QUEENSLAND COLLEGE OF TEACHERS

Highly Accomplished Teacher

EVIDENCE SAMPLE 2

Evidence samples

Evidence samples are being provided by the Queensland College of Teachers (QCT) to support applicants' understanding of selected descriptors from the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (APST). It is important for applicants for Certification as Highly Accomplished and Lead teachers to have a detailed understanding of the descriptors to enable them to demonstrate the required practice at the relevant career stage.

This detailed understanding also includes being able to identify the parts of individual descriptors that require their 'direct action'. Direct action refers to the verbs in the descriptors that require applicants to demonstrate the practice at the relevant career stage e.g. support and work with colleagues (HAT), lead initiatives and lead colleagues (LT).

QCT evidence samples include explanations from nationally trained assessors as to how an applicant's artefacts demonstrate or do not demonstrate all elements of selected descriptors at their career stage.

This evidence sample has been taken from a Highly Accomplished teacher's portfolio and includes three descriptors that have been assessed as '*Fully evidenced*'. For a descriptor to be assessed as Fully evidenced, all parts of the descriptor must be demonstrated through direct evidence. Descriptors assessed as Partially evidenced have had some elements or parts of the descriptor validly evidenced; however, one or more of the elements has not been validly evidenced.

Applicant's context

The evidence samples presented here are from a secondary school teacher's Highly Accomplished teacher portfolio. The applicant's portfolio was developed using evidence sets, which are several artefacts linked to a common theme (*Guidelines for teachers applying for certification by the QCT as Highly Accomplished Teachers and Lead Teachers*, p. 6).

The evidence samples are an example of how one applicant has demonstrated the Standards/descriptors in their context. Applicants should always consider their own context and practice and select the best evidence from their practice to demonstrate the Standards/descriptors. The applicant used the HAT and LT Certification OneNote Template to develop their portfolio. The evidence samples reproduced here are the applicant's actual annotated evidence. This evidence sample includes selected artefacts from Evidence Sets 1 and 2 to evidence descriptors 2.5, 3.6 and 5.3.

Artefacts

The applicant's artefacts in this evidence sample have been effectively named in the following format e.g. 1A(1), 1A(2), 1A(3) etc. and have been clearly linked to specific descriptors. However, although the applicant has named their artefacts as one artefact e.g. 1A(1) they would not necessarily be counted as one artefact by the QCT. Applicants should refer to the QCT's Interpretation of "artefact" and artefact examples in the Guidelines for teachers applying for certification by the Queensland College of Teachers as Highly Accomplished Teachers and Lead Teachers (p. 6-7) to support their understanding of what constitutes an artefact, to ensure their portfolio meets artefact guidelines.

Assessor notes

Assessor notes have been provided to explain how the evidence demonstrates or does not demonstrate the elements of the descriptors.

Descriptor 2.5 – Fully evidenced

Evidence Set 1: *Science teaching - Years 8 -10* included artefacts 1A – 1H. Evidence Set 2: *Senior Biology teaching - Years 11-12* included artefacts 2A – 2G. Artefacts linked from Evidence Set 1 to descriptor 2.5 included 1A(2), 1B(1) and 1B(2), while Artefact 2A(2) from Evidence Set 2, was also linked. As applicants are required to link their evidence to the descriptors, these were the only artefacts that the assessors could consider in their assessment of descriptor 2.5.

Two nationally trained assessors assessed this evidence as Fully evidencing the descriptor.

HAT 2.5: Support colleagues to implement effective teaching strategies to improve students' literacy and numeracy achievement.

The following elements or parts of descriptor 2.5 must be demonstrated using direct evidence for the descriptor to be assessed as Fully evidenced:

1. Support colleagues
2. to implement effective teaching strategies
3. to improve students' literacy and
4. numeracy achievement.

Element 1 – Support colleagues

Artefact 1A(2): *Supporting colleagues to plan and implement Year 8 Biology teaching and learning program* included Teams discussions with colleagues, lesson resources, teacher feedback survey responses and a student feedback survey question. Artefact 1B(1): *Numeracy in Year 8 Physics* consisted of Teams discussions with colleagues, an email and notes from a data literacy professional development session, lesson plans and resources in OneNote. Artefact 1B(2): *Literacy strategy for exam responses Year 8 Physics* included Teams discussions with colleagues, resources in OneNote, emails regarding lesson observations, lesson observation notes and emails, and student work samples. The assessors noted that support for colleagues for descriptor 2.5 was evident in the Teams discussions with colleagues regarding literacy and numeracy strategies and through the development of literacy and numeracy lesson plans and resources in 1A(2), 1B(1) and 1B(2). Support was also demonstrated through a lesson observation with the applicant and a colleague.

Element 2 – to implement effective teaching strategies

Artefact 1A(2) included teacher feedback survey responses to questions regarding literacy and numeracy strategies. Artefact 1B(1) included notes and planning from the data literacy professional development session and student work samples from lessons and exams. Emails, lesson observation notes and student work samples in Artefact 1B(2) demonstrated the applicant supported a colleague to implement effective literacy strategies. Assessors considered these artefacts as evidence of the applicant supporting colleagues to implement effective teaching strategies.

Elements 3 and 4 – to improve literacy and numeracy achievement

The assessors judged the student work samples, student exam examples, and teacher feedback survey data demonstrated the applicant had supported colleagues with effective teaching strategies to improve literacy and numeracy achievement.

As all elements of descriptor 2.5 were demonstrated through direct evidence in artefacts 1A(2), 1B(1) and 1B(2), it was assessed as being Fully evidenced. As a result, artefact 2A(2) has not been included in this evidence sample.

Descriptor 3.6 – Fully evidenced

The applicant included evidence linked to descriptor 3.6 in Evidence Set 1: *Science teaching - Years 8-10* and Evidence Set 2: *Senior Biology teaching - Years 11-12*. Evidence Set 1 consisted of artefacts 1A -1H, with artefacts 1A(1), 1A(3), and 1B(1) linked to descriptor 3.6. Evidence Set 2 included artefacts 2A - 2G with artefact 2A(3) and 2F(1) linked to descriptor 3.6. As artefacts must be clearly linked to specific descriptors by the applicant, 1A(1),1A(3),1B(1), 2A(3) and 2F(1) were the only artefacts that the assessors could consider when assessing descriptor 3.6.

This evidence was assessed by two nationally trained assessors as Fully evidencing the descriptor at the Highly Accomplished career stage.

HAT 3.6: Work with colleagues to review current teaching and learning programs using student feedback, student assessment data, knowledge of curriculum and workplace practices.

The following elements or parts of descriptor 3.6 must be demonstrated using direct evidence for the descriptor to be assessed as Fully evidenced:

1. Work with colleagues
2. to review current teaching and learning programs
3. using student feedback
4. student assessment data
5. knowledge of curriculum and
6. workplace practices.

Element 1 – Work with colleagues

Artefact 1A(1): *Planning Year 8 Biology teaching and learning program* included Teams discussions and emails discussing changes to Year 8 Biology. Artefact 1A(3): *Feedback and review of Year 8 Biology teaching and learning* included Year 8 Science 2021 student survey feedback, student assessment data, evaluation of the student feedback, and meeting minutes. Artefact 2A(3): *Evaluating Urban Ecology Lessons* included Urban ecology Term 4 2021 student feedback, emails and a review and evaluation summary. The assessors judged Teams discussions, emails, meeting minutes and evaluation items clearly demonstrated the applicant's role in working with colleagues.

Element 2 – to review current teaching and learning programs

It was clear to the assessors that the purpose of the applicant's work with colleagues in Artefacts 1A(1), 1A(3) and 2A(3) was to review Year 8 Science 2021 and the Urban ecology unit in Term 4, 2021.

Element 3 – using student feedback

The Year 8 Science 2021 student survey in Artefact 1A(3) and Urban ecology Term 4 2021 student survey in Artefact 2A(3) were used by the applicant with colleagues to review the teaching and learning programs. This was demonstrated in the meeting minutes and emails. As a result, the assessors determined that the applicant had used student feedback to review teaching and learning programs.

Element 4 – student assessment data

Artefact 1A(3) included the item, 'student assessment data – Cohort summative assessment item achievement by subject' for four assessment tasks. The meeting minutes in 1A(3) included detailed notes of the applicant's lead role in unpacking the assessment data to colleagues to review the teaching and learning programs. Thus, the applicant also demonstrated working with colleagues to use student assessment data to review teaching and learning programs.

Elements 5 and 6 – knowledge of curriculum and workplace practices

Artefacts 1A(1), 1A(3) and 2A(3) all included the applicant leading the review of teaching and learning programs, and in doing so, demonstrated their knowledge of the Science curriculum. The applicant also used workplace practices including Teams discussions, emails, faculty meetings, student and staff surveys and use of OneNote for collaboration in the review of teaching and learning programs.

As all elements of the descriptor were demonstrated through artefacts 1A(1), 1A(3), 1B(1) and 2A(3), the descriptor was assessed as Fully evidenced. As Artefact 2F(1) was not needed to Fully evidence this descriptor it has not been included in the evidence sample.

Descriptor 5.3 – Fully evidenced

The applicant included evidence linked to descriptor 5.3 in Evidence Set 1: *Science teaching - Years 8 -10* and Evidence Set 2: *Senior Biology teaching - Years 11-12*. Evidence Set 1 consisted of artefacts 1A – 1H, with artefacts 1C(2) linked to descriptor 5.3. Evidence Set 2 consisted of artefacts 2A – 2G, with artefact 2G(2) linked to this descriptor. As artefacts must be clearly linked to specific descriptors, 1C(2) and 2G(2) were the only artefacts that the assessors could consider when assessing descriptor 5.3.

This evidence was assessed by two nationally trained assessors as Fully evidencing the descriptor at the Highly Accomplished career stage.

HAT 5.3: Organise assessment moderation activities that support consistent and comparable judgements of student learning.

The following elements or parts of descriptor 5.3 must be demonstrated using direct evidence for the descriptor to be assessed as Fully evidenced:

1. Organise assessment moderation activities
2. that support consistent and comparable judgements of student learning

Element 1 – Organise assessment moderation activities

Artefact 1C(2): *Moderate assessment in Year 8 Physics*, was linked to descriptor 5.3 and consisted of four items including Teams discussions with colleagues, a 'completed blind sample marking moderation sheet', collated moderation responses and meeting minutes. The Teams discussion included a post by the applicant detailing a new 'calibration style moderation activity for the Year 8 Physics exam' for colleagues. The meeting minutes also clearly detailed the applicant's role in trialing this new approach to moderation. The assessors judged the Teams discussion, moderation sheet, collated moderation responses and meeting minutes demonstrated the applicant's role in organising the moderation activities.

Element 2 – that support consistent and comparable judgements of student learning

The Teams discussion in Artefact 1C(2) clearly details the applicant outlining the purpose of the calibration style moderation. The meeting minutes for the exam moderation discussion, in this artefact, also detail colleagues' discussions regarding consistency in marking and future assessments. As a result, the assessors judged that the moderation activities supported consistent and comparable judgements of student achievement.

The descriptor was assessed as being Fully evidenced based on artefact 1C(2) alone. As a result, artefact 2G(2) has not been included in this evidence sample.