Evidence set 3: Creek Project (CP) - OneNote

HAT Evidence sample 1 | Introduction | Written Statement | Evidence Set 1 | Evidence Set 2 | Evidence Set 3 | Evidence Set 4 | Evidence Set 5 | Individual Artefacts | Observations | Referees

Evidence set 3: Creek Project (CP)

Wednesday, 24 August 2022 11:51 AM

Standards and Descriptors addressed through this evidence set

Professional Knowledge				Professional Practice						Professional Engagement	
1		2		3		4		5		6		7	
Know the students and how they learn		Know the content and how to teach it		Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning		Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments		Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning		Engage in professional learning		Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and community	
☑	1.1	☑	2.1	☐	3.1	☑	4.1	☐	5.1	☐	6.1	☑	7.1
☑	1.2	☑	2.2	☑	3.2	☐	4.2	☑	5.2	☐	6.2	☑	7.2
☑	1.3	☑	2.3	☑	3.3	☐	4.3	☐	5.3	☐	6.3	☐	7.3
☐	1.4	☐	2.4	☐	3.4	☑	4.4	☑	5.4	☐	6.4	☑	7.4
☑	1.5	☑	2.5	☐	3.5	☐	4.5	☑	5.5				
☑	1.6	☐	2.6	☑	3.6								
				☑	3.7								

Evidence Set context

The Creek Project (CP) grew from conflicting interpretations on how to complete the task amongst teachers in the Year 8 team. As such, with the backing of data and research, I created and presented a new model grounded in community experts' involvement in a day-long incursion. The resulting success of my program (evidenced by student engagement and staff feedback) led to its inclusion in school's strategic plan, forged strong community links with the Brisbane City Council (BCC) and Southeast Queensland Water (SEQW).

Assessor notes

The applicant's Evidence Set 3 contained artefacts a - p. Only artefacts 3g, 3h, 3i, 3L and 3m have been included in this evidence sample as they are the artefacts linked to descriptors 1.6 and 5.5 in this evidence sample. In their portfolio, the applicant included the same annotations on their evidence set page and also on the individual artefact pages. This was the applicant's preference to allow the assessor to choose how they read the annotations. However, annotations do not be need to be included both with the evidence set and artefact. The applicant's annotations for Evidence Sets 3 and 4 have been included as separate files for reference. These annotations link artefacts a - p to the descriptors on the table above. Users of this evidence sample may choose to just read the annotations included on the artefact pages (3h, 3h, 3i, 3L and 3m) or may also like to read the annotations by evidence set to see 2 different ways of annotating evidence. Regardless of how applicants annotate their evidence, they should ensure that their annotations in total do not exceed the QCT's 10,000 word limit.

If you prefer the annotations in order instead of on individual artefacts:

Evidence Set

Add Page

Evidence set 3: Creek Project (CP)
Artefact [a]: Evaluating the project
Artefact [b]: Research before proposing project
Artefact [c]: Risk Assessment
Artefact [d]: Project Day
Artefact [e]: Project surveys
Artefact [f]: Adjustments to assessments
Artefact [g]: Resource adjustments for Students with a Disability or Les
Artefact [h]: Creation of adjusted assessment with colleagues
Artefact [i]: Helping colleagues to understand special education legisla
Artefact [j]: Professional Networking
Artefact [k]: Community links
Artefact [L]: Constructing appropriate feedback for students
Artefact [m]: Direct feedback relationship between teacher, student
Artefact [n]: Inclusion in strategic plan
Artefact [o]: Creek excursion
Artefact [p]: Project academic outcomes

Screenshot 1 - Evidence Set 3 from applicant's portfolio based on HAT & LT OneNote template.

A clearer copy of this page is included on the next page.

Evidence set 3: Creek Project (CP)

Wednesday, 24 August 2022 11:51 AM

Standards and Descriptors addressed through this evidence set

Professional Knowledge		Professional Practice			Professional Engagement	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Know the students and how they learn	Know the content and how to teach it	Plan for and implement effective teaching and learning	Create and maintain supportive and safe learning environments	Assess, provide feedback and report on student learning	Engage in professional learning	Engage professionally with colleagues, parents/carers and community
☑ 1.1	☑ 2.1	☐ 3.1	☑ 4.1	☐ 5.1	☐ 6.1	☑ 7.1
☑ 1.2	☑ 2.2	☑ 3.2	☐ 4.2	☑ 5.2	☐ 6.2	☑ 7.2
☑ 1.3	☑ 2.3	☑ 3.3	☐ 4.3	☐ 5.3	☐ 6.3	☐ 7.3
☐ 1.4	☐ 2.4	☐ 3.4	☑ 4.4	☑ 5.4	☐ 6.4	☑ 7.4
☑ 1.5	☑ 2.5	☐ 3.5	☐ 4.5	☑ 5.5		
☑ 1.6	☐ 2.6	☑ 3.6				
		☑ 3.7				

Evidence Set context

The Creek Project (CP) grew from conflicting interpretations on how to complete the task amongst teachers in the Year 8 team. As such, with the backing of data and research, I created and presented a new model grounded in community experts' involvement in a day-long incursion. The resulting success of my program (evidenced by student engagement and staff feedback) led to its inclusion in school's strategic plan, forged strong community links with the Brisbane City Council (BCC) and Southeast Queensland Water (SEQW).

Assessor notes

The applicant's Evidence Set 3 contained artefacts a - p. Only artefacts 3g, 3h, 3i, 3L and 3m have been included in this evidence sample as they are the artefacts linked to descriptors 1.6 and 5.5. In their portfolio, the applicant included the same annotations on their evidence set page and also on the individual artefact pages. This was done by the applicant to allow the assessor to choose how they read the annotations. However, annotations do not be need to be included with the evidence set and individual artefacts. The applicant's annotations for Evidence Sets 3 and 4 have been included as separate files for reference. These annotations link artefacts a - p to the descriptors on the table above. Users of this evidence sample may choose to just read the annotations included on the artefact pages (3h, 3h, 3i, 3L and 3m) or may also like to read the annotations by evidence set to see two different ways of annotating evidence. Regardless of how applicants annotate their evidence, they should ensure that their annotations in total do not exceed the QCT's 10,000 word limit.

If you prefer the annotations in order instead of on individual artefacts:

Evidence Set 3