

## Grading Report

**\*\*Overall Score\*\***: 2.5 out of 4

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

## Component Analysis

### P1 (Learning target(s) connected to standards)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: Clear connection to standards is not visible; essential for guiding instruction.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The provided response does not align with first-grade standards, suggesting either a mismatch or level adjustment.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Clearly state the learning target and ensure it's age-appropriate and standards-aligned.

### P4 (Communication of learning target(s))

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: Learning targets are not explicitly communicated.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The work lacks mention of objectives or goals.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Begin with a simple statement of what is expected to help students focus.

### P5 (Success criteria)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: No success criteria are provided.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: There is no indication of how success will be measured.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Define success through clear criteria at the beginning.

### CEC2 (Learning routines)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: Learning routines are not evident.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The task seems isolated rather than part of a classroom routine.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Incorporate clear routines to help structure student learning.

### SE1 (Quality of questioning)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: Questions seem complex for the intended grade level.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The content of the question appears advanced for a first grader.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Simplify questions to be more appropriate for the age group.

### SE4 (Opportunity and support for participation and meaning making)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: Limited evidence of interactive or participatory elements.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The task did not include elements encouraging sharing or discussing ideas.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Include prompts that encourage students to express and share ideas.

### SE5 (Student talk)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: The task does not promote student dialogue.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The assignment lacks elements that encourage discussion.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Integrate peer discussions or group work to enhance learning.

### CP5 (Use of scaffolds)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: There are no evident scaffolding strategies to aid comprehension.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The content and task complexity require support structures.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Use visual aids or simpler texts to build understanding.

### SE2 (Ownership of learning)

- **\*\*Explanation\*\***: The assignment doesn't promote student ownership.
- **\*\*Evidence\*\***: The task is too complex and teacher-directed.
- **\*\*Suggestions\*\***: Allow students to choose from certain tasks or topics to increase ownership.

### **SE3 (Capitalizing on students' strengths)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: No evidence of leveraging students' strengths is observed.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The uniformity of the task does not accommodate varying strengths.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Provide choices in how to complete tasks, catering to different strengths.

### **CP4 (Differentiated instruction for students)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Differentiation strategies are not evident.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The same task is likely given to all, without adjustments for different needs.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Implement tiered activities or varies levels of support.

### **A4 (Teacher use of formative assessments)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: No formative assessment is evident during the task.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The completion of this written task does not provide ongoing assessment.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Use short, ongoing assessments to gauge understanding frequently.

### **P2 (Lessons connected to previous and future lessons, broader purpose and transferable skill)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Connections to other lessons or broader skills are unclear.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The response is treated as a standalone activity.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Clarify how this task fits within a larger curriculum context.

### **CP1 (Alignment of instructional materials and tasks)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Misalignment with grade-level expectations.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: Complexity and content are not suitable for 1st-grade students.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Align materials to grade-level standards and abilities.

### **CP2 (Teacher knowledge of content)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Teacher knowledge seems evident but not at the appropriate level.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The questions and responses require advanced content understanding.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Adjust knowledge presentation to match young learners' needs.

### **CP3 (Discipline-specific teaching approaches)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: No specific teaching methods appropriate for young learners are visible.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The structure leans toward direct instruction without age-appropriate strategies.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Use interactive and age-specific teaching approaches.

### **P3 (Design of performance task)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: The performance task does not seem age/developmentally appropriate.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: The question complexity and depth are too advanced.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Design tasks that involve play, exploration, and hands-on activities.

### **CEC1 (Classroom arrangement and resources)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Not applicable to this written task.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: Cannot assess physical arrangements or material use.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Introduce physical resources into tasks as appropriate.

### **CEC3 (Use of learning time)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Unclear how time is used effectively for learning.
- \*\*Evidence\*\*: One standalone task does not assess overall learning time management.
- \*\*Suggestions\*\*: Use schedules or structures to maximize learning time.

### **CEC4 (Student status)**

- \*\*Explanation\*\*: Could not be assessed.

- **Evidence**: This single assignment lacks visibility into student engagement or belonging.
- **Suggestions**: Ensure all students feel included through diversified tasks.

### **CEC5 (Norms for learning)**

- **Explanation**: No learning expectations are defined.
- **Evidence**: The task lacks guidelines or behavior expectations.
- **Suggestions**: Develop and communicate clear norms and expectations.

### **A1 (Student self-assessment)**

- **Explanation**: No provisions for student self-assessment observed.
- **Evidence**: The assignment did not solicit any reflective thinking or self-appraisal.
- **Suggestions**: Embed questions or opportunities for students to assess their own work.

### **A2 (Student use of formative assessments over time)**

- **Explanation**: Evidence of continuity in formative assessments is missing.
- **Evidence**: This document does not show opportunities for ongoing assessment.
- **Suggestions**: Implement regular formative assessments.

### **A3 (Quality of formative assessment methods)**

- **Explanation**: The assessment method appears inadequate for students to show learning.
- **Evidence**: Only a written response was required without varied formative methods.
- **Suggestions**: Use diverse assessments like quizzes, discussions, and projects.

### **A5 (Collection systems for formative assessment data)**

- **Explanation**: Unclear how data is managed from assessments.
- **Evidence**: The single assignment does not provide data management.
- **Suggestions**: Develop a structured approach for collecting and reviewing assessment data.

### **PCC2 (Communication and collaboration with parents and guardians)**

- **Explanation**: School-home communication is not evidenced here.
- **Evidence**: This task does not demonstrate a communicative link to parents.
- **Suggestions**: Engage parents by sharing expectations, progress, and activities.

### **PCC3 (Communication within the school community about student progress)**

- **Explanation**: Lacks evidence of inter-school communication.
- **Evidence**: No collaborative elements visible.
- **Suggestions**: Use meetings or shared platforms to discuss progress with colleagues.

### **PCC1 (Collaboration with peers and administrators to improve student learning)**

- **Explanation**: Collaborative efforts are not evident.
- **Evidence**: The written task appears to be developed independently.
- **Suggestions**: Encourage co-planning and teamwork for task creation.

### **PCC4 (Support of school, district, and state curricula, policies, and initiatives)**

- **Explanation**: Alignment with curricula was not effectively demonstrated.
- **Evidence**: Task complexity overshadows curricular alignment.
- **Suggestions**: Adhere to district standards and align accordingly.

### **PCC5 (Ethics and advocacy)**

- **Explanation**: Not clearly assessable within the task.
- **Evidence**: Ethical and advocacy evidence cannot be ascertained.
- **Suggestions**: Promote inclusivity and fairness in all educational content.

## **Feedback to Student**

Great effort in attempting to tackle the task. It's a good start! Remember, learning is a journey. Keep practicing reading and writing skills. If there are ever parts that need further explanation, don't hesitate to ask for help – that's how we grow! Good job, and keep up the hard work. Ø=Þ

## **Feedback to Teacher**

The student's submission appears to be a mismatch with the expected grade-level standards. Consider re-evaluating the complexity of tasks and ensure they match the students' developmental levels. Integrating structured opportunities for interaction, participation, and formative assessment can significantly benefit learners. Additionally, providing clear learning targets and success criteria will enhance focus and goal alignment. Reviewing and building on these aspects can improve student engagement and achievement.