

Grading Report

Overall Score (out of 4): 2

****Rubric Coverage****: All components reviewed.

Component Analysis

- ****P1 (Learning target(s) connected to standards)****
 - ***Explanation***: The response did not clearly articulate learning targets connected to specified educational standards.
 - ***Evidence***: The student wrote about classification without indicating specific educational standards.
 - ***Suggestions***: Encourage students to connect their answers to specific learning goals or standards in their curriculum.
- ****P4 (Communication of learning target(s))****
 - ***Explanation***: The response did not communicate clear learning targets.
 - ***Evidence***: The work presented an answer to a question but did not indicate understanding of overarching goals or targets.
 - ***Suggestions***: Guide students to first identify learning targets before attempting the task.
- ****P5 (Success criteria)****
 - ***Explanation***: There was no clear indication of what success looks like in this task.
 - ***Evidence***: The student provided factual content but lacked success criteria metrics.
 - ***Suggestions***: Provide examples of success criteria, like 'correctly defining terms' or 'explaining concepts in their own words.'
- ****CEC2 (Learning routines)****
 - ***Explanation***: The student's response indicates a lack of structured learning routines.
 - ***Evidence***: The answer appears informed but lacks a systematic approach.
 - ***Suggestions***: Introduce routines that involve planning and structuring responses.
- ****SE1 (Quality of questioning)****
 - ***Explanation***: The student's answer addresses pre-formed questions, but lacks depth in the response.
 - ***Evidence***: The answers were factual and straightforward.
 - ***Suggestions***: Use more open-ended questions to encourage deeper reflection and understanding.
- ****SE4 (Opportunity and support for participation and meaning making)****
 - ***Explanation***: The response suggests limited participation in making meaning.
 - ***Evidence***: The student provided answers but did not elaborate on personal understanding.
 - ***Suggestions***: Encourage interactive discussions about topics to deepen understanding.
- ****SE5 (Student talk)****
 - ***Explanation***: Limited evidence of student talk in the submission.
 - ***Evidence***: The response is written and does not reflect verbal participation.
 - ***Suggestions***: Include oral presentations to assess this component effectively.
- ****CP5 (Use of scaffolds)****
 - ***Explanation***: Scaffolds were not evident in the response.
 - ***Evidence***: The student provided factual content without scaffolding prompts.
 - ***Suggestions***: Implement guided questions or graphic organizers to assist in organizing thoughts.
- ****SE2 (Ownership of learning)****
 - ***Explanation***: There is minimal evidence of ownership of learning.
 - ***Evidence***: The response is direct but doesn't show initiative or personalization.
 - ***Suggestions***: Foster environments where students can choose how to demonstrate their learning.
- ****SE3 (Capitalizing on students' strengths)****
 - ***Explanation***: There is no indication the task used student strengths.

- *Evidence*: The answer was generic without showcasing personal strengths.
- *Suggestions*: Develop tasks that allow students to use their unique skills and interests.
- **CP4 (Differentiated instruction for students)**
- *Explanation*: Not sufficient indication of differentiated instruction.
- *Evidence*: The content was standard for all students.
- *Suggestions*: Provide alternative formats or levels of the task to meet diverse needs.
- **A4 (Teacher use of formative assessments)**
- *Explanation*: No formative assessments were referenced.
- *Evidence*: The response lacked connection to assessed growth.
- *Suggestions*: Incorporate check-ins or feedback points within the task.
- **P2 (Lessons connected to previous and future lessons, broader purpose and transferable skill)**
- *Explanation*: The task was independent and not clearly linked to other lessons or skills.
- *Evidence*: Factual answers unrelated to broader skills or lessons.
- *Suggestions*: Show how the current task builds on previous skills or lessons.
- **CP1 (Alignment of instructional materials and tasks)**
- *Explanation*: The instructional task appeared misaligned.
- *Evidence*: The answer focused on factual recall over application.
- *Suggestions*: Align questions with comprehensive tasks covering varied learning priorities.
- **CP2 (Teacher knowledge of content)**
- *Explanation*: Teacher content knowledge was not assessed here.
- *Evidence*: Not applicable.
- *Suggestions*: Ensure content knowledge is implicit in all related tasks or assignments.
- **CP3 (Discipline-specific teaching approaches)**
- *Explanation*: Discipline-specific methods weren't clear here.
- *Evidence*: The response was generic, non-specific to teaching methods.
- *Suggestions*: Utilize methods specific to the subject area to engage students.
- **P3 (Design of performance task)**
- *Explanation*: The design of the task focused on recall rather than performance.
- *Evidence*: The task required factual answer rather than analytical performance.
- *Suggestions*: Design tasks that involve analysis, synthesis, and creation.
- **CEC1 (Classroom arrangement and resources)**
- *Explanation*: No evidence addressing classroom arrangement.
- *Evidence*: The written task did not provide insight into classroom setup.
- *Suggestions*: Classroom dynamics could be mentioned where applicable.
- **CEC3 (Use of learning time)**
- *Explanation*: The task does not explicitly manage or allocate learning time.
- *Evidence*: Single context answers with no timeline.
- *Suggestions*: Time budgets for tasks could be more structured within the classroom environment.
- **CEC5 (Norms for learning)**
- *Explanation*: Learning norms were not evident in submission.
- *Evidence*: The task didn't elaborate on classroom norms.
- *Suggestions*: Establish and reinforce shared classroom expectations.
- **A1 (Student self-assessment)**
- *Explanation*: No evidence of self-assessment.
- *Evidence*: Task submitted for external assessment without self-evaluation.
- *Suggestions*: Include reflective questions prompting self-assessment.
- **A2 (Student use of formative assessments over time)**
- *Explanation*: Lacks evidence of ongoing formative assessment application.
- *Evidence*: The work doesn't suggest iterative assessment or feedback incorporation.
- *Suggestions*: Embed checkpoints for ongoing personalized feedback and growth.

- **A3 (Quality of formative assessment methods)**
- **Explanation**: Not evaluated based on quality methods.
- **Evidence**: Task didn't reference or reflect assessment quality.
- **Suggestions**: Utilize more diverse methods for monitoring progress.
- **A5 (Collection systems for formative assessment data)**
- **Explanation**: No system was visible in this task.
- **Evidence**: Submission lacks an indication of data collection systems.
- **Suggestions**: Create tools for collecting and analyzing student performance data.
- **PCC2 (Communication and collaboration with parents and guardians)**
- **Explanation**: No evidence of parent communication.
- **Evidence**: The task was student-centered without external collaboration.
- **Suggestions**: Share updates with parents on student progress and needs.
- **PCC3 (Communication within the school community about student progress)**
- **Explanation**: Task doesn't highlight school community engagement.
- **Evidence**: Focus was internal to student work.
- **Suggestions**: Collaborative efforts between educators could boost alignment and insights.
- **PCC1 (Collaboration with peers and administrators to improve student learning)**
- **Explanation**: The document did not engage peers or administrative insights.
- **Evidence**: Independent student work.
- **Suggestions**: Encourage shared teaching practices across cohorts.
- **PCC4 (Support of school, district, and state curricula, policies, and initiatives)**
- **Explanation**: Task was self-contained without showcasing broader curriculum support.
- **Evidence**: Presentation didn't reflect adherence to policy structures.
- **Suggestions**: Align tasks with broader educational initiatives and policies.
- **PCC5 (Ethics and advocacy)**
- **Explanation**: Evidence of ethical teaching was not assessed.
- **Evidence**: Task itself did not raise or require ethical considerations.
- **Suggestions**: Embed ethical discussions where relevant in tasks and class discussions.

Feedback to Student

Your work demonstrates knowledge about classification systems, which is impressive! To make your responses even better, try to connect the information to what you've learned in class or why it's important. Also, it's helpful to explain in your own words what you understood about the topic.

Feedback to Teacher

Overall, the student has demonstrated basic recall of factual knowledge. For greater student engagement and a demonstration of understanding, consider integrating tasks that require connection to specific learning targets and standards, and employ scaffolding techniques. Cultivating an environment where students take ownership of their learning by articulating personal relevance and using varied assessment techniques could enhance learning outcomes.