

CASE A - Original-Book Retrieval Storytelling Feedback

HAOLLA public de-identified learning evidence

60 / 100

Overall score - provisional

What the evidence shows

The learner recalled core story entities and attempted to continue the event sequence from memory. The main bottleneck was not willingness to retell, but completing English clauses when one noun or connector was temporarily unavailable.

Rubric snapshot

- Content recall: 14/25
- Story structure and linking: 12/20
- Language accuracy: 15/25
- Expression and delivery continuity: 10/15
- Independent retrieval: 9/15

Scope: this is a provisional score based only on the captured speech segment available for evaluation. Unobserved portions were not invented or penalized.

CASE A - Detailed Language Corrections

HAOLLA public de-identified learning evidence

Grammar / sentence completion

Before: They found the...

Improved: They found something.

Why: The verb find needs a usable object. If the exact noun is unavailable, finish a safe complete clause first and recover the detail next.

Before: Their story, and Jack and Annie see...

Improved: In the story, Jack and Annie see...

Why: Make the opening phrase functional. In the story creates a clear frame; the event then follows as a complete clause.

Vocabulary and expression

Before: coming to them

Improved: coming toward them

Why: Toward is a more precise movement choice when a character is approaching another character.

Do not invent extra corrections when evidence is uncertain. The goal is evidence-linked repair, not filling a checklist.

CASE A - Retrieval and Story Structure

HAOLLA public de-identified learning evidence

Strengths

- Core characters and the Viking event were retrieved.
- The learner attempted narrative continuation rather than isolated vocabulary recall.
- The structure see + object + -ing is usable when the noun reference is clear.

Highest-priority bottlenecks

- Sentence completion after a retrieval pause.
- Clear event sequencing without relying on repeated and.
- Article and reference stability when introducing or reusing a character.

The next goal is not longer speech. It is a shorter chain of complete event clauses that remain stable under recall pressure.

CASE A - HAOLLA Retry Protocol

HAOLLA public de-identified learning evidence

1. Retrieve who - event - next

For each chunk, recall WHO, WHAT HAPPENED, and WHAT HAPPENED NEXT before adding detail.

2. Use rescue sentences

When a specific noun is unavailable, finish a safe complete sentence rather than freezing mid-phrase.

3. Replace repeated and

Practice Then, After that, Suddenly, and At that moment to make event sequence visible.

4. Space the retry

Retry after a short delay, again the next day, and once more after several days.
Retrieval difficulty is evidence for what needs strengthening.

CASE A - Diagnostic Questions

HAOLLA public de-identified learning evidence

Learner check - no answers included

- What exactly did they find?
- Who does they refer to?
- What happened immediately before Jack and Annie saw the Viking?
- Was it one Viking or several in the original passage?
- Retell the event in three complete sentences without using and more than once.
- Retell again using Then, Suddenly, and After that.

Public evidence boundary

This document is a de-identified first-party learner case. It does not claim a universal effect and does not guarantee the same score, timeline, or outcome for another learner.