

Program Learning Outcome Two (PLO 2)

Myriam Edith Barros

Westcliff University

CAP 670 Practicum

Professor Thomas Tischler

March 11, 2025

Program Learning Outcome Two (PLO 2)

In this Program Learning Outcome Two (PLO 2), I demonstrate how my professional spoken and written English meets the level of proficiency expected of an educator who must function as a reliable language model in a primary and elementary teaching context. My practicum setting is in a public Montessori charter school serving multilingual learners from pre-kindergarten three through six grade, and where teacher language shapes both access and outcomes. In this environment, English is not only a medium for delivering content. It is also a daily model of academic vocabulary, sentence structure, and discourse patterns that students internalize as they learn to participate in discussion, explain thinking, and produce increasingly complex writing. For that reason, the focus of this Program Learning Outcome (PLO) is not simply correctness. It is intentional communication. This includes clarity of direction, precision of instructional prompts, consistency in terminology, and professional tone in written materials that guide teaching, feedback, and assessment.

This submission also reflects the dual responsibility of Montessori Republic education. Montessori pedagogy emphasizes independence, purposeful work, and sustained engagement. At the same time, public school expectations require that instruction and assessment be transparent, aligned and clearly communicated to multiple origins audiences. Within these realities, I approach language proficiency as an equity practice. I must be able to adjust teacher talk to development level, support emerging bilinguals without lowering rigor, and communicate evaluation criteria in a way that is comprehensible and fair. The artifacts in this submission therefore emphasize two themes: instructional language that models academic English during literacy learning and assessment language that makes expectations explicit through measurable, students-centered criteria.

Examples

- **Concurrency Learning Assessment (CLA) One:** [The Very Hungry Caterpillar Lesson Plan.](#)
- **Professional Assignment (PA) Two:** [Creation of an Analytic Break for Elementary English Language Art Assessment.](#)

Rationale

At Breakthrough Montessori Public Charter School, the grades I support include kindergarten, first grade, and second grade students in a multilingual public Montessori setting. In this context, my English must function as a stable language model. It must be clear, accurate, and consistent across instruction and assessment. Teacher language shapes how students learn academic vocabulary, sense patterns, and classroom discourse, especially for emerging bilinguals (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

In Example One, my lesson plan based on *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*, demonstrates my proficiency in professional written English for instruction. It includes measurable objectives and sequence procedures, and it also has planned teacher prompts that model spoken English. In a mixed-grade pull out group, I use predictable prompts such as “What happened first?”, “What happened next?”, and “What happened last?”. Then, students rehearse with sentence frames before independent work. This is scaffolding that supports comprehension increases or output (Gibbons, 2015). It also reflects Montessori emphasis on purposeful guidance within dependence space (Montessori, 1967).

In Example Two, my analytic English language arts rubric, demonstrates my proficiency in professional written English for assessment and feedback. The rubric uses measurable descriptors, and supports consistent feedback such as, “Add a transition word”, or “Add one

detail to strengthen elaboration”. This demonstrates achievement of PLO 2 because it shows I can write precise evaluative language and feedback statements that serve as a model of academic English for students and a transparent communication tool for educators and families. Clear rubrics make expectations visible and feedback actionable (Brookhart, 2018). Together, the lesson plan in the rubric shows an aligned cycle of language modeling, practice, assessment, and next steps across kindergarten through second grade.

Narrative

The teaching implications of PLO 2 are direct in my environment context. When I pull a small group, I sometimes combine students from kindergarten, first grade, and second grade who share similar English proficiency needs. My goal is to teach one shared language objective while adjusting the expected output. For example, the shared objective might be sequencing events using transition words. Before the lesson, I prepare visuals, vocabulary cards, and sentence frames at three levels. This planning protects Montessori independence because students can return to the work cycle with language tools instead of confusion (Montessori, 1967). During the lesson, I treat teacher talk as intentional modeling, not spontaneous explanation. I read aloud, I repeat phrases, and I model short retellings while pointing to visuals. Then, I move students into oral rehearsal. Kindergarten students use short frames, such as “First, the caterpillar ate ____”. First grade students add transitions, such as, “Next”, “After that”, and “Finally”. Second grade students produced complete sentences with detail, such as “First, the caterpillar ate one apple but he was still hungry”. Structured interaction like this increases meaningful output and supports language development for emerging bilinguals (Gibbons, 2015). It also reflects what teachers need to know about language when they serve language models (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

After the work cycle, the rubric becomes the bridge between instruction and improvement. I use one or two rubric criteria as student friendly goals, such as, “I use transitions”, and “I added details”. Then, I conference briefly using consistent feedback language such as, “your sequence is clear, now add one detail”, or “You used first and next, now add finally”. Clear rubric language strengthens formative assessment because it makes expectations measurable and feedback actionable (Brookhart, 2018). I use the same rubric results to regroup students for the next lesson, even if they are not in the same grade, because the language needs are the same. This creates an instructional loop that connects my language modeling to observable growth, which aligns with the reflection and follow-through emphasized in this week's teaching philosophy reading (Haave, 2014).

References

- Brookhart, S.M. (2018). *How to create and use rubrics for formative assessment and grading*. ASCD.
- Carle, E. (1969). *The Very Hungry Caterpillar*. World Publishing Company.
- Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.) Heinemann.
- Haave, N (2014, June 2). *Six questions that will bring your teaching philosophy into locus*. Faculty Focus.
- Montessori, M (1967). *The Absorbent Mind* (C.A. Claremont, Trans.) Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Original work published 1949).
- Wong Fillmore, L., & Snow, C.E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. (ED44379).