

Solutions

2.1 He plotted all four points correctly. He did not explain why one segment was steeper in the English explanation. Neither observation establishes complete graph understanding or a permanent inability.

2.2 No first-language explanation is recorded to establish that the concept was already understood. Naming axes and plotting points do not themselves show a correct explanation of the slope comparison. Accept the teacher's need to check both meaning and wording if the missing evidence is explained; do not award the teacher's authority alone as proof of the cause.

2.3 The partner could identify the steeper segment but not repeat the reason after the first Thursday explanation. Chen added a link between vertical and horizontal changes after comparison with the worked explanation. The same partner then repeated the reason correctly.

2.4 For example: "On Monday I will explain another graph without the term list", "ask a partner to repeat the slope comparison and its reason, then compare the explanation with the worked answer", "and record any missing idea or word that evening before choosing the next change". Accept another feasible specific plan. Full marks or feeling confident is not a sufficient check of understanding.

3.1 Award 2 per distinct supported evaluation: relevant correction/evidence, why it matters for future learning. Examples: liking diagrams does not prove an inability to read, so Chen should test ways to use the explanation rather than skip it; the first Thursday check still missed the reason, so the term list alone did not fix everything; one graph and the same partner do not establish all-graph understanding, so a different graph or unaided check is needed; a future full-mark result is outside the evidence, so replace it with a controllable task. Repeating the small-sample limit for two different claims earns only one evaluation.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate Monday success; accurate Monday difficulty; vocabulary-only cause kept provisional; Thursday's specific action; first feedback and resulting revision; accurate later partner result with a scope limit; feasible next task and review; coherent truthful 100–130 word account. Example: "On Monday I plotted four points correctly but did not explain why one segment was steeper. I guessed that vocabulary was the only problem, although I had no recorded first-language explanation to check that. On Thursday I practised a new graph with three key terms. My partner could identify the steeper segment but not its reason. Comparing my recording with the worked explanation showed a missing link between vertical and horizontal changes. I added that link, and the same partner then repeated the reason correctly. This checks only one graph with support. On Monday I will try another graph without the term list, ask for the reason to be repeated and record what still needs work."