

Volume 39, Issue 5

In this issue:

Subject matter knowledge: It matters! **2**

Dr Christine Mae is the Education Officer for Mathematics in Sydney Catholic Schools. Her research focuses on understanding relationships between different aspects of teacher knowledge in order to improve the quality of professional learning.

SPaRK – The River and the Book **16**

James Witchard is a Deputy Principal at Riverstone High School. In this Shared Practice and Resource Kit (SPaRK), James shares cross curriculum learning and teaching strategies based on an enchanting novel for Stage 4 students.

Learning in the time of COVID-19 – reimagining normal **21**


Carole Hansen, Quality Teaching Rounds (QTR) project advisor, reflects on what quality teaching looks like during challenging and changing times.

Scan is a leading refereed journal that focuses on the interaction between information in a digital age and effective student learning. Scan offers engaging professional support for all educators.

Copyright The material in this publication is subject to copyright under the Copyright Act 1968 (Cth), and is owned by or licenced to the State of New South Wales through the Department of Education (the Department). Material published in 'Scan' Covers and other third party content in 'Scan' are reproduced with permission, where applicable. Apart from the rights granted in the restricted waiver of copyright (below) all other rights are reserved. For all other uses you must contact editor.scan@det.nsw.edu.au for permission.

Restricted waiver of copyright The published material in 'Scan' is subject to a restricted waiver of copyright to allow the subscriber to print or download copies of the material contained in the publication for use within a subscribed school, subject to the conditions below: 1. All printed material shall be made without alteration or abridgment and must retain acknowledgment of the copyright. 2. The school or college shall not sell, hire or otherwise derive revenue from copies of the material, nor distribute copies of the material for any other purpose. 3. Institutional subscriptions only permit sharing within the subscribed school or institution. 4. Individual subscriptions are for personal use only and are non-transferrable. 5. The restricted waiver of copyright is not transferable and may be withdrawn in the case of breach of any of these conditions.

© 2020 State of New South Wales (Department of Education) ISSN 2202-4557 SCIS 1547886



Subject matter knowledge: It matters!

Dr Christine Mae is the Education Officer for Mathematics in Sydney Catholic Schools. Her research focuses on understanding relationships between different aspects of teacher knowledge in order to improve the quality of professional learning.

In mathematics education, subject matter knowledge matters! This article reports findings from a study of relationships between teachers' understandings of content, the tasks they design and their interpretations of student thinking. A combined methods approach was used to gather multiple data sets from 64 upper primary teachers. The study found that differences in teachers' understandings of area, perimeter and volume accounted for approximately half of the variance in two aspects of pedagogical knowledge, when the content remained constant and subject matter knowledge was probed through problem solving.

There may be nothing more foundational to teaching than subject matter knowledge (Ball, Thames & Phelps, 2008). However, empirical evidence supporting the impact of teachers' subject matter knowledge on student learning remains inconclusive. A consistent finding is that students learn more when teachers focus on understanding (Hattie & Anderman, 2012). The centrality of understanding, as a dimension of teacher knowledge that impacts student achievement, is reflected in research on conceptual understanding (Kilpatrick, Swafford & Findell, 2001), profound understanding (Baumert, Kunter, Blum, Brunner, Voss, Jordan, Klusmann, Krauss, Neubrand & Tsai, 2010; Ma, 1999) and relational understanding (Skemp, 1976).

Excellence in mathematics education involves opportunities for students to solve complex problems, high expectations for communicating thinking, and exposure to alternative solution approaches (Thomson, Hillman & Wernert, 2012). Equity necessitates access to quality mathematics teaching for **all**, rather than **some**, students (Gonski, 2011). Investigating how teachers' understandings of mathematics influence their knowledge for teaching is thereby central to increasing equity and excellence in education.

Designing mathematical tasks, and interpreting students' responses to them, exemplify ways in which daily teaching draws upon teachers' mathematical knowledge. The design of tasks matters. 'It is through tasks, more than in any other way, that opportunities to learn are made available' (Anthony & Walshaw, 2010, p 96). To shift teaching beyond procedural exercises, teachers need a repertoire of tasks and problems through which students can explore and understand concepts (Shulman, 1986). **Noticing** refers to the ways that teachers attend to, interpret and respond to student thinking (Jacobs, Lamb & Phillips, 2010). Noticing is central to student achievement because it provides the connection between students, the task and the content (NCTM, 2014). To design tasks that stimulate learning, and 'scrutinize, interpret, correct, and extend' thinking (Ball, Hill & Bass, 2005, p 17), teachers need to represent ideas in multiple ways and carry out and understand multi-step problems. Thus, effective mathematics teaching involves teachers in doing mathematics.

The research investigated 'how teachers' understandings of mathematics influence their knowledge for teaching it'. Numerous studies have explored relationships between subject matter and pedagogical knowledge using attainment in coursework, generalised measures of subject matter knowledge, or measures emphasising Number and Algebra. In this study, area, perimeter and volume provided a specific analysis of relationships, using content that is problematic for students and teachers (Blume, Galindo & Walcott 2007; Steele, 2013).

Data gathering methodologies

A combined methods approach (Gorrard & Taylor, 2004) was adopted to investigate a complex question, involving multiple aspects of teacher knowledge, and facilitate the selection of tools and methods for gathering data and testing relationships in the same study. Within this approach, correlational research offered the benefit of identifying and evaluating the strength of relationships between aspects of knowledge without the need to assign teachers to different learning conditions (Cresswell, 2003).




Figure 1. Summary of methods.

Figure 1 provides a summary of the research, including the research questions, data gathering, analysis and relationships studied. A cross-sectional research design created a 'snapshot' across three aspects of teacher knowledge. Multiple sets of data were gathered from 64 participants, from the same schooling system, teaching the final two years of primary school (students aged 10-12 years) in the same metropolitan area, at the same point in time, and in relation to the same content (Gorrard et al., 2004). Teachers engaged in three tasks that were replicas of the types of challenges faced in their daily teaching, to provide valid information about aspects of teacher knowledge (Goe, Bell & Little, 2008). On a single day of participation, teachers engaged in a Design task, Problem solving task and Noticing task.

Design task

The Design task was used to gather data regarding the level of cognitive demand in a task designed by each teacher. Teachers used the [NSW Mathematics K-10 syllabus](#) as a starting point for designing a task to assess **students' understandings** of area, perimeter or volume. A framework, combining levels and characteristics of the Task Analysis Guide (TAG) developed by Stein & Smith (1998) with an adaptation of the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO)

taxonomy (Biggs & Collis, 1982), was used to analyse and categorise all tasks. The frameworks were combined to include a **Pre-structural** category describing tasks that provided no relevant opportunity to learn the selected content, whilst utilising the levels of the TAG to discriminate lower and higher level tasks. Numerous steps were taken to establish reliable levels for all tasks, including the use of multiple expert raters and clearly stated guidelines to remove potential ambiguities or biases.

Problem solving task

The Problem solving task was used to gather data regarding **teachers' understandings** of area, perimeter and volume when solving mathematical problems that were applications of content they teach to students in the final two years of primary school. The task consisted of a set of nine items, adapted from the National Assessment Plan for Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) Numeracy tests between 2008 and 2013. The items were selected through a trial in which 32 teachers solved and rated a larger set of 22 items assessing the same content. Data were gathered to provide information about participants' understandings of the content as well information about the items. Participants' raw scores were used to allocate responses to categories, while item analysis included the number of correct responses to each item, the content focus of each item and teachers' ratings of the familiarity, routineness and complexity of each item (Hirstein, 1981; Mevarech & Kramarski, 2014).

Noticing task

The Noticing task was designed to gather data regarding 'teachers' interpretations of students' understanding and reasoning' in written work samples. Teachers were presented with a set of five work samples in response to an area problem, representing different levels of student thinking, ranging from incorrect solutions due to predictable misconceptions to correct solutions using sophisticated reasoning (Goe et al., 2008). The work samples were based on the final item from the Problem solving task, which involved calculating the area of a plane shape with numerical dimensions on all sides – a situation noted as problematic for students (Hirstein, 1981). Teachers ranked the work samples from Extensive (A) to Limited (E) and recorded feedback to students to confirm their rankings. Teachers' responses were categorised according to where they ranked a work sample with sophisticated thinking (Noticing task position category) and which work sample they ranked as Extensive (Noticing task student category).

Analysis of data

Data were analysed for distribution and central tendency [$M = 3.03$ ($SD = 1.23$, $N = 64$)]. Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of Design task responses across all levels of cognitive demand. More teachers designed tasks in the **Procedures without connections** category than in any other category. Approximately one-third of the teachers designed the types of higher level tasks recommended for student learning: **Procedures with connections to meaning** or **Doing mathematics** tasks. The eight tasks in the **Pre-structural** category did not reflect any relevant opportunity for students to learn the selected content.




Figure 2. Design task.

Problem solving task scores were used to allocate responses to Problem solving categories [$M = 3.02$ ($SD = 1.32$, $N = 64$)]. Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of responses across the full range of Problem solving categories from **Low** (0 or 1 correct) to **High** (8 or 9 correct). On average teachers answered half of the problems correctly. However, 37.5% of teacher responses demonstrated stronger subject matter knowledge by solving most or all problems. Notably, teachers were far more likely to solve problems rated as familiar, non-routine and/or low in complexity.




Figure 3. Problem solving task.

Figure 4 captures the distribution of Noticing task position responses [$M = 3.20$ ($SD = 1.33$, $N = 64$)] across all categories. Most teachers did not interpret the correct, sophisticated mathematical thinking in a work sample as evidence of Extensive achievement. Teachers were equally likely to rank this work sample as Thorough or Sound as they were to rank it as Extensive. Approximately one-third of responses ranked this work sample lower than at least one work sample with an incorrect solution. Notably, teachers who correctly solved the item that work samples were based on (indicated by darker shading) were far more likely to notice higher levels of student thinking.




Figure 4. Noticing task

Data from the three teacher tasks were used to identify relationships between aspects of teacher knowledge. Figure 5 illustrates the relationship between Problem solving and Design task data. The Pearson correlation coefficient [$r = 0.759$, $n = 64$, $p = 0.01$] revealed teachers' understandings of content as highly, significantly predictive of the level of cognitive demand in the tasks they designed using the same content. A significant regression ($F(1,62) = 84.485$, $p < .001$) was found, with an R^2 value of 0.577.




Figure 5. Relationship A.

Visual inspection of the scatterplot in Figure 6 shows the way in which Problem solving was predictive of Noticing task position categories [$r = 0.674$, $n = 64$, $p = 0.01$]. A significant regression equation ($F(1,62) = 51.550$, $p < 0.001$) was found, with an R^2 value of 0.454. Fisher's exact test identified solving the problem that student work was based on as highly, significantly predictive of noticing student thinking [< 0.00001 , $p < 0.05$].




Figure 6. Relationship B.

Relationships between aspects of teacher knowledge were then studied simultaneously. Figure 7 presents a three-dimensional view of teacher knowledge created to synthesise findings regarding how teachers' understandings of content influence their knowledge for teaching. In this graphic, each circle represents one participant. Circle size indicates the strength of subject matter knowledge, while position conveys the strength of two aspects of pedagogical knowledge. The dotted lines indicate the median score for aspects of pedagogical knowledge and divide the graphic into four quadrants of teacher knowledge.




Image:Figure 7. Relationships between three variables of teacher knowledge.

Discussion

The strength of relationships identified between aspects of teacher knowledge highlighted the important role that subject matter knowledge plays in supporting pedagogical knowledge. The results reflected the fundamental belief of pedagogical content knowledge, such that neither subject matter knowledge, nor knowledge of teaching alone, are sufficient for effective teaching (Shulman, 1986). However, in this study, evidence of pedagogical knowledge not supported by proficiency with the subject matter, was scarce. Subject matter knowledge matters. It impacts on teachers' interpretations of the intended curriculum, the learning opportunities they design to implement the curriculum, and their interpretations of how well students have attained the curriculum (Mullis & Martin, 2011).

The variability of teacher knowledge and an emphasis on procedural thinking were prominent throughout the results. All levels of cognitive demand were evident in the tasks, teachers' understandings of content supported them in solving anywhere from none to all of the problems

presented, and teachers' interpretations of the same work sample ranged across five reporting descriptors. In the correlational analysis, teachers' problem solving scores explained 57.7% of the variation in the level of cognitive demand in tasks, and 45.4% of the variation in their noticing of higher levels of student thinking. An emphasis on procedural thinking was also evident throughout the results. More teachers designed tasks that focused on **Procedures without connections**, most teachers solved only familiar, routine problems and almost half interpreted procedural thinking as evidence of **Extensive** achievement - even though the thinking was inefficient. Notably, teachers who solved only problems rated as familiar and routine designed lower level tasks and misinterpreted higher level reasoning in a work sample using a novel solution approach. The variability of subject matter knowledge, its association with variations in pedagogical knowledge, and a reliance on procedural thinking, present challenges for increasing the quality of mathematics education.

Teachers' understandings of content are central to student learning. The ratio of higher to lower level tasks, proportion of teachers solving only familiar, routine problems, and valuing of procedural thinking over reasoning, indicate that conceptual (Kilpatrick et al., 2001), profound (Baumert et al., 2010; Ma, 1999) and relational (Skemp, 1976) understandings of mathematics are not prevalent. If Australian students need increased opportunities to solve more complex problems, high expectations for reasoning and exposure to alternative solution approaches (Thomson et al., 2012), improving the quality of tasks, and teachers' noticing of student thinking in response to them, are fundamental to achieving standards of excellence. As equity necessitates access to quality mathematics teaching for **all** students (Gonski, 2011), the variability of teachers' subject matter knowledge, and its influence on aspects of their pedagogical knowledge, requires further investigation and investment. Ball and colleagues (2008) observed that the learning gains of students in the classes of teachers with higher levels of mathematical knowledge for teaching were equal to the effects of an additional two to three weeks of instruction per year. Hence, deepening teachers' understandings of the mathematics they teach may provide a means for overcoming educational inequity.

An underlying issue in improving student achievement is the need for opportunities that stimulate thinking beyond what students can already do (Thomson et al., 2012). Given the extent to which subject matter knowledge influenced the design of tasks and teachers' noticing of student thinking, increasing subject matter knowledge provides a powerful means for activating and increasing pedagogical knowledge. Teachers' understandings of content influenced the clarity of learning goals, expectations for student learning, opportunities to develop deeper conceptual understandings of content and noticing higher levels of student thinking. As no significant differences were observed between the Problem solving scores of teachers in the two higher categories for the Design Task or the Noticing Task, increases in subject matter knowledge beyond a certain threshold might not be associated with higher levels of teacher effectiveness (Ball et al., 2005).

The findings support the notion that it is not how much, but how, teachers know mathematics that matters (Ma, 1999). Teachers with responses in lower Problem solving categories may not need to learn more mathematics, but rather, to develop the Profound Understandings of fundamental mathematics (PUFM) described by Ma. Teachers with PUFM are more able to highlight and connect mathematical ideas and display multiple solution approaches. They place greater emphasis on justifying mathematical arguments, are more likely to approach topics in multiple ways and offer a greater variety of examples to students. By comparison, teachers without PUFM tend to focus on knowledge of how to complete procedures, rather than how

procedures are connected to important principles of mathematics. Differences between teachers with and without PUFM may explain differences between teachers in the High-High and Low-Low quadrants of teacher knowledge depicted in Figure 7. As noted by Ma (1999), differences in teachers' understandings of basic mathematical principles influence their development of networks of conceptual ideas that play an important role in supporting effective teaching.

Correlations between teachers' understandings of content and their knowledge for teaching it may be due to an inextricable link between teaching and problem solving. Both problem solving and teaching require teachers to solve problems 'for which the solutions may not be readily apparent' (Chick & Stacey, 2013, p 2). Teachers who were proficient with the content to the extent that they solved unfamiliar, non-routine, complex problems, were far more likely to design higher level tasks and notice higher levels of student thinking. Higher levels of subject matter knowledge did not guarantee high levels of pedagogical knowledge, but they predicted and explained variations in it. All teachers with responses in the High category for Problem solving gave responses at or above the median score for both aspects of pedagogical knowledge. Considered simultaneously, the aspects of teacher knowledge suggest that mathematical proficiency is a critical component of teacher knowledge (Kilpatrick et al., 2001). While subject matter knowledge alone is insufficient for proficient teaching, teachers with low levels of proficiency with the content did not design higher level tasks and notice higher levels of thinking (Baumert et al., 2010; Hill et al., 2008).

Variations in, and relationships among, teachers' subject matter knowledge and two aspects of pedagogical knowledge, have implications for educational policy and the allocation of resources to support teacher education (Hill et al., 2008). Almost two-thirds of the 24 teachers demonstrating stronger subject matter knowledge also designed a higher level task and noticed higher levels of student thinking. The findings reinforce the importance of teachers possessing connected, coherent, structured understandings of mathematics (Ma, 1999) as a foundation for pedagogical knowledge. By contrast, just over two-thirds of the 40 teachers exhibiting weaker subject matter knowledge also designed tasks with lower levels of cognitive demand and misinterpreted higher levels of student thinking. However, the results also highlight that teacher knowledge is finely grained. Further research, involving larger numbers of teachers, and applying different content to the study of these relationships, is needed. To provide an excellent mathematics education for every student, we need to identify the mathematics that teachers need to know, how they need to know it and what this means for the opportunities we provide for teachers to learn and understand the mathematics they teach (Kilpatrick et al., 2001).

References and further reading

Anthony, G., & Walshaw, M. (2009). Characteristics of effective teaching of mathematics: a view from the West. *Journal of Mathematics Education*, 2(2), 147-164.

Ball, D. L., Hill, H. C., & Bass, H. (2005). Knowing mathematics for teaching: Who knows mathematics well enough to teach third grade, and how can we decide? *American Educator*, 29(1), pp.14-22.

Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H. & Phelps, G. C. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407.

Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., Klusmann, U., Krauss, S., Neubrand, M. & Tsai, Y.M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, 133-180.

Biggs, J.B., & Collis, K.F. (1982). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy*. Academic Press, New York.

Blume, G. W., Galindo, E., & Walcott, C. (2007). Performance in measurement and geometry from the perspective of the Principles and Standards for School Mathematics. In P. Kloosterman & F. K. Lester (Eds.), *Results and interpretations of the 2003 Mathematics Assessment of the National Assessment of Educational Progress* 95–138). National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Reston, VA.

Chick, H. & Stacey, K. (2013) Teachers of mathematics as problem-solving applied mathematicians. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 13(2), 121-136.

Creswell J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches and mixed methods approaches*. Sage, London.

Goe, L., Bell, C., & Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, Washington D.C.

Gonski, D., Boston, K., Greiner, K., Lawrence, C., Scales, B., & Tannock, P. (2011). [Review of Funding for Schooling—Final Report](#). The Australian Government, Canberra.

Gorrard, S., & Taylor, C. (2004). *Combining methods in educational and social sciences research*. McGraw-Hill Education, London.

Hattie, J., & Anderman, E. M. (2012). *International guide to student achievement*. Taylor and Francis, Florence.

Hirstein, J. (1981). The second national assessment in mathematics: Area and volume. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*. 74(9), 704-708.

Jacobs, V. R., Lamb, L. L. C., & Philipp, R. A. (2010). Professional noticing of children's mathematical thinking. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 41(2), 169–202.

Kilpatrick, J., Swafford, J., & Findell, B. (Eds) (2001). *Adding It Up: Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

Ma, L. (1999). *Knowing and teaching elementary mathematics: Teachers' understandings of fundamental mathematics in China and the United States*. Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ.

Mevarech, Z. R., & Kramarski, B. (2014). *Critical maths for innovative societies: The role of metacognitive pedagogies*. OECD, Paris.

Mullis, I. & Martin, M. O. (Eds.) (2015). [TIMSS 2015 assessment frameworks](#). Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM). (2014). *Principles to Actions: Ensuring Mathematical Success for All*. NCTM, Reston, VA.

NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA) for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales. (2012). [Mathematics K-10 syllabus](#).

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Skemp, R. R. (1976). Relational understanding and instrumental understanding. *Mathematics Teaching*, 77, 20-26.

Steele, M. D. (2013). Exploring the mathematical knowledge for teaching geometry and measurement through the design and use of rich assessment tasks. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 16(4), 245-268.


Stein, M. K. & Smith, M. S. (1998). Mathematical tasks as a framework for reflection: From research to practice. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 2(1), 50-80.

Thomson, S., Hillman, K., & Wernert, N. (2012). Monitoring Australian Year 8 student achievement internationally: *TIMSS 2011*. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), Melbourne.

This article draws on work originally presented at the 42nd annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia:

Mae, C. (2019). [Subject matter knowledge: it matters!](#) In G. Hine, S. Blackley & A. Cook (Eds.), *Mathematics education research: Impacting practice* (Proceedings of the 42nd annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia, pp. 476-483). Perth: MERGA.

How to cite this article - Mae, C. (2020). 'Subject matter knowledge: It matters!', *Scan*, 39(5).




SPaRK – The River and the Book

James Witchard is a Deputy Principal at Riverstone High School. In this Shared Practice and Resource Kit (SPaRK), James shares cross curriculum learning and teaching strategies based on an enchanting novel for Stage 4 students.

Resource overview

‘The River and the Book’ by Alison Croggon (Walker Books, 2015) is a short novel exploring the impacts of cultural theft, globalisation and invasion. Endorsed by Amnesty International, UK as contributing to a better understanding of human rights, this book is an excellent novel for Stage 4 students. ‘The River and the Book’ tells the story of Simbala and her plight to save her village and river from developers. The Book, a powerful prophecy tool, predicts the changes coming to Simbala’s village. However, it is the theft of the Book itself that causes the breakdown of cultural systems in ways that are far too familiar to nations across the world. Croggon brings some of the ubiquitous experiences of indigenous cultures to life in an unnamed country that effectively could be anywhere.



Educational significance

In a world where we sometimes experience the historical denial of invasion and the ongoing devastation caused by our forbearers, engaging all students in a discussion relating to cultural theft is imperative. For some students, this is a lived experience. For others, there is a responsibility to present the information in a way that engages students and empowers their voices against the mistakes of the past. By using the core outcomes from the [NSW English K–10 syllabus](#), it was possible to create a clear and specific structure for teaching this novel. It has also been a valuable way to introduce students to high school novel studies.

The study was divided into three main sections:

- Critical analysis
- Language forms and features
- Cultural understanding

This model has proven to be an effective springboard for students beginning their high school English journey.

Suggestions for using this resource

As this is a relatively short novel (136 pages), it is ideal for in-class reading time which can assist students to develop their independent reading skills. Our strategy has been to divide the book into five-chapter sections and apply learning and teaching activities relating to the sections listed above. Not only does this ensure a direct link to the syllabus outcomes, but it also allows a consistent structure for students beginning high school English studies. Assessment tasks are also linked to these main sections, so students know exactly what outcomes they are working towards. Based on their work throughout the term, students already know their outcome-based strengths and weaknesses and can apply themselves appropriately.

Teaching activities

We begin our unit by exploring some pre-reading activities, metalanguage and general awareness of ‘what is a unit study?’ We also engage students in a mini cultural awareness education session to arm our students with the appropriate language and terms to explore a foreign culture.

With foundational knowledge set, we begin our ‘5x3’, that is five chapters of reading followed by three activities. A sample of this unit is provided below for chapters 1-5.

Critical analysis: characters and roles

- List Sim’s full name
- Describe the type of child Sim was
- Describe the role the river played in Sim’s village
- Explain why Mizan visited the village
- Explain the role of The Keepers
- Describe the role of The Book
- Sim now lives in the city. Predict why you think she no longer lives in her village.

Language forms and features: adjectives

Copy the following definition:

Adjectives: An adjective is a describing word. Adjectives tell us about the quality of a person or thing.

For example: a **tall** boy

Task:

- Create a list of 10 adjectives located in Chapter 1, 2 and 3.
- Explain why you think adjectives are important in narratives.
- Explain why you think the author uses so many adjectives in the opening chapters of this novel.

A copy of the complete learning and teaching resource for [The River and the Book – Year 7 Novel Study: Riverstone High School](#) (PDF 1.2MB) is publicly available.

Cultural understanding

Water plays a vital role in every culture and country. For Sim and her family, the river supplies water to feed their plants and animals, a place to fish and transport. Many groups of people have built their whole way of life around rivers that pass through their villages. In the narrative, Sim says that their river has changed and is polluted. This is a deadly threat to their way of life.

The following video (2.47) focuses on state of the Niger River Delta after being polluted by multinational companies extracting oil in the area. Students can view the video and complete the tasks provided below.

YouTube video: UN confirms massive oil pollution in Niger Delta – Amnesty International at <https://youtu.be/VhIW-DzaosQ>

- Describe how the river looks after becoming polluted.
- Explain the effects on the people living in the villages.
- Suggest what you think will happen if the villagers continue to eat the fish they catch in the river.
- Explain how you think the pollution issue in Sim's village in 'The River and the Book' is similar to what is occurring on the Niger Delta.

Syllabus links

The transcultural nature of the novel and the unspecified setting allow significant links to be made between the [NSW English K–10 syllabus](#) and [NSW History K–10 syllabus](#). Our school has successfully taught this novel as a Year 7 novel study covering:

- EN41A – A student responds to and composes texts for understanding, interpretation, critical analysis, imaginative expression and pleasure
- EN45C – A student thinks imaginatively, creatively, interpretively and critically about information, ideas and arguments to respond to and compose texts

- EN48D – A student identifies, considers and appreciates cultural expression in texts

In addition, there are relevant connections to the Stage 4 history content that allow studies on 'The River and the Book' to be a companion unit or be converted into a cross-curricular study. It is especially pertinent to Depth study 6: Expanding contacts – Aboriginal and Indigenous Peoples, colonisation and contact history.

History K–10 outcomes include:

- HT42 – describes major periods of historical time and sequences events, people and societies from the past
- HT43 – describes and assesses the motives and actions of past individuals and groups in the context of past societies
- HT44 – describes and explains the causes and effects of events and developments of past societies over time
- HT46 – uses evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations
- HT47 – identifies and describes different contexts, perspectives and interpretations of the past
- HT410 – selects and uses appropriate oral, written, visual and digital forms to communicate about the past.

Experimenting

While much of the work in this unit is quite prescriptive, there are many opportunities to experiment with issues arising from the novel. In particular, there is a great link for Stage 4 students between the English outcomes ([NSW English K–10 syllabus](#)) and the Depth Study 6: Expanding Contacts – 6d Aboriginal and Indigenous Peoples, Colonisation and Contact History in Stage 4 history ([NSW History K–10 syllabus](#)).

For instance, the depth study explores a comparison between the experiences of Aboriginal Australians and another indigenous group such as the Plains Indians of North America, The Pacific Region, China, Africa, South-east Asia or South Asia. It focuses on the nature of colonisation, the impact of contact and the ongoing consequences of colonisation. In our school we have always opted to compare the Australian Aboriginal experience with the Plains Indians of North America. There are strong links here that allow student understanding to deepen beyond the historical exploration of colonial times encountered in primary school.

'The River and the Book' relates to many aspects of this depth study. The experiences on the Pembar Plains discussed in the novel can be related to many indigenous histories around the world. Studying the English novel while students concurrently undertake the previously mentioned depth study in history allows students to form their own links in understanding. There is also great capacity to draw a stronger connection and design a Project Based Learning or a cross-curricula project.

By way of example students could:

- Design a museum exhibit on cultural theft.
- Create a 'Book' that tells the prophecies and histories of a chosen indigenous group.

- Create a comparative text that uses the experiences of their chosen cultural group and shows how these historically recorded instances are woven into the fictional narrative. (This comparison could be presented in a multimodal manner).

References

Croggan, A. (2015). *The River and the Book*. Walker Books, Australia.

NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA) for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales. (2012). [English K-10 syllabus](#).

NSW Education Standards Authority (NESA) for and on behalf of the Crown in right of the State of New South Wales. (2012). [History K-10 syllabus](#).

Witchard, J. (2017). [The River and the Book: Year 7 novel study. Riverstone High School, NSW](#).

How to cite this article – Witchard, J. (2020). SPaRK: The River and the Book. *Scan*, 39(5).

Learning in the time of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) – reimagining normal

Carole Hansen

Learning in the time of COVID-19 – reimagining normal

Carole Hansen, Quality Teaching Rounds (QTR) project advisor, reflects on what quality teaching looks like during challenging and changing times.

Fire, floods and a pandemic. Term 1 in our schools was unlike anything anyone could have predicted.

In a time of emergent learning, fast-paced changes and unforeseen challenges, teachers and school staff were tasked with the seemingly impossible – to adapt, deliver and stand on education’s frontline in a new and testing learning environment.

The pressure to get learning online or in mailed packages has seen a scramble for content and impossible deadlines, with many teachers challenged by a new way of teaching and learning.

So, what do quality teaching and learning look like at times like these? Is quality teaching a focus? I would argue that our focus never shifts – teachers are committed to maintaining high standards, and continually committed to learning that enhances the outcomes for our students and us as professionals. This has been a time for survival and adaptation (both of which we are very familiar with, as teachers). As such, I would like to offer some encouragement.

Examining learning from home through the lens of the quality teaching model

Rather than reinventing the wheel and adding to the recent noise, I would like to propose that we already have a tool to focus on quality. The quality teaching model (QT model) provides a comprehensive lens through which to analyse teaching. It also offers a shared language and understanding of what quality teaching and pedagogy might look like with our students.

By reimagining how we teach through this lens, we are not only re-shaping our thinking about face-to-face learning, but also our recent milieu – learning from home.

Here are 3 considerations:

Students are at the heart of what teachers do

This value is embedded in and across the QT model. I refer to social support, where we set the tone of the learning environment for our students. This has been demonstrated through the commitment of many across the state who have focused on embedding wellbeing lessons into their online learning platforms or hard copy packages. It's also been seen in the daily check-ins with students, and via the physical delivery of lesson materials to students without access to technology or the internet. I have heard of principals dusting off the old school bus to make deliveries in local areas! You are teaching valuable skills – resilience, online etiquette, adaptive learning, different ways of thinking, problem-based learning and flexible learning. As we see in the QT model, celebrate success in appropriate ways – small successes and small steps each day.

High expectations

High expectations drive us to push through glass ceilings and engage in conceptual risk-taking. Teachers have continued to reward and encourage such behaviours in the learning from home environment. Recent learning conditions **are** a challenge. The QT model highlights how teachers can challenge their own assumptions and preconceptions about the capacities of their students and their ability to engage in challenging work. Teachers are also setting an example of rising to the occasion for their students, asking them to adjust, but not expecting less at this time.

The holistic nature of the quality teaching model

The holistic nature of the QT model reflects the resilience of the profession – teachers work together endlessly and despite all odds, all the time. The model's elements inform each other. Consequently, whether you are focused on embedding clear and deep knowledge into your lessons, or bringing home the real life implications of connectedness, or facilitating skills for remote student direction via the screen, the teaching and learning of our teachers is consistently focused on elevating all the 18 elements over the course of our units of work.

These four key questions underpin the work of teachers:

1. What do you want your students to learn?
2. Why does the learning matter?
3. How well do you expect them to do it?
4. What are you going to get your students to do (or produce)?

And in regard to our current COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) context, I posit that it has been (adaptive) business per usual – teachers have a longstanding commitment to and focus on the delivery of quality teaching and learning. COVID-19 conditions have highlighted the invaluable nature of school staff, as well as the importance and significance of teachers' day-to-day work: the broadening of young minds.

In light of students' return to the physical classroom, I'm sure that many teachers are reflecting on the unique time of teaching that this year has engendered. What experiences are you proud of? What have you learned during the learning from home phase? And has it changed your practice now that students are back in school? Further reflection is available through the [Quality Teaching Rounds \(QTR\)](#) which utilises the QT model as a lens for shaping discussion and analysis of our teaching practice. [QTR professional learning workshops](#) have moved to an online format and are available now.

Teachers, I salute you! I echo the same sentiments of many across corporate department teams – thank you to our teaching and school staff. Your resilience as emergent frontline workers is admirable and noteworthy.

References and further reading

Collins, L. (2017). Quality teaching in our schools. *Scan*, 36(4), 29-33.

NSW Department of Education & University of Newcastle. (n.d.). Quality teaching online (NSW DoE staff). This website includes links to the Classroom Practice Guide, videos, articles and other resources supporting the quality teaching model.

University of Newcastle. (2020). Quality Teaching Rounds.

If you would like further information about the quality teaching model, please contact Allan Booth.

How to cite this article – Hansen, C. (2020). Learning in the time of COVID-19 (novel coronavirus) – reimagining normal. *Scan*, 39(5).