

---

## Exit Ticket

This formative assessment task builds on the exit ticket approach used in the Make Your Mark Year 8 unit, scaled for Year 9 and 10. Students at this level are asked to respond to three structured prompts at the end of each studio lesson, scaffolded throughout class through modelling the vocabulary in feedback towards student work, through deconstructing exemplars and blending teacher assessment and self-assessment. Another option is through referencing contrasting exemplars as a 'game' by stating the opposite to loosen their thinking.

### Student-Facing Prompts

- Q1 – What is your work saying that words alone cannot? Describe the feeling, idea or intention behind the choices you made in today's session.
- Q2 – What visual language choices did you make, and why? Name at least two elements or principles and explain the reasoning behind each choice.
- Q3 – What is your next step, and what do you need to get there? Identify one specific thing you will work on next lesson and note any materials, feedback or support you need.

### Victorian Curriculum 2.0 Alignment

- VCAVAE037 – Explore how artists develop and refine ideas through experimentation and reflection
- VCAVAV039 – Develop and refine skills and techniques to realise artistic intentions
- VCAVAR042 – Analyse and evaluate how visual language communicates ideas and viewpoints
- VCAVAR043 – Identify and analyse how cultural, historical and contemporary contexts influence artworks

## **Teacher Evaluation Reflection**

### ***Did Students Learn What I Planned to Teach?***

The Studio Reflection Exit Ticket is designed to generate direct evidence of whether the unit's core learning intentions are being met. At Year 9/10, the central goal is for students to move beyond technical production toward intentional, self-directed artmaking. At Year 9/10, the central goal is for students to begin naming what they are doing and why, as the beginning of understanding their work within a larger context. The three prompts are structured to reveal exactly where each student sits in that process.

Prompt 1 targets artistic intent: can the student articulate what their work is communicating? A student who responds only in technical terms has not yet made the connection between material and meaning. A student who writes 'I see calm, because it made me feel calm' is starting to connect feeling with material, but is not yet grasping the conceptual understanding the unit is designed to build. If he or she can then position themselves as viewer and step into the feeling of the dots (that perhaps someone else made, or by showing them contrasting exemplars of calm dots and chaotic dots) they can then step from experience via metacognition understanding, combine those and understand it conceptually. Reading these responses across a class after Lesson 1 immediately tells the teacher who is working conceptually and who needs a more direct prompt to move from technique to intention.

Prompt 2 targets visual language: are students using curriculum-aligned vocabulary deliberately and with understanding? The Victorian Curriculum at Levels 9/10 expects students to analyse and evaluate how visual language communicates ideas (VCAVAR042). Students who are still finding the language for their own choices can develop it through engaging with the work of others, and receiving feedback on their own work.

Prompt 3 targets self-directed learning: can the student identify their own next step? A student who writes 'I need to work on my composition but I don't know how' is giving the teacher specific, actionable information. The exit ticket distinguishes between students who are stuck technically and those who are stuck motivationally, or through not yet understanding the task. This is a distinction that is harder to make in whole-class observation.

### **Adjustments to Future Curriculum Planning**

The exit ticket data informs planning in two directions: across lessons and across the unit.

Within a lesson cycle, the teacher reads the responses before the next session. From there they group students, adjust the opening, take out or add materials, or build in a short modelling sequence if the class is not yet ready to move forward. Letting students mark and play with materials while being immersed in vocabulary and exemplars is another way to keep things moving without pressure. This is the Gradual Release of Responsibility principle (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983) used responsively rather than rigidly.

Across the unit, the cumulative pattern of responses builds a portrait of each student. A student whose Prompt 1 responses grow in conceptual sophistication across four lessons is showing exactly the arc the unit is designed to produce. This is what formative assessment is for: making visible what summative assessment will only confirm when it is too late to act (Black & Wiliam, 1998). The exit ticket creates a written record to plan from, rather than relying on memory of who seemed engaged (Caudullo, 2025).

### **Adapting Teaching and Resources**

If exit ticket responses show that students are struggling to articulate visual language choices (Prompt 2), the teacher introduces a shared vocabulary wall. These will be key terms displayed with student-generated examples rather than definitions. From there the vocabulary is referenced throughout the class: walking through the room, commenting on work, using the terms in feedback, modelling what a response sounds like. Depending on the class, perhaps to specific words from the vocabulary used and reused by everyone throughout. Making it 'Today's Words' that will be practiced as often as possible for 15 minutes.

If Prompt 3 responses reveal that students are identifying the same next step across multiple lessons, they are stuck. The teacher introduces a structured peer critique using the TAG model (Tell, Ask, Give). Peer feedback at this level does two things: it gives the stuck student a fresh perspective, and it builds the critical vocabulary of the student giving the feedback. Also under give it can be directed towards inspiration: offering ideas for next steps. Austin's Butterfly (Berger, 2003) shows powerfully that specific, targeted peer feedback produces genuine improvement. At Year 9/10, students have the conceptual maturity to give feedback that is honest and generative. They need a structure to do it well.

## References

Berger, R. (2003). *An ethic of excellence: Building a culture of craftsmanship with students*. Heinemann.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(2), 139–148.

Caudullo, E. (2025). *Feedback on Assessment Task 1: Make Your Mark* [Unpublished assessment feedback]. Deakin University.

Churchill, R., Apps, J., Batt, M., Beckman, L., Grainger, P., Keddie, A., Letts, W., Mackay, J., McGill, M., Moss, J., Nagel, M., Shaw, K., & Rogers, J. (2022). *Teaching making a difference* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(3), 317–344.

Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2024). *Victorian Curriculum F–10 Version 2.0: Visual Arts*. <https://f10.vcaa.vic.edu.au/learning-areas/the-arts/visual-art>