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About this advice

This advice is intended to help teachers in their school setting. It provides information about:

- Monitoring and Verification
- Selecting evidence for moderation purposes
- The post-verification evidence and exit level of achievement decisions.
Q. What is the difference between monitoring and verification?

A. Part of the moderation for authority subjects is monitoring and verification. These two processes have very different purposes at two different points of time in the course. Both are about individual schools getting feedback from the district panel in response to evidence that they put together in a school submission. It is not about the student.

**Monitoring** provides advice to schools in relation to:

- the implementation of their approved work program that supports the syllabus
- advice about the school’s assessment instruments in relation to the opportunities for students to demonstrate what they know and can do in relation to the general objectives of the Visual Art syllabus
- the school’s application of the syllabus standards at that point in time in the course.

**Verification** provides advice to schools about:

- the school’s application of the syllabus standards based on the evidence in the sample folios
- the school’s judgments about interim level of achievement placements
- the sample evidence that represents the school’s judgment across the entire cohort.

Q. Should a monitoring and verification submission look the same?

A. As the purpose is different, the contents of the submissions could also differ. The monitoring submission would include evidence of responses across the full range of assessment instruments offered in Semesters 1 and 2 in the course of study. A verification submission would include evidence of school summative decision making across the range of levels of achievement. Verification evidence should match the characteristics of the standards awarded and the interim relative level of achievement placement.

Page 31 of the syllabus outlines and identifies evidence for verification. A verification submission has very specific evidence requirements. In Visual Art, a submission may not include the quantity of work a student has done in response to the summative assessment instrument, but evidence of the “signposts”* that a teacher considers demonstrate the characteristics of the awarded standards.

*Signposts: identify the significant points that show the characteristics of the awarded standard. These characteristics will reveal the quality of a student’s knowledge and understanding, decision making, personal aesthetic (style and expression), the construction and communication of meaning, the use of visual language and expression, creative thinking, critical analysis, problem-solving, and exploration of ideas and viewpoint to match the syllabus standards.

Q. Who reviews my school submission?

A. At both monitoring and verification, each school submission is reviewed independently by two panel members from your school district.

The moderation process and protocols for both Authority and Authority-registered subjects are available on the QSA website at <www.qsa.qld.edu.au> Years 10–12 > Moderation and quality assurance > Moderation handbook, procedures and forms. These will outline the requirements for all moderation procedures.
Periodically, memos are published and sent to all schools in preparation for moderation. All teachers can subscribe to the QSA to receive all memos sent.

**Q. What do I need to include in a Year 11 monitoring submission?**

**A.** The school’s submission is expected to provide sufficient, clearly documented information for monitoring to take place effectively and to assist the panel in giving meaningful advice.

A minimum of five student folios must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 11 subject-group.

The five student samples representative of the five levels of achievement are to contain assessment instruments selected to reflect the entire Year 11 course and are to be consistent with the units outlined in the work program for Year 11. The emphasis need not be highly resolved or “finished” artworks.

Where there are fewer than five students in the subject-group, all student folios are sent. If the sample includes folios where special provision has meant that conditions for some assessment items differ, a note included in the sample will assist the panel in understanding the different conditions.

If there are more than five students in the subject-group, the submission is to include sample folios closest to the middle of each level of achievement.

Where there are more than five students in the subject-group but there are no students achieving one or more of the levels of achievement, the submission is to include the folio of the student who has been placed closest to the middle of the levels of achievement and the folio of the top student in the subject-group. Include folios of other students from the subject-group until five folios have been included.

**Each sample folio would include:**

- a student profile that illustrates the decisions made in awarding the interim level of achievement.
- a collection of work representative of achievement in making and appraising
- evidence that demonstrates a diverse approach to media and contexts.

In making, a demonstration of the selected concepts, related focus/es, contexts and media approaches that:

- reflect the structure and intent of the work program
- provide evidence of the Inquiry Learning Model that scaffold the students’ researching, reflecting and development of concepts
- show responses that demonstrate resolutions to problem-solving tasks without necessarily being highly polished “resolved” artworks
- provide evidence of the opportunity for students to learn and experience the development of a “body of work”
- show assessment that provides opportunity for students to address the criteria for making (syllabus p. 4).

In appraising:

- a minimum of two appraising responses (including one extended writing response 800–1000 words)
  - that are reflective of the structure and intent of the work program
are related to the concepts, focus, context and media they have studied
provide an opportunity for students to pursue further research of artists and artworks related to their making
support the opportunity to experience the development of a "body of work"
• assessment that provides opportunity for students to address the criterion of appraising (syllabus p. 5).

When selecting evidence for the monitoring submission, consider the following:
• Is the work accompanied by the task and marked criteria sheet (the originals or copies of the originals, including teacher comments)?
• Are there outcomes that represent each concept outlined in the work program?
• Is there evidence of the suggested focuses offered in the work program?
• Is there evidence of resolution appropriate to the expectation of the course, assessment program and task?
• Is there evidence of research and development of ideas?
• Is there evidence of a diverse range of learning experiences?
• Does the work appropriately and clearly represent the proposed level?
• Are there details about the changed conditions for samples where there has been special provision?

Q. What do I do with the advice on the R3?

A. Monitoring provides feedback to schools in relation to the implementation of their approved work program; advice about their assessment instruments in relation to the opportunities for students to demonstrate what they know and can do with what they know, in relation to the general objectives; and the school’s application of the syllabus standards at that point in time in the course.

After considering this advice in relation to the samples that were submitted, the school may make some minor changes or they may reflect on the comments but be confident in the teaching, learning and assessment program that has been designed to suit the needs of their school community, and make no changes. Review panels give advice without the specific knowledge of individual school contexts.

However, where comments relate to school judgment, a school should act to improve understanding of the criteria and the characteristics of syllabus standards.

Examples of considerations in response to R3 comments:
• *implementation of the work program*: if there were deviations, reflect on the reason for these and whether this can be addressed; consider the need for any amendments to the program with consideration to your own school context and the specifics and alignment with the syllabus; the success of the concepts, focus/s and contexts; the developmental nature of teaching and learning
• *assessment instruments*: the purpose they play in the developmental structure of your course and assessment plan; the relevance and opportunity provided by the assessment at that point in time in the course; the significance of the assessment instrument in preparation for summative instruments
• *school judgments*: use current criteria and standards; peer moderation opportunities to consolidate a shared understanding of the standards; familiarisation with characteristics across the A–E standards; network and professional discussion with other teachers.
Q. What about verification?

A. The school’s verification submission will provide clear citable evidence across the range of levels of achievement, to demonstrate the schools’ judgments to support their interim level of achievement decisions. The selected sample folios represent the school’s judgment across the cohort.

A minimum of **nine sample folios** must be included irrespective of the size of the Year 12 subject-group.

Where there are **fewer than nine students** in the subject-group, all student folios are sent. If the sample includes folios where special provision has meant that conditions for some assessment items differ, a note included in the sample will assist the panel in understanding the different conditions.

The **top of the cohort** must be part of the nine samples, as well as complete samples closest to mid-range and threshold across the levels of achievement for that cohort. There must be a sample folio to represent the school’s judgment for all levels of achievement that have been awarded for that cohort. Where the only sample for that level of achievement is atypical, incomplete or represents an incomplete course of study, this sample must also be included, as a sample of the school’s judgments at that level of achievement.

Page 31 of the syllabus outlines and identifies evidence for verification. A verification submission has very specific evidence requirements. In Visual Art, a submission may not include the quantity of work a student has done in response to the summative assessment instrument, but evidence of the "signposts" that a teacher considers demonstrates the characteristics of the awarded standards.

*Signposts identify the significant points that show the characteristics of the awarded standard. These characteristics will reveal the quality of a student’s knowledge and understanding, decision making, personal aesthetic (style and expression), the construction and communication of meaning, the use of visual language and expression, creative thinking, critical analysis, problem solving, and viewpoint to match the syllabus standards.*

A verification submission includes the evidence of the school’s judgments and their summative decision making across the range of levels of achievement. Verification evidence should demonstrate the match between the characteristics of the sample work and the standards awarded, and the interim relative level of achievement placement. The standards in the 2007 syllabus are mid-range, and the syllabus specifies the minimum combination of standards across the criteria for each level of achievement (syllabus p. 30).

Quality evidence to support school judgments in a typical submission equates to:

- **Identifying** clearly and consistently each sample throughout the submission. Matching the samples with corresponding folders where images are presented digitally.
- **Providing** fully completed profiles for each sample which is accurately transcribed from task sheets.
- **Using** clear and consistent labels to indicate the resolved work/s and where evidence begins and ends for each summative assessment instrument for each sample.
- **Ensuring** clear images (whole work as well as close-up details, not just cropped details) of the final resolved work(s) as either good quality colour printouts or jpeg files. The images of resolved work should be clearly identified and distinguished from any process or developmental work. The inclusion of an indication of scale, an image showing the work hanging or installed in a space and the provision of a clear artist’s statement.
identifying key media and materials and a brief statement of the intent of the student would support this evidence further.

- **Selecting** evidence of the most significant process or developmental work that directs panellists to key points in the student's research, development or resolution of the summative work. Some ways these key points or significant signposts can be evidenced is by either scanning, photocopying or removing pages from a student’s visual diary, including photographs of works in progress, evidencing the problem solving and decision making being undertaken by a student or by tagging or labelling pages directly in a student's visual diary or process journal. By being selective and signposting significant points in the student’s research, development, resolution and reflection, the school has the opportunity to underscore and present the actual decision making they themselves are undertaking when determining a student’s proposed level of achievement. This process allows the school to identify the points on which the school has made the decision and the match to the standards.

**Q. How do I select the evidence?**

**A.** When assessing the work, think about what it is that you see, read, note or identify in the collection of student work (in their research, development, resolution and reflection in both making and appraising assessment instruments), that informs your decision when you award a grade for that criterion. These are the “signposts” that someone else should be able to review to understand and see the match to the syllabus standards.

The nature of visual art often results in discussion between teacher and student, particularly in regard to the conceptual understanding and intention of artwork, the purpose and selection of materials. In samples where these discussions have also been part of school decision making, ensure there is evidence of these aspects to support the school judgments. One critical piece of evidence that should be provided or identified in the developmental evidence in a body of work is the student’s conceptual intention through their selected focus’ (syllabus p. 31). This may be informal.

After compiling your folios of evidence, review them yourself and where possible with someone else, to see if you can clearly and easily identify sufficient evidence of all the characteristics of the interim level of achievement that this sample represents.

**Q. Would the amount of evidence be the same for each sample in a submission?**

**A.** Along with the requirements for verification (syllabus pp. 30–31), evidence may differ in amount and type of evidence for each sample. This will be determined by the standard and the media of the sample response. Each standard across the two objectives identifies characteristics that differ across the A–E standard descriptors and the evidence would show a match to these descriptors in the sample work, resulting in more evidence for the higher achievements. This is not based on quantity of work, but the signposted qualities that demonstrate the differing characteristics in the higher standards. An example of the type of evidence could be where a response is an installation, evidence of the initial location, space, size, surrounding considerations as well as photographs of the final placement, long view and close-up and details of the final work, could provide evidence and understanding of problem solving, media, purpose, and intention of the work.

**Q. Can I put everything in and let the panel make the decision?**

**A.** No. Teachers assess student work; panels review the decisions that are made at the school by looking at the match between the provided evidence and the characteristics of the awarded standards in each sample folio in the submission. A reviewer will have a better
understanding of the decisions that have been made in making samples if the evidence provides clear, detailed images that are annotated to describe size, media, medium, whether the image is a resolved or developmental piece of evidence, an opportunity to understand the context and focus that the student chose in response to the concept, relevant research, development and reflection, tagged evidence (e.g. particular pages in a VHA sample process journal that signpost certain characteristics that are not evident in other forms of evidence).

Q. Can I have three bodies of work and select the two best?
A. No, the syllabus clearly states that courses will be developed to enable specialisation in Year 12, through two resolved bodies of work. Schools provide opportunities for students to demonstrate all aspects of the criteria across the three objectives and plan assessment instruments with this in mind. Each assessment instrument will have a purpose, and contributes to the exit standards. This syllabus requirement supports a depth of teaching and learning (pp. 10).

Q. Can I submit my entire submission electronically?
A. The 2007 syllabus pp. 30–31 details information for submitting evidence for making in a verification submission. If a school is submitting images electronically, the images should be formatted to be opened on any computer, preferably PowerPoint format. Do not submit in a format that requires specific software. Please do not format the content in a way that will restrict access but will enable the work to be easily viewed across the submission and within individual samples. If the making evidence is submitted on a DVD, it should be formatted to play on any DVD player. To ensure that the reviewer has a clear understanding of the evidence which demonstrates teacher judgments, please ensure electronic evidence has:

- electronic folders that directly match the submission samples
- labels and information and distinctions between the students' developmental and resolved work (including descriptions of media and material scale indicators or measurements, student work or artists researched images, images as records of resolved work or images themselves as resolved pieces within the body of work, body of works)
- annotations that show the match to the standards, if this is not obvious
- evidence of the student’s conceptual intention in written or oral form included in the related slides, or referenced if it is in hard copy in the sample folio
- an explanation of the installation, performance or design media included in the related slides
- visual images of the context, display, or placement of artwork
- identified appraising response/s: if the appraising response was originally submitted in electronic form and the media of the task conditions.

Check with your district coordinator well before submitting electronic images to ensure that the reviewers in your district have the facility to pre-review the submission and that there will be facilities on verification day to review the work. It may be that you will be required to print the images if this facility is not available. It is important to have clear and descriptive images that identify the characteristics and signpost the evidence on which the school has made the judgment. While it is possible that digital images may be clearer, closer to the real work and convenient, the evidence should be easily accessible for the reviewer in their particular circumstances. In some districts, panel members are bringing along their own laptops to enable the work to be reviewed.
In the short term, schools are still requested to submit the work program, clean assessment instruments, and original student sample criteria sheets in hard copy, along with the electronic evidence in a school submission.

Q. What do I do with the advice on the R6?
A. Verification provides feedback to schools about their application of the syllabus standards based on the evidence in the sample folios, and interim level of achievement decisions. After reviewing the samples with consideration to the advice:

- the school may consider that their judgments were not an appropriate match to the syllabus standards and agree with the recommended placement on the R6, sign it and return a copy to the district panel chair
- during the verification negotiation period, the school could contact the district panel chair for further information in regard to the advice. The school could provide further evidence to the chair to support their original placements and decisions
- when agreed, consider the advice on standards and how it applies to the non-sample folios.

Q. Can I change what I consider to be summative following the verification meeting?
A. No. At verification a school makes interim judgments based on the assessment instruments (two bodies of work p. 10) outlined in their work program that show significant difference by either Concepts and/or Focuses. Discussions on teacher judgments and school placements on the R6 are based on the school submission of evidence and assessment instruments.

Q. How is the post-verification piece of assessment used in the final exit level of achievement decision?
A. Post-verification evidence is in addition to the verification folio and completes the assessment plan outlined in the school work program. The syllabus states that the post-verification assessment contributes to “one of the verification bodies of work” (syllabus p. 31) so the relevant body of work at exit will have another piece of evidence not available at verification when interim standards and level of achievements were awarded.

The selected Body of Work (now including the post-verification evidence) is reviewed again by the teacher, and an exit decision is made for that body of work. The extra evidence in the selected body of work may demonstrate characteristics not demonstrated at verification or confirm what has already been demonstrated. The post-verification evidence may assist teachers in the final separation of students and exit placements on the Form R6.

Evidence at verification cannot be “undemonstrated” at exit even if the final piece is not representative of the verification standards already achieved in making or appraising.

The post-verification work is not a discrete stand-alone piece of evidence with another Visual Literacy, Application or Appraising grade at exit.

The final assessment opportunity will enable a student to demonstrate what they really know and can do at the end of the two years, so the opportunity the task provides for them is important and should be at the least, as rigorous and challenging as all summative assessment.
Q. What do I do if there are changes in students’ placement at exit?

A. This will differ depending on the size of your cohort. At exit, a cohort with fewer than 14 OP-eligible students is considered a small group, while more than 14 OP-eligible students is a large group. For any movement that is “significant” the school will strike a Fax Form R7 and contact the district panel chair. Consult the QSA website for further information <www.qsa.qld.edu.au/1426.html> > R7 fax form.