiences are not always linked with some details and examples and/or which fail to indicate new directions for the learner to explore.	
Applying	Clearly indicates with ample details	Indicates with sufficient details and	Indicates with some details and examples	

	and examples how key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) are relevant and can be applied to the learner's own experiences.	examples how key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) are relevant and can be applied to the learner's own experiences.	how key issues, concepts and elements associated with the learning topic(s) are relevant and can be applied to the learner's own experiences.	
Total →				
Facilitator's feedforward:				

Appendix B

Checklist of Essential Presentation Elements

Driving Question: Why do current language teaching methodologies de-emphasize the role of grammar and accuracy in language learning and how can we design a teaching approach that appeals both to the individual and collective learning needs, goals, and experiences of our diverse body of ESL students.

Title of Presentation: _____

Main Presentation Tool Used: _____

Instructions: Complete the checklist below answering the following questions and placing a checkmark in the appropriate box. For any boxes marked "somewhat" or "no", make sure you revise that element of your presentation. Doing so will ensure that your presentation is complete and will effectively communicate the information you are presenting to your audience, regardless of the web 2.0 technology you have chosen to deliver your presentation.			
Standard	Yes	Somewhat	No
1. Does the presentation include all of the required elements of the task?			
2. Does the presentation have an effective introduction that activates the audience?			
3. Does the presentation use facts and details to communicate main points.			
4. Does the presentation use concrete examples to illustrate information?			
5. Is the presentation well-paced?			
6. Are the selected media elements (video, audio, illustrations) relevant to the information being presented?			
7. Do the selected media elements (video, audio, illustrations) enhance important points being made in the presentation?			
8. Do the selected media elements (video, audio, illustrations) engage the audience?			
9. Is the tone and focus of the presentation relevant to the task and to the audience?			
10. Does the presentation pose questions or issues for other learners to consider in the discussion?			

Appendix C

Presentation Peer Feedback Form

Driving Question: Why do current language teaching methodologies de-emphasize the role of grammar and accuracy in language learning and how can we design a teaching approach that appeals both to the individual and collective learning needs, goals, and experiences of our diverse body of ESL students.

Title of Presentation: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Instructions: Peer feedback is very important, not only to provide your colleagues with your assessment of their work, but also for you as a teacher since you will need to have your students be able to provide feedback to their peers in the many communicative activities that you will plan for your lessons.

To guide your feedback to your peer(s), we have provided several prompts. Remember to be specific, constructive, thoughtful and, of course, professional in your remarks. Both your peers and the lesson facilitator will be able to read your feedback.

- 1) From this presentation, I liked...

- 2) From this presentation, the most important thing I learned was...

- 3) From this presentation, I feel I can use...

- 4) One thing that I feel I could use more information about is...

Additional comments?