

Instructional Material Critique & Redesign with Infographic

Shu Jun Li

Graduate School of Education: Touro University

**EDPN: 673 Methods and Materials for Teaching English as a Second
Language**

Dr. Jasmin Cowin

April 26, 2026

Selecting and adapting instructional materials for multilingual learners requires more than alignment to academic standards. Effective instruction depends on teachers' ability to adjust approaches based on learner needs, instructional contexts, and discourse demands rather than applying methods rigidly (Celce-Murcia et al., 2014). Materials must also ensure equitable access to rigorous content through intentional language supports, cultural relevance, and meaningful engagement. The WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework (WIDA, 2020) emphasizes integrating language development with content learning through scaffolding, disciplinary language use, and multimodal supports that promote both comprehension and expression. When language development is embedded within content instruction, multilingual learners can simultaneously build knowledge and academic language.

This project critically analyzes two early literacy texts, *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* and *Frog and Toad Are Friends*, selected to represent different stages of literacy development and shifting linguistic and cognitive demands across grade levels. The PreK text emphasizes repetition, predictable structure, and visual scaffolds, while the Grade 2 text introduces more complex narrative structures, dialogue, and inferential reasoning about abstract concepts such as friendship. Both texts are evaluated using the New York State Next Generation Learning Standards and the WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework, focusing on linguistic demand, scaffolding, cultural accessibility, and academic language development.

The project also includes instructional redesign using Copilot as a co-creative tool to address gaps in language support and accessibility. Adaptations include clarified vocabulary, structured language production opportunities, and multimodal scaffolds, along with a student-centered infographic to support comprehension. Guided by a TESOL-informed perspective, this study argues that instructional materials must be

intentionally designed to support multilingual learners at all stages of development, ensuring that increasing academic demands do not exceed available language supports (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2017).

Step 1: Standards Alignment & Initial Analysis

Selecting instructional materials for multilingual learners requires more than alignment with academic standards; it requires attention to linguistic demand, discourse expectations, and scaffolding that ensures equitable access. Effective instruction depends on teachers adapting materials to learner needs and instructional contexts rather than applying texts rigidly (Celce-Murcia et al., 2014). The WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework emphasizes that language development is maximized when embedded within content learning through multimodal supports, scaffolded interaction, and explicit attention to disciplinary language (WIDA, 2020). In alignment with this perspective, my ESL philosophy positions multilingualism as an asset and emphasizes leveraging students' linguistic repertoires to support both language development and content mastery. This analysis evaluates *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* and *Frog and Toad Are Friends* using the New York State Next Generation English Language Arts Standards and WIDA framework to examine their support for academic language development and literacy access.

The Very Hungry Caterpillar supports emergent multilingual learners through predictable sequencing, repetitive syntactic structures, and strong visual scaffolding. These features reduce linguistic complexity while preserving conceptual clarity, aligning with WIDA expectations for Entering–Emerging learners (Levels 1–2). The text aligns with NYS Next Generation ELA Standards RL.PK–2.1, RL.PK–2.3, and RL.PK–2.4, which emphasize sequencing, recall, and basic descriptive language. The repetitive structure (“On Monday he ate...”) supports temporal sequencing through

consistent linguistic patterns, reducing cognitive load and strengthening early narrative comprehension.

From a multilingual learner perspective, this predictability supports meaning-making by allowing students to focus on narrative structure rather than syntactic decoding. However, while the text effectively supports foundational literacy development, it primarily develops receptive language rather than academic language production. Students can retell and sequence events but are not consistently required to engage in explanation, justification, or inference. This limitation aligns with NYSED's Building the Bridge framework (2014), which emphasizes extending ESL instruction beyond comprehension into structured opportunities for language production across modalities.

From a TESOL perspective, the text provides strong comprehensible input but limited structured output. Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2017) emphasize the importance of explicit language objectives and structured interaction when engaging learners with cognitively demanding content. Instructional supports such as sentence frames (e.g., "The caterpillar became ___ because..."), guided oral rehearsal, and modeled responses are therefore essential to extend learning toward academic language use. Culturally, the text is broadly accessible due to its universal theme of transformation but does not explicitly engage students' linguistic or cultural identities. From a translanguaging perspective (García & Wei, 2014), this limits opportunities for students to draw on their full linguistic repertoires during meaning-making. Overall, the text is effective for early comprehension but requires intentional scaffolding to support academic language development.

Frog and Toad Are Friends represents a more linguistically and cognitively complex text requiring inferential reasoning, narrative interpretation, and emotional

analysis. It includes dialogue-driven structure, implicit meaning, and abstract concepts such as friendship and problem-solving. The text aligns with NYS Next Generation ELA Standards RL.2.1, RL.2.3, and RL.2.6, which require students to ask and answer questions about texts, describe character responses, and analyze differing perspectives. These standards reflect a shift from literal comprehension toward interpretive and analytical discourse.

Linguistically, students must interpret implied meaning, evaluate character emotions, and construct evidence-based explanations. From a WIDA (2020) perspective, the text aligns with Levels 2–3 (Emerging–Developing), as learners are expected to produce connected discourse and interpret meaning beyond explicitly stated information. Unlike heavily scaffolded texts, meaning is embedded in dialogue and narrative tone, increasing linguistic and cognitive demand. The Building the Bridge framework (NYSED, 2014) underscores the need to connect ESL instruction with content learning and native language resources to support comprehension of complex texts. Without structured scaffolding, multilingual learners may access surface-level meaning but struggle with inference and emotional nuance. TESOL research (Echevarría et al., 2017) further emphasizes that explicit language objectives, modeling, and structured interaction are essential for cognitively demanding texts. Instructional supports such as sentence frames (e.g., “I think Frog felt ____ because...”), guided discussion, and structured peer interaction are therefore necessary for academic language development. Without these supports, learners risk remaining at partial comprehension without access to interpretive discourse. Culturally, while themes of friendship are broadly relatable, interpretations of emotional expression may vary across cultural contexts. Translanguaging practices (García & Wei, 2014) can support deeper comprehension by allowing students to

process complex ideas in their home language before expressing them in English.

Overall, the text offers strong potential for academic language development but is highly dependent on intentional instructional scaffolding.

Across both texts, there is a clear progression in linguistic and cognitive demand aligned with the NYS Next Generation ELA Standards and WIDA framework. The *Very Hungry Caterpillar* supports foundational literacy skills such as sequencing and recall, while *Frog and Toad Are Friends* requires inferential reasoning and interpretive discourse. However, in both cases, access to academic language is not inherent in the text but constructed through instructional design. Consistent with Celce-Murcia et al. (2014), Echevarría et al. (2017), WIDA (2020), and NYSED (2014), this analysis reinforces that multilingual learners require both access and challenge. Instruction must reduce linguistic barriers while maintaining cognitive rigor through scaffolding, structured interaction, and language-focused instruction. Without this balance, learners risk either limited comprehension or limited academic language development.

Step 2: Non-Negotiable ELL Criteria Assessment

This evaluation is grounded in the Non-Negotiable ELL Criteria and Miekley's ESL Textbook Evaluation Checklist (Miekley, 2005), with findings synthesized in Checklist Charts 1–2. These charts provide structured evidence across content, vocabulary and grammar, exercises and activities, visual design, and contextual appropriateness, enabling a systematic comparison of how each text facilitates multilingual learners' access to grade-level content and academic language development. Both texts maintain academic rigor appropriate to developmental level, meeting the criterion of preserving grade-level expectations without compromising content integrity. The *Very Hungry Caterpillar* preserves conceptual sequencing and narrative structure while reducing linguistic complexity, allowing emergent learners

to access core ideas without dilution. In contrast, *Frog and Toad Are Friends* maintains full narrative complexity, including implicit meaning and character motivation, ensuring that cognitive demand remains consistent with grade-level expectations. In relation to knowledge-building and language development, the texts serve distinct instructional functions. The first develops foundational conceptual knowledge such as sequencing, time, and cause-and-effect relationships, whereas the second develops interpretive and analytical understanding related to character behavior, emotion, and perspective-taking. However, more advanced academic language development is evident in the second text due to its sustained requirement for inference, explanation, and extended discourse.

Both texts demonstrate limited cultural representation, partially meeting the cultural relevance criterion. Although themes such as transformation and friendship are broadly accessible, neither text explicitly reflects diverse cultural identities or multilingual experiences. Consequently, cultural meaning must be constructed through instruction rather than embedded within the texts, limiting their capacity to function as identity-affirming resources without teacher mediation. With respect to language development, a clear distinction is evident. *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* primarily facilitates receptive language skills such as labeling, sequencing, and retelling, whereas *Frog and Toad Are Friends* requires productive academic language, including explanation, justification, and inference. This indicates that only the second text substantially supports rigorous disciplinary language development aligned with upper WIDA expectations. Neither text independently provides full equitable access to grade-level content for multilingual learners. The first prioritizes accessibility but limits cognitive depth, while the second introduces cognitive rigor alongside

increased linguistic demand. As a result, equitable access across both texts is contingent upon instructional scaffolding rather than inherent text design.

Scaffolding demands are significant for both materials, particularly in relation to discourse, vocabulary, and structured interaction. As supported by Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2017), effective instruction requires sentence frames, modeled responses, guided discussion, structured interaction, and explicit vocabulary instruction. These supports are especially critical in *Frog and Toad Are Friends*, where inferential language demands are substantially higher.

Across proficiency development, the texts demonstrate a clear continuum aligned with WIDA Levels 1–3. *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* supports Entering–Emerging learners through repetition, visual support, and predictable structure, while *Frog and Toad Are Friends* supports Emerging–Developing learners through increased syntactic complexity and interpretive demands. This progression reflects a gradual increase in cognitive and linguistic challenge aligned with grade-level expectations. Both texts can function as integrated ESL–ELA instructional resources when implemented through intentional pedagogical design. Alignment with the NYS Next Generation ELA Standards and WIDA (2020) framework reinforces that language development and content learning are interdependent; however, this integration is not embedded within the texts themselves and must be constructed through instruction. Overall, analysis across all eight Non-Negotiable ELL Criteria indicates that neither text independently satisfies all requirements. *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* excels in accessibility, sequencing, and foundational comprehension but lacks depth in academic language development and cultural representation. *Frog and Toad Are Friends* demonstrates stronger alignment with inferential thinking, discourse development, and analytical reasoning but requires substantial scaffolding to ensure

equitable access for multilingual learners. Consistent with TESOL research (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2017), Celce-Murcia et al. (2014), WIDA (2020), and NYSED's Building the Bridge framework (2014), these findings underscore that equitable instruction is not determined by text selection alone but by instructional design. Effective implementation requires intentional scaffolding, culturally responsive pedagogy, and integrated ESL–ELA instruction to ensure that multilingual learners can simultaneously access grade-level content and develop academic language proficiency.

Checklist Charts 1:

Textbook Evaluation Checklist The very hungry caterpillar		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Totally Lacking	Mandatory	Optional	Not Applicable
I. Textbook									
A. Content									
i.	Is the subject matter presented either topically or functionally in a logical, organized manner? (1,2,3) ^a	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Does the content serve as a window into learning about the target language culture (American, British, ect.)? (2,18)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the reading selections authentic pieces of language? (5, 10)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Compared to texts for native speakers, does the content contain real-life issues that challenge the reader to think critically about his/her worldview? (1,2,3,7,21)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Are the text selections representative of the variety of literary genres, and do they contain multiple sentence structures? (1, 13)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
B. Vocabulary and Grammar									
i.	Are the grammar rules presented in a logical manner and in increasing order of difficulty? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Are the new vocabulary words presented in a variety of ways (e.g. glosses, multi-glosses, appositives)? (2,3,12)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the new vocabulary words presented at an appropriate rate so that the text is understandable and so that students are able to retain new vocabulary? (1,2,3,5)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Are the new vocabulary words repeated in subsequent lessons to reinforce their meaning and use? (1,2,3,)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Are students taught top-down techniques for learning new vocabulary words? (7,8,9,11)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
C. Exercises and Activities									
i.	Are there interactive and task-based activities that require students to use new vocabulary to communicate? (1,2,3,5)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Do instructions in the textbook tell students to read for comprehension? (6)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are top-down and bottom-up reading strategies used? (17)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Are students given sufficient examples to learn top-down techniques for reading comprehension? (7,8,9,10)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Do the activities facilitate students' use of grammar rules by creating situations in which these rules are needed? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
vi.	Does the text make comprehension easier by addressing one new concept at a time instead of multiple new concepts? (2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
vii.	Do the exercises promote critical thinking of the text? (2)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
D. Attractiveness of the Text and Physical Make-up									
i.	Is the cover of the book appealing? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Is the visual imagery of high aesthetic quality? (1,2,3,14)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the illustrations simple enough and close enough to the text that they add to its meaning rather than detracting from it? (1)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Is the text interesting enough that students will enjoy reading it? (15)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N

II Teacher's Manual									
A. General Features									
i. Does the manual help teachers understand the objectives and methodology of the text? (1,2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii. Are correct or suggested answers given for the exercises in the textbook? (1,2,3,4)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
B. Background Information									
i. Are teachers shown how to teach students to use cues from morphology, cognates, rhetorical relationships, and context to assist them in lexical inferencing? (7)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii. Is there a list of true and false cognates for vocabulary words? (1,2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
C. Methodological Guidance									
i. Are teachers given techniques for activating students' background knowledge before reading the text? (8,9,22)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii. Are teachers given adequate examples for teaching students to preview, skim, scan, summarize, and to find the main idea? (8,11,6)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii. Does the manual suggest a clear, concise method for teaching each lesson? (1,2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
D. Supplementary Exercises and Materials									
i. Does the manual give instructions on how to incorporate audio-visual material produced for the textbook? (2)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii. Does the manual provide teachers with exercises to practice, test, and review vocabulary words? (1,2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii. Does the manual provide additional exercises for reinforcing grammar points in the text? (1,2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
III. Context									
A. Is the textbook appropriate for the curriculum? (1,2,19,20)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
i. Does the text coincide with the course goals? (1,2,3,19,20)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
B. Is the textbook appropriate for the students who will be using it? (1,2)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
i. Is the text free of material that might be offensive? (1,6,16)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii. Are the examples and explanations understandable? (1)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii. Will students enjoy reading the text selections? (1,2,3,15)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv. Will the content meet students' felt needs for learning English or can it be adapted for this purpose? (2,3)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
C. Are the textbook and teacher's manual appropriate for the teacher who will be teaching from them? (1,2,4)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
i. Is the teacher proficient enough in English to use the teacher's manual? (1)		4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N

Checklist Charts 2:

Textbook Evaluation Checklist Frog and Toad Are Friends		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Totally Lacking	Mandatory	Optional	Not Applicable
I. Textbook									
A. Content									
i.	Is the subject matter presented either topically or functionally in a logical, organized manner? (1,2,3) ⁱ	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Does the content serve as a window into learning about the target language culture (American, British, ect.)? (2,18)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the reading selections authentic pieces of language? (5,10)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Compared to texts for native speakers, does the content contain real-life issues that challenge the reader to think critically about his/her worldview? (1,2,3,7,21)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Are the text selections representative of the variety of literary genres, and do they contain multiple sentence structures? (1,13)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
B. Vocabulary and Grammar									
i.	Are the grammar rules presented in a logical manner and in increasing order of difficulty? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Are the new vocabulary words presented in a variety of ways (e.g. glosses, multi-glosses, appositives)? (2,3,12)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the new vocabulary words presented at an appropriate rate so that the text is understandable and so that students are able to retain new vocabulary? (1, 2,3,5)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Are the new vocabulary words repeated in subsequent lessons to reinforce their meaning and use? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Are students taught top-down techniques for learning new vocabulary words? (7,8,9,11)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
C. Exercises and Activities									
i.	Are there interactive and task-based activities that require students to use new vocabulary to communicate? (1,2,3,5)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Do instructions in the textbook tell students to read for comprehension? (6)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are top-down and bottom-up reading strategies used? (17)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Are students given sufficient examples to learn top-down techniques for reading comprehension? (7,8,9,10)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
v.	Do the activities facilitate students' use of grammar rules by creating situations in which these rules are needed? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
vi.	Does the text make comprehension easier by addressing one new concept at a time instead of multiple new concepts? (2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
vii.	Do the exercises promote critical thinking of the text? (2)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
D. Attractiveness of the Text and Physical Make-up									
i.	Is the cover of the book appealing? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
ii.	Is the visual imagery of high aesthetic quality? (1,2,3,14)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iii.	Are the illustrations simple enough and close enough to the text that they add to its meaning rather than detracting from it? (1)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N
iv.	Is the text interesting enough that students will enjoy reading it? (15)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N

II Teacher's Manual									
A. General Features									
i. Does the manual help teachers understand the objectives and methodology of the text? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
ii. Are correct or suggested answers given for the exercises in the textbook? (1,2,3,4)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
B. Background Information									
i. Are teachers shown how to teach students to use cues from morphology, cognates, rhetorical relationships, and context to assist them in lexical inferencing? (7)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
ii. Is there a list of true and false cognates for vocabulary words? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
C. Methodological Guidance									
i. Are teachers given techniques for activating students' background knowledge before reading the text? (8,9,22)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
ii. Are teachers given adequate examples for teaching students to preview, skim, scan, summarize, and to find the main idea? (8,11,6)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
iii. Does the manual suggest a clear, concise method for teaching each lesson? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
D. Supplementary Exercises and Materials									
i. Does the manual give instructions on how to incorporate audio-visual material produced for the textbook? (2)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
ii. Does the manual provide teachers with exercises to practice, test, and review vocabulary words? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
iii. Does the manual provide additional exercises for reinforcing grammar points in the text? (1,2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
III. Context									
A. Is the textbook appropriate for the curriculum? (1,2,19,20)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
i. Does the text coincide with the course goals? (1,2,3,19,20)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
B. Is the textbook appropriate for the students who will be using it? (1,2)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
i. Is the text free of material that might be offensive? (1,6,16)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
ii. Are the examples and explanations understandable? (1)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
iii. Will students enjoy reading the text selections? (1,2,3,15)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
iv. Will the content meet students' felt needs for learning English or can it be adapted for this purpose? (2,3)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
C. Are the textbook and teacher's manual appropriate for the teacher who will be teaching from them? (1,2,4)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	
i. Is the teacher proficient enough in English to use the teacher's manual? (1)	4	3	2	1	0	M	O	N	

Step 3: Selection Rationale

The selection of *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* and *Frog and Toad Are Friends* was intentional and grounded in their ability to represent a developmental continuum of literacy and language demands for multilingual learners. Together, these texts provide a purposeful contrast between emergent and developing stages of early literacy, allowing for analysis of how linguistic complexity, cognitive expectations, and academic language opportunities shift across grade levels. This aligns with Hadaway and Young (2010), who emphasize the importance of selecting texts that reflect learners' developmental and linguistic trajectories to ensure appropriate access to literacy instruction.

The Very Hungry Caterpillar was selected because it exemplifies a highly scaffolded early literacy text characterized by predictable sequencing, repetitive syntax, and strong visual support. These features make it appropriate for emergent multilingual learners who require substantial linguistic scaffolding to access meaning. In accordance with WIDA (2020) and Celce-Murcia et al. (2014), such texts provide essential comprehensible input that supports early language development while reducing unnecessary linguistic barriers. Its structure enables learners to engage with foundational literacy concepts such as sequencing, repetition, and basic narrative comprehension, making it an effective entry point for students at the beginning stages of English development. In contrast, *Frog and Toad Are Friends* was selected for its increased linguistic and cognitive demand, particularly its use of dialogue, implied meaning, and character-driven narrative. These features require learners to move beyond literal comprehension toward inference, interpretation, and explanation, which are essential components of academic language development in upper elementary instruction (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2017). This text aligns with expectations that

multilingual learners should engage with grade-level content that promotes higher-order thinking, provided appropriate scaffolding is in place (NYSED, 2024).

Together, these texts were chosen not only for their individual instructional value but also for their combined ability to illustrate progression in language proficiency and academic demand. This pairing enables a structured examination of how access to content shifts from heavily scaffolded comprehension to more interpretive and discourse-driven engagement. This selection reflects my TESOL-informed teaching philosophy, which positions multilingual learners as capable of engaging with rigorous content across proficiency levels when supported through intentional scaffolding and integrated language and content instruction (García & Wei, 2014; WIDA, 2020).

Step 4: WIDA PRIME Analysis

The WIDA Protocol for Review of Instructional Materials for English Learners (PRIME) evaluates instructional materials based on their alignment with the WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework, with particular attention to language functions, discourse demands, modalities, scaffolding, and proficiency-level appropriateness (WIDA, n.d.). Applying this framework to *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* and *Frog and Toad Are Friends* allows for an analysis of how each text supports or limits multilingual learners' access to academic language and grade-level content.

The Very Hungry Caterpillar aligns strongly with WIDA PRIME expectations for Entering–Emerging learners (Levels 1–2) due to its predictable structure, repetitive language patterns, and heavy reliance on visual scaffolding. The text supports foundational language functions such as recounting and sequencing through repeated sentence structures (e.g., “On Monday he ate...”), which reduce cognitive

and linguistic load and allow learners to construct meaning through pattern recognition. This supports early comprehension but does not extend into higher-order language functions such as explaining, justifying, or analyzing relationships. Vocabulary is concrete, high-frequency, and context-embedded, which supports initial acquisition but offers limited opportunities for academic vocabulary expansion or multiple meaningful uses across contexts. In terms of modalities, the text primarily supports reading and listening, while speaking and writing require substantial teacher scaffolding to move beyond one-word responses or simple retells. As a result, the text provides strong comprehensible input but limited opportunities for discourse-level language development without instructional mediation.

Frog and Toad Are Friends aligns more closely with WIDA PRIME expectations for Levels 2–3 (Emerging–Developing) because it introduces increased linguistic complexity and richer discourse demands. The text requires learners to interpret dialogue, infer meaning, and analyze character emotions and motivations, supporting language functions such as describing, explaining, and interpreting. Unlike the PreK text, meaning is less visually supported and more dependent on linguistic cues, requiring greater proficiency and inferential thinking. Vocabulary is more abstract (e.g., friendship, worry, problem-solving), which increases conceptual demand and requires contextualization and repeated exposure for full acquisition. This creates stronger opportunities for academic language development, particularly in oral discussion and interpretive writing tasks, but also increases the need for intentional scaffolding such as sentence frames, guided questioning, and structured peer interaction. Without these supports, learners may access surface meaning but struggle with deeper interpretation.

Across both texts, a clear developmental progression is evident. *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* supports foundational comprehension through repetition, predictable structure, and visual support, while *Frog and Toad Are Friends* promotes inferential thinking, interpretive discourse, and early analytical reasoning. However, neither text fully satisfies WIDA PRIME expectations independently. The first lacks opportunities for extended discourse and academic language production, while the second requires substantial scaffolding to ensure equitable access across modalities and proficiency levels. Overall, this analysis reinforces that alignment with the WIDA Standards Framework is not inherent in instructional texts but is achieved through instructional design. Consistent with WIDA (n.d., 2020), Celce-Murcia et al. (2014), and Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2017), effective implementation depends on intentional scaffolding, explicit language objectives, and structured interaction to ensure that multilingual learners can simultaneously access content and develop academic language proficiency.

Step 5: Redesign & Visual Support Creation

To address the linguistic and cognitive barriers identified in Step 2 and Step 4, instructional materials were redesigned using Copilot as a co-creative tool to enhance accessibility, scaffolding, and engagement for multilingual learners. The redesign focused on making academic language more comprehensible while maintaining grade-level conceptual rigor, consistent with WIDA (2020) expectations for integrating language development with content learning through multimodal and scaffolded supports.

A key instructional challenge identified in *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* was the limited opportunity for academic language production beyond sequencing and recall. To address this, a bilingual English–Chinese infographic was created to support

comprehension and bridge home language knowledge with English development. Because the majority of students in the classroom come from Chinese-speaking families, the redesign intentionally incorporates translanguaging practices (García & Wei, 2014), allowing students to access meaning through both languages. The infographic includes key vocabulary (e.g., “caterpillar,” “hungry,” “ate,” “became a butterfly”) presented side-by-side in English and Chinese, along with visual representations of the life cycle to reinforce sequencing and conceptual understanding. Sentence frames were also added to support productive language use (e.g., “The caterpillar ate ___ and became .” / “毛毛虫吃了，变成了___。”).

For Frog and Toad Are Friends, the instructional redesign focused on increasing accessibility to inferential meaning and emotional language. Copilot was used to generate a bilingual comic-strip format that breaks the narrative into simplified panels. Each panel includes short dialogue, visual cues, and parallel English–Chinese text to support comprehension of abstract concepts such as friendship, worry, and problem-solving. The redesign reduces linguistic density while preserving key academic language functions such as explaining and interpreting character actions. For example, prompts such as “I think Frog felt ___ because .” are paired with Chinese support (“我认为青蛙感到___因为”) to scaffold explanation and justification.

The Copilot-generated outputs were critically evaluated and revised to ensure alignment with TESOL principles, the New York State Next Generation ELA Standards, and the WIDA English Language Development Standards Framework. While Copilot provided initial structural ideas for bilingual supports and visual organization, modifications were made to simplify language, ensure cultural responsiveness, and strengthen opportunities for student interaction. Additional teacher-created scaffolds, such as guided discussion questions and vocabulary

previews, were integrated to extend learning beyond passive comprehension toward academic language production.

Overall, the redesigned materials support multilingual learners by reducing unnecessary linguistic barriers while maintaining cognitive demand. The integration of bilingual (English–Chinese) supports validates students’ home languages as assets in learning, while visual scaffolds and sentence frames promote gradual movement toward independent academic language use. Consistent with WIDA (2020), Echevarría, Vogt, and Short (2017), and García and Wei (2014), this redesign demonstrates that equitable access is achieved through intentional instructional design that leverages multimodal supports, structured interaction, and translanguaging practices rather than simplified content alone.

Create a bilingual infographic for multilingual learners in PreK aligned with WIDA Levels 1-2 (Entering–Emerging).

The infographic should be based on The Very Hungry Caterpillar and focus on sequencing and life cycle development.

Requirements:

- Show 4–5 clear stages of the caterpillar’s life (e.g., egg hungry caterpillar, eating, growing, cocoon, butterfly)
- Use simple, repetitive sentences appropriate for early English learners
- Include visual descriptions for each stage
- Provide key vocabulary with English–Chinese support (not full translation of all text)
- Include sentence frames to support basic language production (e.g., sequencing, cause-effect)
- Add 2–3 simple discussion questions in both English and Chinese
- Use clear, culturally inclusive, and age-appropriate language

Here is a **clean, classroom-ready bilingual (English–Simplified Chinese)** infographic script you can paste directly into Canva, PowerPoint, or a poster layout. It is aligned with **WIDA Levels 1–2**, uses **simple, repetitive language**, and supports **sequencing + life-cycle development** for PreK multilingual learners.

The Very Hungry Caterpillar — Life Cycle Infographic

好饿的毛毛虫：生命循环图

Stage 1 — Egg

蛋

Sentence (WIDA 1–2):

- The egg is small.*
蛋很小。

Visual description:
A tiny white/yellow egg on a leaf.
一片叶子上的小小的蛋。

Stage 2 — Hungry Caterpillar

饿的毛毛虫

Sentence:

- The caterpillar is hungry.*
毛毛虫很饿。

Visual description:
A small green caterpillar waking up.
一只刚醒来的绿色小毛毛虫。

Stage 3 — Eating

吃东西

Sentence:

- It eats food. 它吃东西。

Visual description:
The caterpillar eating fruit or leaves.
毛毛虫在吃水果或叶子。

Stage 4 — Growing

长大

Sentence:

- It grows bigger. 它长得更大。

Visual description:
A larger caterpillar with a rounder body.
身体变得更大的毛毛虫。

Stage 5 — Cocoon

茧

Sentence:

A brown or yellow cocoon hanging on a branch.
挂在树枝上的茧。

Stage 6 — Butterfly

蝴蝶

Sentence:

- It becomes a butterfly. 它变成了蝴蝶。

Visual description:
A colorful butterfly with open wings.
一只张开翅膀的彩色蝴蝶。

Key Vocabulary 关键词汇

- Egg — 蛋
- Caterpillar — 毛毛虫
- Hungry — 饿
- Eat — 吃
- Grow — 长大
- Cocoon — 茧
- Butterfly — 蝴蝶

Sentence Frames (Sequencing + Cause-Effect)

句型框架 (顺序 + 因果)

- First, ___ / 首先, ___
- Next, ___ / 然后, ___
- Then, ___ / 接着, ___
- Finally, ___ / 最后, ___
- The caterpillar is ___ / 毛毛虫 ___
- It eats ___ / 它吃 ___
- It becomes ___ / 它变成 ___

Discussion Questions (English + Chinese)

讨论问题

- What does the caterpillar eat?
毛毛虫吃什么?
- What comes after the cocoon?
茧后面是什么?
- How does the caterpillar change?
毛毛虫是怎么变化的?

Create a bilingual (English–Chinese) comic strip script for multilingual learners in Grade 2 aligned with WIDA Levels 2–3 (Emerging–Developing).

The comic should be based on Frog and Toad Are Friends and focus on the theme of friendship and problem-solving.

Requirements:

- Include 4–6 panels with clear scene descriptions
- Use simple but complete sentences that support developing English proficiency
- Include dialogue between Frog and Toad that models academic language functions such as explaining, describing feelings, and giving reasons
- Provide key vocabulary support in English and Chinese (e.g., friend, worry, help, problem, solution)
- Include sentence frames to support speaking and writing (e.g., “I think ___ because ___”)
- Add visual cues (facial expressions, actions) to support comprehension
- Include 2–3 discussion questions in both English and Chinese to promote interpretive thinking
- Ensure the content is culturally inclusive and accessible for multilingual learners

Here’s a bilingual (English–Simplified Chinese) comic-strip script for multilingual Grade 2 learners, aligned with WIDA Levels 2–3 (Emerging–Developing). It models friendship and problem-solving through Frog and Toad’s dialogue, using academic language functions (explaining, describing feel ↓, giving reasons) and visual cues for comprehension.

Comic Strip Script: Frog and Toad Are Friends — “The Lost Button”

青蛙和蟾蜍是朋友——《丢失的纽扣》

Panel 1 — At the Pond 池塘边

Scene Description: Frog and Toad walk together. Toad looks worried.
Visual Cues: Toad’s eyebrows down, Frog’s hand on Toad’s shoulder.

Toad: “I lost my button.”
蟾蜍: “我丢了我的纽扣。”
Frog: “Don’t worry. We can find it together.”
青蛙: “别担心, 我们可以一起找。”

Panel 2 — Searching in the Grass 草地上找

Scene Description: They look under leaves.
Visual Cues: Frog kneels, Toad points.

Frog: “I see a button here!”
青蛙: “我在这里看到一个纽扣!”
Toad: “That one is too small. Mine is big and brown.”
蟾蜍: “那个太小了。我的纽扣又大又棕。”

Panel 3 — Looking by the Path 小路旁

Scene Description: Frog finds another button.
Visual Cues: Frog smiles, Toad shakes his head.

Frog: “Is this your button?”
青蛙: “这是你的纽扣吗?”
Toad: “No, that one is too shiny. Mine is plain.”
蟾蜍: “不, 这个太亮了。我的是普通的。”

Panel 4 — Feeling Tired 累了

Scene Description: They sit down. Toad sighs.
Visual Cues: Toad droops, Frog thinking.

Toad: “I feel sad. We can’t find it.”
蟾蜍: “我很难过。我们找不到它。”
Frog: “Let’s think of a solution.”
青蛙: “我们来想一个解决办法。”

Panel 5 — Finding the Button 找到纽扣

Scene Description: Frog points to Toad’s jacket.
Visual Cues: Frog surprised, Toad looks down.

Frog: “Toad, your button is on your jacket!”
青蛙: “蟾蜍, 你的纽扣在你的夹克上!”
Toad: “Oh! I feel happy now.”
蟾蜍: “哦! 我现在很开心。”

Sentence Frames 句型框架

- I think because. 我认为, 因为。
- I feel when. 当时, 我感到。
- We can solve the problem by ____. 我们可以通过 ____ 来解决问题。

Discussion Questions 讨论问题

- How did Frog and Toad help each other?
青蛙和蟾蜍是怎样互相帮助的?
- What makes a good friend?
什么是好朋友?
- How did they solve the problem?
他们是怎么解决问题的?

The Very Hungry Caterpillar – Life Cycle

好饿的毛毛虫：生命循环图



Key Vocabulary 关键词汇	
	Egg 蛋
	Caterpillar 毛毛虫
	Hungry 饿
	Eat 吃
	Grow 长大
	Cocoon 茧
	Butterfly 蝴蝶

Sentence Frames (Sequencing + Cause-Effect) 句型框架 (顺序 + 因果)	
● First, _____.	● The caterpillar is _____.
● Next, _____.	● It eats _____.
● Then, _____.	● It becomes _____.
● Finally, _____.	

Discussion Questions (English + Chinese) 讨论问题	
1 What does the caterpillar eat? 毛毛虫吃什么?	
2 What comes after the cocoon? 茧后面是什么?	
3 How does the caterpillar change? 毛毛虫是怎么变化的?	

Frog and Toad Are Friends – “The Lost Button”

青蛙和蟾蜍是朋友——《丢失的纽扣》

1 At the Pond 池塘边

Toad: "I lost my button."
蟾蜍: "我丢了我的纽扣。"

Frog: "Don't worry. We can find it together."
青蛙: "别担心, 我们可以一起找。"

2 Searching in the Grass 草地上找

Frog: "I see a button here!"
青蛙: "我在这里看到一个纽扣!"

Toad: "That one is too small. Mine is big and brown."
蟾蜍: "那个太小了, 我的纽扣又大又棕。"

3 Looking by the Path 小路旁

Frog: "Is this your button?"
青蛙: "这是你的纽扣吗?"

Toad: "No, that one is too shiny. Mine is plain."
蟾蜍: "不, 这个太亮了, 我的是普通的。"

4 Feeling Tired 累了

Toad: "I feel sad. We can't find it."
蟾蜍: "我很难过, 我们找不到它。"

Frog: "Let's think of a solution."
青蛙: "我们来想一个解决办法。"

5 Finding the Button 找到纽扣

Frog: "Toad, your button is on your jacket!"
青蛙: "蟾蜍, 你的纽扣在你的夹克上!"

Toad: "Oh! I feel happy now."
蟾蜍: "噢! 我现在很开心。"

6 Reflecting 反思

Frog: "We worked together and did not give up."
青蛙: "我们一起努力, 没有放弃。"

Toad: "You are a good friend."
蟾蜍: "你是一个好朋友。"

Key Vocabulary 关键词汇		
English	Chinese	Meaning
friend	朋友	someone you care about
worry	担心	to feel nervous
help	帮助	to give support
problem	问题	something that needs fixing
solution	解决办法	how to fix a problem

Sentence Frames 句型框架	
	I think _____ because _____. 我认为 _____ 因为 _____。
	I feel _____ when _____. 当 _____ 时, 我感到 _____。
	We can solve the problem by _____. 我们可以通过 _____ 来解决问题。

Discussion Questions 讨论问题	
1 How did Frog and Toad help each other? 青蛙和蟾蜍是怎样互相帮助的?	
2 What makes a good friend? 什么是好朋友?	
3 How did they solve the problem? 他们是怎样解决问题的?	

Supporting Multilingual Learners Through Text Selection, Scaffolding, and Redesign

Texts Analyzed

The Very Hungry Caterpillar



Grade Band: PreK

Strengths: Sequencing, Repetition, Visual Scaffolds

Frog and Toad Are Friends



Grade Band: Grade 2

Strengths: Inference, Dialogue, Discourse Development

Key Findings

The Very Hungry Caterpillar

- Supports WIDA Levels 1-2
- Strong Comprehension Support
- Limited Academic Output
- High Accessibility



Frog and Toad Are Friends

- Supports WIDA Levels 2-3
- Strong Inferential Thinking
- Rich Academic Discussion
- Requires Scaffolding

WIDA PRIME Analysis

Vocabulary	Caterpillar	Frog & Toad	Frog & Toad
Vocabulary	Basic Vocabulary	Abstract Vocabulary	Besake
Language Functions	Retell - Sequence	Explain - Infer	Read • Listen
Modalities	Read - Listen	Speak - Write - Read	Speak • write Read
Scaffolding Need	Moderate Support	High Support	

Redesign Supports:

Bilingual Supports
 Sentence Frames
 Guided Direct
 Guided Discussion
 Sentence Frames
 Guided Discussion
 Mespic Adaptation
 Peer Interaction

References

- Carle, E. (1969). *The very hungry caterpillar*. World Publishing Company.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Snow, M. A. (2014). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.). National Geographic Learning.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2017). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hadaway, N. L., & Young, T. A. (2010). *Matching books and readers: Helping English learners in grades K–6*. Guilford Press.
- Lobel, A. (1970). *Frog and toad are friends*. Harper & Row.
- Microsoft. (2026). *Microsoft Copilot* [Artificial intelligence tool]. <https://copilot.microsoft.com/>
- Miekley, J. (2005). ESL textbook evaluation checklist. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(2), 1–9.
- New York State Education Department. (2014). *Building the bridge: The teaching of language arts to limited English proficient/English language learners*. Author.
- New York State Education Department. (2024). *New York State next generation English language arts learning standards*. Author.
- WIDA. (2020). *WIDA English language development standards framework, 2020 edition: Kindergarten–grade 12*. Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System.
- WIDA. (n.d.). *Protocol for review of instructional materials for English learners (PRIME V2)*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. https://www.hmhco.com/fl-intervention/pdf/wida_r180.pdf