

Program Learning Outcomes Three and Four (PLOs 3 and 4):

Myriam Edith Barros

Westcliff University

CAP 670 Practicum

Professor Thomas Tischler

March 19, 2025

Program Learning Outcomes Three and Four (PLOs 3 and 4):

Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3) focuses on applying Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) pedagogy to design learning experiences that support multilingual learners. Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4) focuses on understanding and applying second language acquisition theory, including cognitive, affective, social, and cultural factors that influence language learning. For PLO 3, I selected the artifact Virtual Lesson Sight Words English Presentation, We Can See It! This artifact is appropriate for PLO 3 because it demonstrates TESOL pedagogy through lesson design, modeling, repeated exposure, guided practice, and structured opportunities for student participation. For Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4), I selected Professional Assignment One (PA 1), Reading as a Basis for Vocabulary Growth in ESL / EFL Teaching. This artifact is appropriate for PLO 4 because it demonstrates my understanding of how second language acquisition theory informs vocabulary development, text selection, cognitive load, affective support, and learner access.

Artifacts

Artifact for Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3): Virtual Lesson Sight Words English Presentation, We Can See It!

Artifact for Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4): Professional Assignment One (PA 1): Reading as a Basis for Vocabulary Growth in ESL / EFL Teaching.

Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3) Rationale

I selected Virtual Lesson Sight Words English Presentation, We Can See It! as evidence for Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3) because it demonstrates my ability to apply Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) pedagogy in a concrete instructional design. PLO 3 requires more than describing teaching strategies; it requires showing how pedagogical decisions support multilingual learners' access, participation, and comprehension.

This artifact does that through a level-appropriate sight word lesson that uses explicit modeling, repeated exposure, choral response, guided practice, and gradual movement toward independent application.

The sight word lesson reflects purposeful pedagogy for young multilingual learners because it makes the language task visible and manageable. Students first encounter target sight words through a predictable whole-group routine, then practice recognition through repeated prompts, and finally apply the words in short phrases or sentences. This progression supports automaticity while also reducing the pressure that multilingual learners may feel when asked to speak or read in English. The lesson also aligns with a Montessori public charter context because it uses structure and repetition without removing student participation, movement, and independence. In this way, the artifact demonstrates that effective TESOL pedagogy depends on clear sequencing, developmentally appropriate scaffolding, and opportunities for meaningful student interaction (Gibbons, 2015; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

This artifact has the strongest evidence connected to instructional design, TESOL pedagogy, classroom routines, and the teacher's ability to plan accessible learning experiences for multilingual learners. It shows how I can translate pedagogical principles into a lesson that supports participation, builds confidence, and makes English language practice more intentional.

Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3) Narrative

The teaching implications of Program Learning Outcome Three (PLO 3) are directly connected to my work in a Montessori public charter context, where students are expected to develop independence while also needing explicit access to language. The sight word artifact strengthened my understanding that independence does not happen by chance for multilingual learners. It must be supported through predictable routines, clear teacher language, and structured opportunities to practice. In early elementary classrooms, students may appear disengaged or

hesitant not because they are unable to participate, but because the language demands of the task have not been made visible enough. This artifact helped me see that a strong TESOL lesson must intentionally move learners from teacher modeling, to guided rehearsal, to independent use.

In practice, this means that I should design lessons where students hear, see, say, and use target language multiple times before being expected to produce it independently. Beginning with low risk participation, such as choral response or echo reading, allows multilingual learners to practice English without feeling singled out. Partner rehearsal and short sentence frames can then help students move toward more independent communication. These routines support the social dimension of language learning because students use language through interaction rather than waiting silently for teacher validation (Vygotsky, 1978; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

This reflection also has implications for teacher coaching. When supporting teachers, I can help them identify the language demands of a lesson, write a clear language objective, and choose one participation routine that increases student talk. This approach respects Montessori independence while also ensuring that multilingual learners are not left to figure out academic language alone. PLO 3 therefore helped me understand that TESOL pedagogy is not an additional layer added to instruction; it is the intentional design of access, practice, and participation within the lesson itself.

Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4) Rationale

I selected Professional Assignment One (PA 1), Reading as a Basis for Vocabulary Growth in ESL / EFL Teaching, as evidence for Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4) because it demonstrates my ability to connect second language acquisition theory to instructional decision-making. PLO 4 requires attention to the cognitive, affective, social, and cultural factors that influence language learning.

This artifact addresses those factors by examining how reading supports vocabulary development and why teachers must carefully evaluate vocabulary load, text accessibility, learner background knowledge, and opportunities for repeated exposure. The reading and vocabulary artifact shows that vocabulary learning is not only a matter of memorizing word lists. It is shaped by how often learners encounter words, whether the text is comprehensible, and whether students have enough support to connect new vocabulary to meaning. When the vocabulary load is too high, comprehension can collapse and students may become discouraged. When the text is accessible and the target vocabulary is intentionally selected, reading becomes a source of language growth rather than frustration. This reflects second language acquisition theory because it connects input, interaction, comprehension, and repeated exposure to vocabulary development (Krashen, 1982; Long, 1996; Nation, 2001; Schmitt, 2000).

This artifact is used because of its strongest evidence, connected to theory-based analysis of how multilingual learners acquire vocabulary through reading. It demonstrates my understanding that language development is influenced by cognitive load, affective safety, social interaction, and culturally responsive text selection. For this reason, PA 1 provides clear evidence of my growth in using theory to guide instructional judgment.

Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4) Narrative

The teaching implications of Program Learning Outcome Four (PLO 4) are especially important for literacy instruction because teachers must make decisions that either open or limit access to meaning. The reading and vocabulary artifact helped me understand that text selection and vocabulary planning are equity decisions. If a text contains too many unfamiliar words, multilingual learners may spend so much effort decoding individual terms that they lose the meaning of the passage. In that situation, reading becomes a barrier rather than a pathway to

vocabulary growth. This reflection pushed me to think more carefully about how second language acquisition theory should guide everyday instructional choices.

In my practice, applying PLO 4 means selecting accessible texts, identifying a small number of essential words, and creating repeated opportunities for students to encounter and use those words in meaningful contexts. This may include previewing vocabulary, using visuals and gestures, rereading short passages, asking students to retell ideas with target words, and connecting new vocabulary to students' experiences. These choices respond to cognitive factors by managing language load, affective factors by reducing frustration, social factors by supporting interaction, and cultural factors by honoring the knowledge students bring to the classroom (Gibbons, 2015; Nation, 2001; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000).

This artifact also changed how I think about teacher preparation and coaching. Teachers need support not only in choosing texts, but also in predicting which words will block comprehension and which words are most useful for academic growth. They also need to understand that vocabulary support should not be isolated from reading, speaking, and writing. Instead, vocabulary should be revisited across several days through purposeful routines that help learners build meaning and confidence. PLO 4 therefore represents my growth in using theory as a practical tool for improving instruction. It reminds me that strong teaching for multilingual learners requires both knowledge of language development and careful attention to the conditions that allow students to take academic risks in English.

Taken together, these two separate artifacts demonstrate my growth in TESOL pedagogy and second language acquisition theory. The sight word lesson presentation provides evidence for PLO 3 because it shows my ability to design instruction that supports access, participation, and practice for multilingual learners. Professional Assignment One (PA 1) provides evidence for PLO 4 because it shows my ability to analyze language development through theory and apply that understanding to vocabulary growth, text selection, and learner support. Together, these outcomes show the type of TESOL educator I am becoming: one who values clear pedagogy, theory-informed decision-making, learner dignity, and equitable access to language learning.

References

- Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching English language learners in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Long, M. H. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. In W.C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.413-468). Academic Press.
- Montessori, M. (1967). *The absorbent mind* (C. A. Claremont, Trans.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston. (Original work published 1949)
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. E. (2000). What teachers need to know about language. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. (ED444379).