# **Grading Report**

# Overall Score (out of 4): 2

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

# **Component Analysis**

- \*\*P1\*\*

**Explanation:** The student's work indicates some understanding of the learning target.

**Evidence:** The content provides an attempt to address why classification of plants is necessary, indicating an expectation for understanding classification.

**Suggestions:** Clarify the learning target by relating it more explicitly to the standard, e.g., "Understand and explain the importance of classifying plants."

- \*\*P4\*\*

**Explanation:** The communication of learning targets is partially evident.

**Evidence:** The task is clear, but could be enhanced with explicit mention of the specific learning target in simpler terms.

Suggestions: Use student-friendly language to articulate the learning objective clearly.

- \*\*P5\*\*

**Explanation:** Success criteria are not clearly communicated.

**Evidence:** There's no clear indication of what 'success' looks like in completing this task.

**Suggestions:** Define success criteria, such as correctly identifying and explaining key reasons for plant classification.

- \*\*CEC2\*\*

**Explanation:** Learning routines are evident.

**Evidence:** The structured response reflects routine in answering questions.

Suggestions: Establish clearer structures such as writing prompts or frameworks to guide students.

- \*\*SE1\*\*

**Explanation:** Quality of questioning can be improved.

Evidence: The question is too broad for 1st grade understanding.

**Suggestions:** Simplify the question to make it more age-appropriate, encouraging critical thinking.

- \*\*SF4\*\*

**Explanation:** Opportunity for participation is limited.

**Evidence:** The work is text-heavy and may not cater to young learners' need for varied participation methods. **Suggestions:** Incorporate activities such as drawing, sorting, or group discussion to allow active participation.

- \*\*SE5\*\*

**Explanation:** Little opportunity for student talk.

**Evidence:** The written response does not encourage verbal interaction.

Suggestions: Introduce activities that require pair discussions or sharing ideas verbally.

- \*\*CP5\*\*

**Explanation:** Scaffolds are not effectively used.

**Evidence:** The complexity of the task suggests limited scaffolding for 1st graders.

Suggestions: Provide scaffolds like keyword banks or sentence starters.

- \*\*SF2\*\*

**Explanation:** Student ownership is minimal.

**Evidence:** The task's complexity limits independent ownership.

**Suggestions:** Allow students to express learning in varied, personalized ways.

- \*\*SE3\*\*

**Explanation:** Student strengths are not capitalized on.

**Evidence:** The uniformity of the task may not leverage individual students' strengths.

Suggestions: Offer multiple modes of expression (drawing, oral explanation).

- \*\*A4\*\*

**Explanation:** Formative assessments are not clear.

**Evidence:** There is no indication of formative assessment in this submission. **Suggestions:** Use simple formative checks like thumbs up/down or exit tickets.

### **Feedback to Student**

Great effort! You did well at writing down your thoughts. Next time, try to use simple sentences, and don't worry about writing too much. Just explain the main ideas with a sentence or two. Keep up the good work!

#### Feedback to Teacher

The assignment goal seems ambitious for a 1st-grade level. Consider simplifying the prompt and using more age-appropriate vocabulary. Incorporate various forms of expression and participation to accommodate diverse learner needs and strengths. Providing clear success criteria and formative assessments will enhance understanding and engagement.