STAFF ROOM POSTER

Making Learning Visible

The useful core of visible learning: learners who know where they are going, and teachers who check the journey is happening.

Goals worth seeing

Learners can say what they are learning and what good looks like, in their own words, not by reciting the board.

In class: Ask mid-lesson: what are we learning, and how will you know yours is good?

Success criteria before the attempt

Criteria are examined with models before work starts: a finished example beats a bullet list.

In class: Two anonymised answers from last year: which is better, against which criterion, and why?

Feedback is sought, not just given

The richest feedback flows learner-to-teacher: their errors tell you what teaching to repair.

In class: The exit tickets say half of us lost the thread at step three. That is my feedback; here is the fix.

Evaluate your impact, not your delivery

The lesson is judged by what they learned, not by how it felt to teach.

In class: Compare the starter and exit answers: who moved? Who did the lesson miss?

SCRIPT CARDS: CUT AND KEEP

Success Criteria Scripts

Four routines that turn criteria from wall decoration into tools learners actually use.

Co-construct from models

Derive the criteria WITH the class from strong and weak examples; they remember what they built.

Say: "What is this answer doing that this one is not? That difference becomes our criterion."

Criteria check before handing in

Self-assessment against one named criterion, not a vague read-through.

Say: "Check yours against criterion two only. Mark the exact sentence where you meet it."

Peer feedback with a frame

Structured, criterion-anchored, kind. Unstructured peer marking helps nobody.

Say: "Tell your partner: one place they met the criterion, one place to apply it again."

Redraft against one criterion

Improvement happens one criterion at a time, with the model visible.

Say: "Redraft the opening only, to hit criterion one. Ignore everything else for now."

QUICK REFERENCE POSTER

The Know-Your-Impact Loop

A four-step cycle for evaluating whether teaching worked, runnable every week without extra marking.

1. Decide the evidence first

Before teaching, choose what will count as proof of learning. One question is enough.

In class: By Friday, 80% can balance a simple equation unaided. That is the bar.

2. Teach, then gather it

Collect the evidence from everyone: whiteboards, exit tickets, a cold-called sample.

In class: Friday starter IS the check. No announcement, no revision warning.

3. Read it honestly

Sort into got it / nearly / not yet. The not-yet pile is information about the teaching, not the learners.

In class: A third stalled at the same step: that step was under-modelled. Mine to fix.

4. Respond visibly

Reteach differently, regroup, or move on, and tell the class what the evidence showed.

In class: Most of us nailed part one; question three caught us out, so we restart there with a new model.

TEACHER CHECKLIST

Is the Learning Visible in This Unit?

Audit one unit per term. Visibility is a property of the unit design, not of any single lesson.

Visible to learners

- [ ] Learning goals exist in learner language, not specification language.
- [ ] Worked models of success are examined before first attempts.
- [ ] Learners self-assess against named criteria at least weekly.
- [ ] Redrafting time exists: criteria without improvement time is theatre.

Visible to the teacher

- [ ] Each week names its evidence of learning in advance.
- [ ] Checks sample everyone, not volunteers.
- [ ] The not-yet pile changes next week's plan, visibly.
- [ ] End-of-unit results are compared against the start, not just recorded.

CPD BRIEFING: STAFF ROOM COPY

Visible Learning: A 5-Minute Honest Briefing

What survives scrutiny, what does not, and how to use the framework without worshipping the numbers.

The core practices stand on their own evidence

Clear goals, criteria with models, information-rich feedback and checking impact are each independently supported. The feedback literature alone (435 studies, d = 0.48) justifies the practice.

The league table does not

Statisticians have shown aggregated effect sizes cannot rank interventions like a universal currency: populations, measures and study quality differ too much. Treat the barometer as a reading list, not a shopping list.

Synthesis quality limits synthesis claims

Case examinations of individual strands show how a synthesis inherits the flaws of its inputs. Any single d-value in the rankings deserves the question: from which studies, on whom, measuring what?

The honest bottom line

Use visible learning as a set of disciplines: define success, gather evidence, respond. Skip the numerology. Your own before-and-after evidence outranks any global effect size for decisions about your class.

Evidence base

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K. and Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: a meta-analysis of educational feedback research. Frontiers in Psychology.

Bergeron, P.-J. (2017). How to engage in pseudoscience with real data: a criticism of John Hattie's arguments in Visible Learning from the perspective of a statistician. McGill Journal of Education.

O'Connor, P. (2020). Visible Learning and whole language: revisiting the 'garbage in, garbage out' problem. Australian Journal of Language and Literacy.

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.