

Program Learning Outcome One (PLO 1)

Myriam Edith Barros

Westcliff University

CAP 670 Practicum

Professor Thomas Tischler

March 3, 2026

Program Learning Outcome One (PLO 1)

This paper addresses Program Learning Outcome One (PLO 1), which focuses on demonstrating principles of language pedagogy and current best practice for teaching English speakers of other languages and relating those principles to research on language acquisition and the teaching of language skills. The purpose of this paper is to explain how two artifacts provide evidence of my developing ability to connect second language acquisition theory, writing pedagogy, and instructional decision making for multilingual learners. Together, the artifacts show how research-based practices should be used to support language development in a public Montessori setting.

Artifacts

Comprehensive Learning Assessment One ([CLA 1](#)): A Multi-draft Writing Approach for Upper Elementary ESL Writers in a Montessori Classroom

Professional Assignment One ([PA 1](#)): Reflection on my Writing Instruction in an L1 Setting

Rationale

I selected these two artifacts because they provide complementary evidence that I can translate research-based language pedagogy into instruction and professional reasoning that supports English learners. In artifact one, I designed a multi draft writing lesson for upper elementary English as a Second Language (ESL) learners in a public Montessori context. The lesson sequence is pre-writing, drafting peer review, revising editing, and publishing. It also embeds scaffolds, such as graphic organizers, sentence starters, transitional language, supports, and structured partner work. These elements align with best practices and second language, writing instruction that emphasize explicit modeling, formative feedback and multiple

opportunities to develop fluency and accuracy across drafts (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014; Hyland, 2019). The lesson also reflects key ideas from second language acquisition research because students rehearse language orally, negotiate meaning with peers, and revise based on feedback. In this context, comprehensible input means students receive clear, supported language models they can understand; pushed output means they are expected to express ideas with increasing precision; and noticing means they become aware of gaps between their current language use and more accurate academic English (Long, 1996; Sway 1985).

Artifact two strengthens my PLO evidence by documenting my reflective, understanding of writing pedagogy. In Performance Assessment (PA) one , I analyze differences between traditional and process-orientated writing instruction and emphasize the importance of feedback and iterative development rather than single draft performance. This reflective stance supports effective Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) practice because teachers must continually evaluate instructional approaches through a research lens and adapt instruction to learners' needs (Brown & Lee, 2015). In practice, this means examining student drafts, conferencing notes, and participation patterns to determine which scaffolds are helping students generate ideas, organize writing, and revise with greater independence. Together, these artifacts demonstrate research-informed pedagogy and current best practices for multilingual learners in writing, integrating structured process, scaffolding interaction, and feedback.

Implication

These artifacts confirm that my strongest instructional leverage point in a Montessori public charter setting is intentional language planning. This matters because Montessori independence, while valuable, can unintentionally limit language support for English learners if students are expected to work independently without visible models, structured talk, or feedback.

The Montessori pedagogy emphasizes purposeful work, hands-on learning and the child's active construction of understanding (Montessori, 1967). In practice, this means I must design lessons where materials and student choice remain central while language supports are also visible and systematic. For example, a writing shelf may include labeled example, transition-word cards, sentence frames, and a peer-conference checklist so that students can access language support independently during the work cycle.

Artifact One reflects that commitment: I used a writing process approach to create repeated and supported opportunities for students to produce academic English, receive feedback and revise toward clarity. Moving forward, I will strengthen this work by consistently pairing Montessori literacy lessons with explicit language objectives. For example, students may use time-order transitions to write a clear sequence of events, and use rubrics or checklists to document growth across drafts. This approach aligns with a formative assessment stance in Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) by using evidence of student language to guide the next instructional step (Heritage, 2010).

In addition, I will design structured peer interaction more deliberately so that language is practiced before, during, and after an independent work cycle. More specifically, I plan to build in brief partner-talk routines at least twice during each writing cycle: once before drafting to rehearse ideas and vocabulary, and once during revision to support feedback and clarification. Sociocultural theory emphasizes that language develops through mediated interaction and scaffold participation in meaningful activity (Vygotsky, 1978). Consistent with this, I will continue to develop routines for oral rehearsal (partners talk, sentence frames, conferencing prompts) so students can "try out" language before committing it to writing, which supports both confidence and accuracy. I will also continue to ensure cultural and linguistic responsiveness by

validating students' home language resources, strategically (Garcia & Kleifgen), while maintaining clear expectations for English academic language production.

Ultimately, these PLO artifacts represent my ability to connect Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, and Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) best practices to concrete classroom design choices. This approach supports English learners' literacy growth within Montessori structures and public school accountability.

References

- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2018). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English learners* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom*. Corwin.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University 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)
- Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.