Teacher CER Scoring Guide

The Race for Less Food Waste

Purpose: Use this analytic rubric to score the student Decision Reflection. A complete response includes a clear claim, at least two relevant pieces of evidence, and reasoning that applies the Decision Lens to the specific context. **Recommended score: 12 points**

Criterion	3 - Strong	2 - Developing	1 - Emerging	0 - Incomplete
Claim and decision	States a clear, specific, and feasible decision that directly addresses the scenario.	States a workable decision, but it is somewhat general or misses a minor constraint.	States a vague, weakly related, or impractical decision.	No claim, or the response does not address the scenario.
Evidence	Uses at least two accurate, relevant details from lesson sources or the scenario.	Uses two details, but one is general, partly accurate, or weakly connected.	Uses one relevant detail or relies mainly on unsupported opinion.	Provides no relevant evidence.
Reasoning and comparison	Clearly connects evidence to the claim and explains why the choice is stronger than an alternative.	Connects evidence to the claim and mentions an alternative, but explanation is incomplete.	Gives limited reasoning, repeats evidence, or does not meaningfully compare an alternative.	Provides no reasoning or comparison.
Decision context	Accurately applies safety, prevention, resource conservation, and local feasibility as relevant.	Applies several relevant factors but overlooks one important condition or assumption.	Mentions a factor without applying it accurately to the setting.	Ignores key constraints or recommends an unsafe response.

Score: ____ / 12

Score interpretation

10-12	7-9	4-6	0-3
Meets or exceeds the lesson target	Approaching the lesson target	Partial understanding; revise with support	Incomplete evidence of understanding

Scoring Notes & Feedback

- Food safety is a nonnegotiable constraint. A response that recommends an unsafe practice cannot earn 3 points for Claim and decision or Decision context.
- Students do not need to select the same action to earn full credit. Accept different decisions when the evidence, assumptions, and local conditions support them.
- Local policy and infrastructure matter. Students may appropriately qualify a response with language such as "if school policy allows" or "where organics collection is available."
- Suggested feedback codes: C = clarify the claim; E = add or improve evidence; R = connect evidence to the claim; D = apply the Decision Lens or context.

Teacher Feedback

Model Response and Teacher Notes

The Race for Less Food Waste

Model Scenario

Several unopened apples remain after lunch in a school cafeteria.

CLAIM	Place eligible unopened apples on an approved share table now, following school food-safety procedures, and use participation data to adjust future ordering.
EVIDENCE 1	The EPA Wasted Food Scale prioritizes preventing wasted food and keeping safe food in use above composting or disposal.
EVIDENCE 2	The apples are unopened and may remain usable for people if school policy and food-safety requirements allow them to be shared.
REASONING	A share table keeps the current food in use, while better ordering helps prevent the same surplus in the future. Together, the actions conserve the land, water, energy, labor, and money invested in producing and serving the apples.
COMPARE	Composting would recover some value, but it is a lower choice when the apples are still safe and edible. Throwing them away would conserve the fewest resources and should be the last option.

Sample Exit Ticket Response

GUIDING QUESTION

How can informed decisions reduce wasted food while conserving the land, water, energy, labor, and money invested in our food system?

Informed decisions reduce wasted food when people first prevent extra food from being created, then keep safe food in use, and use disposal only when better options are not possible. For example, matching cafeteria orders to participation and safely sharing unopened food can conserve the resources already invested in growing, transporting, and preparing it.

REALISTIC ACTION Plan two meals before shopping and check the refrigerator first so I buy only what I expect to use.	**WHY PREVENTION?** Prevention avoids using resources on food that will not be eaten and usually preserves more value than managing food after it becomes waste.
EVIDENCE CHECK The Hidden Journey of Food strengthened my thinking because it showed that discarded food also wastes resources used before the food reached me.	**TEACHER NOTE** This is one strong model, not the only correct response. Score the quality of the claim, evidence, reasoning, and contextual judgment rather than exact wording.

Quick implementation notes

- Allow about 5 minutes for the exit ticket; collect the full CER response for formative or summative scoring.
- For multilingual learners or students who need writing support, permit labeled bullet points or provide sentence starters without reducing the evidence expectation.
- Use class patterns to plan reteaching: weak evidence suggests revisiting lesson sources; weak reasoning suggests modeling how evidence connects to a decision; weak context suggests revisiting the Decision Lens.