**Annelise Balsamo** - Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to the VCE Literature Study Design information webinar series. This is our second live webinar. And this one is on developing interpretations, which is Unit 3, Outcome 2, in the new study design. Our presenter tonight is Lee McQueen, a very experienced literature teacher. And she's going to guide you through the kinds of things that she thinks she'll do in her classroom around this new area of study, and just guide you through teaching and learning, as well as some assessment stuff.

And as we get going, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the many lands on which we're meeting tonight. I'm on the lands of the Wurundjeri people of the Kulin nation, and I'd like to pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. And in that spirit, I'd also like to acknowledge VATE and their role in supporting English teachers across the state of Victoria, but also supporting our work in the implementation webinar series and thank them for their time and their support of our work.

Just a tiny update to the study design. So, this is the new study design, not the current study design, but the one that will be implemented in 2023. We've just removed a sentence that actually came out of the old study design. It's on page 17 for text selection advice. And the sentence that's been removed is students must not complete more than two assessment tasks using the same text. With the new study design, this becomes a sort of slightly confusing sentence. The important thing to note, though, is assessment needs to be based on four texts selected from the annual VCE Literature Text List, plus an adaptation of one of those texts. You must select a fifth text from the text list, but it does not need to be formally assessed, and can be used to enrich student learning, including just for the sheer joy of reading and discussion.

Just in terms of logistics, if you want to ask a question, you can't unmute, but you can put it in the chat. So, if you go to the Q and A box and select all panellists, we'll be able to see those questions and answer them. Some of them may be answered verbally by Lee through her presentation, and some of them, we may answer in writing through the chat. So just keep your eye on that. Just in terms of what you've got, we've got this as a webinar happening now, and it will be recorded, and it will go up on our website. And in terms of finding those resources and the new Literature Study Design, you need to go to our study design page. So, on that page, there is the current study design, there is the new one, if you scroll down, and then there is a link to all the implementation materials, including on-demand videos and these recordings of the live webinars. So, I'd now like to invite Lee to her presentation. Oh, that's the. Sorry, sorry. That's the link, if you're interested in going to that page and finding all of that information. So, I'm now going to throw to Lee and thank her for the time that she's spent in this presentation. Thanks, Lee.

**Lee McQueen** - Thank you. Thanks, Annelise. Thank you, everyone, for coming, especially at this point in the year, when everything is very busy. I wanted to start by just referring to page 19 of the study design, which I have pasted here, and putting emphasis on the things that stood out to me as the key knowledge and skills. But also, what I really wanted to focus on on this slide was those use of those adverbs, those directions where it says, "Students first develop their own interpretations "of a set text. "Students then explore a supplementary reading. "Students develop a second interpretation, "and then they then apply "this understanding to key moments "from the text."

When I'm first looking at a new study design or looking at a new area of study, the first thing that I want to try to get a hold of is how that is going to look. How am I going to create a scope and sequence to build students' key knowledge and key skills across however many weeks and get to that outcome and have them experience as much success as possible in demonstrating the outcome. And I think that if you look at the adverbs here, they first do this, they then do this, students develop that, to then apply this understanding to key moments from the text, they're incredibly helpful to actually map that scope and sequence. Because it's providing the order in which the text, the text that you've chosen, the novel, the play that you use, is introduced, how that's worked with, and then when that supplementary reading is introduced. We'll go through that in a little bit more detail, but I think what this brings to the forefront is that this area of study is a layering of skills and knowledge. That we don't want students to be overwhelmed by the scope of the task or to have that inclusion of a supplementary reading occlude their own reading of the text first.

If you go back to the title of this area of study, I think it is most telling. It's called developing interpretations. Developing is an ongoing process that is scaffolded very deliberately across a number of weeks. So, I know that when I will be developing my scope and sequence for next year, I'll be returning to this and looking at those stages, looking at those adverbs, and say, "Okay, in this week, "what's the first thing they should be doing? "How long is that going to take? "They then need to do this. "How can I provide enough time "in order for those new areas "of knowledge and skills to settle with students? "Then what will they be required to demonstrate?" So, I just think that that is a really useful part of the study design from page 19. So, all throughout, what I've done is we decided the best way to present this, I think, is to put the current study design that we're all working to alongside the new study design.

And I think what we wanted to bring to the forefront is that there is a change, there is a shift. And I think that shift in the key knowledge and key skills into this new area of study is to address concerns, questions that people had about literary perspectives, the current Unit 4, Area of Study 1. And I think the new study design, this Developing Interpretations, from my point of view, takes the best parts of the existing study design, but provides, perhaps, clearer scope in terms of how students should be working with the text, how students should be working with what we might term critical literature, and what that should look like.

So, all throughout, I've tried to provide some colour coding so people can see, okay, this isn't all brand new. Things that I'm currently doing, approaches I'm taking, strategies that are working well for me could also work well with this new area of study, but also trying to emphasise some of the differences. And those differences are, I think, for the absolute betterment of this area of study. So let us deep dive into some of the familiar areas of knowledge that we're asking students to develop. I wanted to start by saying that text selection is key.

I know at my school; we are deep into text selection at the moment. There is a new, updated text list for literature. I think that the new text list, and then coupling that with the new study design, could be a good opportunity to pause and reflect on what's worked well to date and what hasn't worked well to date, what hasn't been a perfect marriage, perfect harmony, and perhaps rejig your texts if you think that that would be for the benefit of better aligning with the area of study. I like the phrase that the text you select should work with you. As a teacher, you need as much support as possible, and that text should be working with you to present to students the key knowledge and skills that you want to have them master. You want them to be able to use the text to work through these. So, I'm just encouraging people to maybe reflect on what text are you currently doing for literary perspectives? If that text is going off the text list, then, obviously, you'll be looking at something else. But if you're currently working with a text that you think isn't ideal for exploring some of the areas that I'm going to discuss today, then perhaps take that as an opportunity to refresh your course in that way.

So, from the key knowledge that's been in this area of study, the new area of study, the central focus is still on exploration of ideas. And I think that this term ideas are so important, and to delineate that from things like themes. Thematic study is very much an English, having your English hat on as a teacher. This reference to ideas is really about getting students to engage with the concerns presented in the text that they might be familiar with from their own lives, how texts represent their own lived experience, but also enduring concerns that we have in society. That idea of texts that are really engaging with the human condition.

And I think that the emphasis throughout this area of study on views and values and context is really central to being able to think, are the ideas in the text that I'm selecting rich? Are they going to engage my students? Are they both familiar, but in some ways, also a little foreign? To stretch our students' understanding is really important. So that idea, that idea of ideas, is so important that we are eschewing theme-based study and kind of, maybe really kind of trite character studies. The next part is that students' work is underpinned by an understanding of the ways language makes meaning. And this is our go-to in literature. So, our focus is on literary form features and language choices. And I'm going to talk a little bit more about that.

All texts on the literature text list are going to enable you to engage with that because, as I said, that's just what we do in literature. There is an emphasis on views and values being presented. And I think there is a real emphasis there on what views and values the author is seeking to endorse, challenge or marginalise. That is the wording that is given to us. And how language executes this purpose. This is really essential, that students are able to look at the views and values that exist within the world of the text, so whether it's a time period, whether it's a specific culture, but then also consider, well, what views and values is the author expressing on these? Are they endorsing the views and values that are within the world of the text? Are they challenging them? Are they showing them to be marginalised? And how is the language that they're using enabling expressing those?

So, it's really important that we are still thinking of texts for this area of study as a product of a historical, cultural context, but also as a vehicle by which authors comment on these. And I'm going to go into a little bit more detail later about some of the resources, strategies, teaching approaches that might help us illume both of those things for our students. But I think there is a clear emphasis in that key knowledge that the views and values is twofold, the views and values of the world of the text, and then the views and values that the author is bringing to those. So, to that end, and kind of in harmony with that, is context.

And context also features in two key ways in the new key knowledge. There's the context in which the text is set or written, and the ways in which this world is reflected in the text. So, there's the reference to assumptions and attitudes. There's, therefore, intimations of what systems or institutions are being represented in the text. So, I think one important thing that I'll want to be talking to my students about is how is the context reflected in a literal or explicit way? You might be doing a text that is very clearly set in a specific time period, or you might be using a text that is using things like metaphor, symbolism or allegory to allude to that context.

So, deciding how a text that chooses one of those and how you're going to help students have the language to identify the context. And then, also, unpack that, I think, will be really essential. And so, it's not just about identifying. It's then also analysing how it's represented. So, does the author try to celebrate or question or wholly destabilise that world that's being reflected? So, I mean, I'm a big fan of alliteration. I'm a literature teacher, but I do like that idea of reflected and represented, and students being able to say, "Well, this is the context that's being reflected." How am I seeing that? Am I seeing that in explicit literal ways? Or is it constructed through metaphor, symbolism, allegory and so on? And then how is it represented? And that's also part of the views and values, is even the tone in which these things are represented. Does that help us understand the commentary that that author is presenting?

So that's part of looking at the context in which texts are read. And it is part of our practise, that in literature, that texts are read and that they're reread. So, we're asking students to read bringing their own context, that idea of reader response. How did they understand the accuracy or limitations of a text's representations? How does their contemporary world view understand or perhaps even judge the inclusiveness of the world being represented in the text? And then we get to that supplementary reading. So, remembering when I went, that page 19, those stages, students first develop an interpretation. That is the reader response. How are they seeing the views and values of the text? How are they judging the inclusiveness, accuracy or limitations of the text in how it's representing that? And then the supplementary reading. Does the supplementary reading enrich, enhance, challenge the way that they then understand those aspects of the text? And does that supplementary reading bring a different historical, social or cultural perspective to it? I think that that's really.

The obvious example was when I used to teach "Heart of Darkness," using some of the Achebe articles and his commentary on "Heart of Darkness." So, I think that that is really important with their understanding of context. That there's the context in which the text is set and written, and then there's the context in which texts are read. And those things interact. But helping students move through those in quite a sequenced way, I think, is really important so that they don't conflate things and they don't muddle things. They don't assume that just because an author has created a world within a text, that, therefore, they are agreeing to that. That, therefore, they are endorsing that. Also, that they have time enough to bring their own reader response, bring their own context, their own world understandings to a text before that supplementary feeds into that.

So, I think that that's quite essential. I guess what is quite new between the current study design and the new study design, and what is going to stand out to most people, is moving away from the language where it says a literary criticism to a supplementary text. Now, this is going to, we're going to continue to build on this throughout the presentation, so I don't want people to think that I'm skimming over it in this moment. We'll continue to dive into that. But I think the thing that is really obvious here and we want to take the time to relay to everyone tonight is that we are moving away from that idea of applying a lens on top of a text. And what I've said here, instead, in my notes, is that it's moving away from applying a lens on top of a text to engaging deeply and critically with another reading of that text. And I think you need to find the vocabulary that will work for your students.

But I've said that I think essential to it is this new opportunity for a supplementary reading is an opportunity for students to grapple with those ideas in the supplementary reading or work through those ideas in the supplementary reading, negotiate those ideas in a supplementary reading. And then synthesise those and bring them back to the original text. So rather than that whole kind of visual metaphor that we were probably all acting out, of putting glasses on, putting on a lens, Marxism, feminism, post-colonialism, and reading the text that way, students are reading the text. They're reading for the context. They're reading for the views and values. They're reading for how their own reader response interprets those things. And then they are picking up a supplementary reading and really pulling that apart.

What I think is most telling is that this is sitting under key knowledge. I think one part of the old literary perspectives was people saw it only as a skill. Only as a skill in which students were expressing the lexicon of post-colonialism or the lexicon of feminism or whatever, to make sure that the assessor, whether it was their teacher marking the SAC or the assessor on the end-of-year exam, was understanding that that was the perspective they were bringing. This requirement about the supplementary reading is sitting under key knowledge because we want students to explicitly, deeply, critically deep dive into this supplementary reading. We want them to spend time with it. And whatever verbs you like, grapple, negotiate, reconcile, is really important. So, I've said here, there is still that clear requirement that students engage with an additional reading, which many of us were already doing, but this is now a supplementary reading. It is a single supplementary reading. It could be that one piece of literary criticism that you're already using with your students, if your text is still on next year, could be the perfect match. It does also say, and I'll talk about this a little bit later, that that supplementary reading could also be something that the teacher prepares.

It says, this is from page 19, "Examples of a supplementary reading can include "writing by a teacher, "a scholarly article "or an explication of literary theory." So, it very much could be something that you're currently using is the perfect match, or it could be that this is an opportunity for you to think about preparing, synthesising a number of readings that you've done with your class, and presenting that to students as one reading. What does not count would be a piece, and it says this again on page 19, that provides only an opinion or evaluation of the merits of the text. So, it wouldn't be enough for the supplementary reading to be like a review, effectively. You know, this is a really good piece. This is a bit of a shocker. I like this, but I don't like this. This supplementary reading should have literary integrity. If we're making it so forefront as a key knowledge component of the new study design, and also how that translates into the skillset of using that in their writing, I think it needs to be something of substance. That doesn't mean it needs to be something long, but it does mean that it needs to have enough for you to spend real significant time on it.

I think at the moment, a lot of teachers would be using some of those readings as students read them a little bit for homework, they take a few little bits away from it, and then it's back. The way I'm envisioning this is that students would spend a good amount of time really deep diving into it. So, we can talk a little bit about how I would use that later, but I just thought that that's important. And it is also the purpose of engaging with the reading, I do think is more explicit than it was in the old study design. It says that the supplementary reading can enrich, challenge or contest the ideas and the views and values and assumptions of the set text to further enhance students' understanding.

So, again, really considering what supplementary reading would be best. What is this actually going to bring to my students' understanding is so essential. Because it is just the single supplementary reading, you need to think, how is this going to be something, how can my students engage with the contention and claims of that piece? How can they negotiate with them? This is the dialogic nature of literature. How can my students read into that? How can they speak back to that? How is that piece talking to the set text? So as much as I kind of prefaced by saying choosing the right text is important, also surveying what supplementary readings are out there that can work together is essential. And I think, and, again, we'll will talk about this a little bit more later, I think that it's far more clear, again, at what point this comes into your teaching as you're working through that area of study, with the emphasis on Part B.

That's in the outcome on, let's move to the page, on page 21 of the study design. So, their engagement should be purposely scaffolded so they can make informed judgments about it. You shouldn't be, in my opinion, giving students, oh, this is the novel we're studying, and this is the supplementary reading from the beginning. We want them to have time to sit with the text themselves, to work through the language of the text, to consider how meaning is being made. And then we are giving them something that, ooh, maybe niggles at them. Maybe they're going to agree with, maybe they're going to want to outright reject, but it's that scaffolded, staggered introduction of this supplementary reading that I think is really crucial. So, we will come back to that.

But then, I guess, the next part is around the familiar skills from the old study design to this new study design. As before, there is that active engagement with the views and values of the text, identifying those, and then developing an interpretation of the author's views and values. The strategies for teaching students to unpack and synthesise additional sources are vital. We've all been doing this when we've been looking at literary perspectives, but I think even more so, as I just said, the skillset needs to be taught in a more direct and, I guess, patient manner.

Maybe I'm just reflecting on my own teaching here, but I think that you need to really ensure that you're taking students through that text. So that, for me, and we'll talk a little bit about how you can give students the skills to unpack, synthesise and critically apply those, rather than just that whole kind of idea of, oh, we're reading through this lens now. We'll read the whole text through that lens. It's about actually using it in a, I guess, a judicious and kind of judgmental way. Judicious in the sense that we're trying to find out, where does this additional supplementary reading apply? Where does it not apply? And also, judgement. Does it hold true? Does this actually accord with students' own rigorous, close reading of the text? Does this actually hold water if you like? So, when we're talking about some of the new skills, what I think is one thing that kind of stands out is that there is a more explicit emphasis on close reading.

And I think that if you have looked at the examiner's report over the past couple of years, there is, obviously, because the key knowledge and skills are different, slight difference in the way that students are engaging with section B to section A in terms of their methodology. Obviously, section B is called close reading, but with section A, sometimes you get the impression that students are surveying the text. That they're kind of up above it a little bit more, and they're not deep into it. And I think that's a product of that metaphor of we're seeing through the lens, and students feel the kind of compulsion to traverse the entirety of the text and talk in a broad, kind of sweeping terms about the perspective that they're working with. And I think here, there is more of an emphasis on returning to close reading. And with that language that says, "Explore the ideas of the text and the ways "in which they are presented."

On page 20 of the study design, there is further explication of what developing and producing an analytical response looks like. There's six dot points. And I really think those are quite essential to look at because they're almost, they help me visualise what should students be producing? What should their work look like? And to me, this reference to use quotation. This is the third, if you've got it in front of you, it's third from the bottom. Use quotations and examples to illustrate and support interpretations and assertions. Now, students were doing this for literary perspectives, they were doing this for section A, but this kind of emphasis wasn't there before. And so, I just think that there is a greater suggestion that students be doing more rigorous, close reading. And I think that's also illuminated a little bit in some of the requirements of the outcome, which we'll get to.

Yep, oh, so I've said here that students doing a secondary interpretation of a set text is kind of what we've always done, and I don't think we need to be afraid of this. We know that as students work through a text and we give them different ideas and we send them off to JSTOR or they just have a conversation with the person next to them, that their interpretations are constantly becoming enriched, that their interpretations are constantly becoming layered and more nuanced and more sophisticated. And they might even renege on some of the initial interpretations that they had in favour of a new one. But what I think is new here and explicitly being asked of us is to encourage student to consider how changing historical, social and cultural contexts becomes part of this, how this informs their interpretation.

So, this could be what the reading, the supplementary reading, brings. This supplementary reading could bring to students an appreciation of a cultural interpretation of the text that they hadn't considered. Or a contemporary piece commenting on the representations of a world stuck in a certain period of history that now might be problematic. Or maybe, instead, how that text was incredibly progressive for that time. So, I just think that that will also help me choose my supplementary reading, just because of that emphasis on changing historical, social contexts, it'll help me think about what supplementary reading? Kind of do two for one. What supplementary reading will help my students enrich, challenge or whatever I choose, their understanding of the text by bringing an appreciation of changing contexts to it.

So, it's very hard to break down a study design in such a discrete way because it all actually is in harmony and synergy with each other, but I think that's a really good, if you kind of have that in mind while you're thinking about your supplementary reading, I think that could be really worthwhile. So, obviously, the other revised or new skill is just having a look at the difference in language between the outcomes. And we will deep dive into the outcomes in a little bit. But we move from language like compare, analyse and evaluate different perspectives presented in literary criticism to apply and explore the conventions of presentation, discussion and/or debate, and develop and produce analytical responses. Then I do think that that, some people might look at that and say, "Ooh, that sounds similar." I think there's quite a difference there.

That idea of using something, use two different interpretations to inform their response, it still has that intimation of taking a lens and applying it on top. Taking what some people might call an ism, and just kind of layer it, rather than letting what I think is the new impetus, is to use the supplementary reading to have a debate with the text we've selected. How are those two interacting? I think that there's such a difference just between using something, which has such a kind of, and that's why I think sometimes we end up with crude interpretations by students. Oh, let me just apply a Marxist reading to this entire text. And they miss the nuance within the text. They miss how close reading can help them develop an interpretation of a text that's far richer than just transplanting something on top or transposing something on top.

Whereas, for me, that idea of discussion or debate is not only a thing that they're going to have to negotiate in their writing, i.e., the outcome is going to be asking them to almost talk. This sounds a bit crass itself, but talk to themselves around what was their initial interpretation and how has it evolved? But there's also a sense of debate between the supplementary reading and the text itself, and how they are in dialogue with each other. So we can definitely have a look at that in greater detail, but I just think that is, again, emphasising a slight difference in how that text, the skillset from just using a lens, using the lexicon of an ism, if that's what you were doing, to actually really getting into the guts of it, and students using a text to discuss how their interpretations change and how those two pieces of literature are in dialogue with each other.

So, this is where I wanted to talk about, I guess, what are some resources or strategies or things that I would want to prioritise in my teaching? So, before we get to the outcome, how do I want to teach? What do I want my kids to be doing and what things do I want to be giving them? And I will say that this work really begins in Unit 2. So, if you are the year 12 teacher, and there's another teacher who teaches year 11, I would encourage you to share the notes that you're taking tonight or watch this recording together because VCE is a two-year course. Year 12 teachers can't work magic. They need to have those seeds planted from year 11.

And just before we jumped online, I had a very quick look back at the Unit 1-2 course, just trying to look at, okay, where does the key knowledge and skills that I'm presenting tonight for this area of study align with Unit 1-2? And they do. And I think that Unit 2, Area of Study 2, the text and its context, could be a good opportunity that if there's specific skills that we're asking of students in this, around context, historical, social, cultural context, understanding, identifying how a context is constructed by an author, and then also how it's being represented by that author. Is it being endorsed, challenged, wholly destabilised, whatever? That could be a good opportunity to plant that seed.

So, if you're the only literature teacher, you probably see that common thread, but if you've got another colleague teaching in year 11, I would be having a discussion with them and saying, "Look, "how can we begin to plant some of those seeds?" Again, they feed into each other. We should never be trying to make Unit 1-2 identical to Unit 3-4. That is not the intention. The intention is just to plant a few of those little skills, a few things around language, so that students can continue to build those over the course. So, I do think with that new kind of emphasis on how language makes meaning, how these ideas are represented, students will obviously need to really expand and master their vocabulary. They need vocabulary that exists around the metalanguage of form.

So, are you choosing a play? Is your novel of a particular genre? Are you doing poetry? This will be essential. So, picking your text matters because you need to think around, well, what metalanguage of form will I have to be teaching my students, and how will I get them to have a strong vocabulary? Is it around teaching them note-taking skills? Matching their vocab to examples in the text versus word banks and lists. I think word banks and those big lists that sometimes you can download offline, students have no sense of application. So, I really would prioritise note-taking skills. And as they're developing their vocabulary, they're also being asked to find examples within the text where they can use that vocabulary. I think those word bank and lists can really derail a student's writing because they think it's all just about kind of spit balling us words and jargon.

All of this only has meaning if they're able to use it accurately and apply it in a way that's unpacking it. Of course, the lexicon of close reading, how they deal, analytical verbs. And then, also, on top of that, the language to unpack the connotations of word choices that our authors have used. They need time and practise to move from that kind of process of identifying, particularly if you're working with a genre or a text type for the first time that students will be very unfamiliar with, to analysing.

So, this is part of developing that scope and sequence. I would want my students to be quite comfortable with the metalanguage of form and to have good close reading skills before I introduce that supplementary reading. I would want them to be able to work with the text as it is in quite an accomplished way before I added the second layer to that. Because all they're going to do, then, all of a sudden, is feel like they have to parrot or appropriate what's in that supplementary reading, whereas they need to have the confidence to express their ideas and the competence to express their ideas before that gets laid in.

So, I think that should be an essential kind of moment in your scope and sequence, how students are going to demonstrate to you that they can do that before you introduce that supplementary reading. Students will also need to be able to develop a nuanced appreciation and articulation of the views and values presented in the text. They really need help on how to draw these out from close reading. It's a problem that students have, that they think that the views and values come first. And they want to lay the views and values on top of their interpretation, whereas, actually, their interpretation should draw out the views and values.

So, I think that modelling structure and placement of these is so crucial. There is the requirement that students are undertaking. So, say, can I find it? It's the last dot point on page 20. Logically sequenced, cogent and fluent. So, students need to be developing their ideas, developing their interpretation through sustained analysis of language, to then present the views and values of the text, to then discuss those.

So, I do think that modelling structure and placement of views and values is essential so that students don't get lost in presenting us heaps of information about context, and then just laying on these views and values. And we're left saying, "How? "Where did you get there? "How is that shown?" And as I said, depending on your text, distinctions may have to be drawn between the narrator of the text, the protagonist, a speaker, and an author. These are all things that students have to negotiate. That just because a character's proposing certain ideas doesn't necessarily mean that the author themselves is endorsing those. That conflation of, which we always get in poetry, of the speaker with the poet, could become a problem here if the students conflate a character in a play or a character with the novel with the voice of the author.

They need to actually go back to that idea of how is something reflected versus represented will be really crucial. Learning around the text context. It's always something that we're having to deal with, but how will this inform and frame their reading? Again, not occlude it. You have to think about your text and decide what approach is best. There are certainly texts which can be very difficult to even get into without doing a little bit of front loading of context. It could be a doco, it could be a presentation, could be a few images. But there are other texts where I think students really benefit from being thrown into it, being thrown into that world, coming to terms with it themselves, and then drip-feeding bits of context, then illuminating what some of these things are.

So, I just think sometimes that really intense front loading, spending a week or a week and a bit on let me give you the whole context of both the world of the text, the literary movement, the genre it represents, all the sudden, it can lead students into writing history essays, autobiographical pieces, or just forgetting the methodology, which is we are drawing this information from the language of the text first. So, you would know your text best, but I think thinking about, do I always need to do that? Or can I drip feed those little bits to the students? Or can I deal with them when we get to that moment of allegory or that moment of metaphor or symbolism? Or when something's explicitly referenced, is that a good moment to then enhance their reading with that?

So, bringing to the forefront, as I said, how the context is represented, why the author has done it. It could be useful for students to develop some character mapping skills so that if you've got specific figures in a text, are they embodiments of certain assumptions and attitudes? I always like to think, what happens to them? What is the fate of these characters? It usually tells us what the author thinks of them. Could be that they're condemning them, or it could be a kind of tragic, kind of poignant point that they're making around the inevitability of this person's fate. So, I think that that can be really useful. And I think also graphic organisers that align the portrayals of certain systems and institutions with their real-life counterpoint but having evidence from the text that illustrates that.

So, we don't get this really turgid, this represents this, this represents this, or a little bit of a Wikipedia backlog of what this actually represented in real life. That would miss the point entirely of this. So now we are getting into, moving closer and closer towards the outcome. So, as I said, careful consideration needs to be given when selecting this supplementary reading and what it will offer students' reading. First and foremost, in my mind will be, will my students be able to engage with it? On a very literal level, is the language accessible to them? Are the ideas relevant to them? This doesn't mean that you can't pick a literary article, this doesn't mean that you can't push, but you know your student cohort.

And I do think that that flexibility of having a teacher-written piece could really support those cohorts of students who have struggled to engage with literary perspectives because some of the critical literature has just, to them, been quite impenetrable. So that's going to be forefront in my mind. Will my students really be able to dive into this with my assistance, okay? I obviously want to stretch them with this reading, but with my assistance, will it be accessible to the students in my class? That language here that I've said around its ability to be used by students to revisit, revise or reaffirm their reading. It really needs to add more. I think that even though there's the opportunity to, the text could enrich their reading in the way that it supports an idea that they've already got going on, it supports their interpretation, it could be one that asks them to go back and revise. And actually, they go, "Oh, I didn't see that. "That's exactly how it is. "I really agree with that interpretation." Or it could be reading that they think, no. I don't think that quite holds true. And that will help them reaffirm their own interpretation.

But what I think is most important is that you are picking a text that, even if it's posing questions, even if it's challenging students' reading, it is complementary and that it's going to work with the direction that they're kind of already on a little bit. That it's working with their trajectory. You don't want students totally contradicting their reading to the point where they're confused. I think a piece that challenges their reading, and they think, that's supplementary reading, I don't agree. Clearly, the language in the text is telling us this. Clearly, this is the. And they're able to double down on their interpretation, that's a wonderful thing. When a student can challenge a piece of critical literature, isn't that just so exciting? But you don't want a piece that, as my students are obsessed at the moment with the word discombobulates, whatever.

Like, please don't write that, guys. You don't want a piece that discombobulates them, and they go, "Wait, what? "Have I been reading this all wrong? "Oh, my God. I don't understand." That's not the end goal. There's a trajectory. You know, as the teacher, I've selected the text for this reason. I've selected the supplementary reading for this reason. How is that going to work to kind of help? They need to chug along. You don't want it stalling them, and them just feeling like totally confused. So that's why I think a written piece by the teacher may be able to bring all of those things together. If you can't find the perfect supplementary reading, a synthesis that the teacher undertakes from multiple pieces or kind of rewriting or selection or elision of a reading out there could be the go, could be what really helps your students with this.

So, I've said there, how can we help students do this? How can we help them unpack and synthesise this in a really meaningful way? They need to avoid turgid comparison. This article says this, but my interpretation is this. Initially I thought that, but actually, now I think this. It should be critical engagement. So, assuring that students are applying the reading to the text.

So, if the supplementary reading that you select doesn't have lots of rich close reading itself, I would be asking students to have two side by side. I would be asking them to be working back and forth, okay? So, if the contention is this in the supplementary reading, guys, let's find some evidence to either see if that holds true or that doesn't hold true. This is one of their arguments. What do we think? Where can we see evidence of that? Where is that idea challenged?

So, the two need to constantly be out in front of them. And some type of recordkeeping, I think, will be absolutely essential. They can't just exist discretely because that's when students are like, "This says this, and this says that. "Initially I thought this, but then this article said that." How do they work together to help students present a cogent, cohesive and compelling reading? I'm really, I'm loving the alliteration tonight. Okay, so, one kind of helpful thing when I was trying to conceptualise the outcome. Clearly, what is not there is a requirement that students explicitly reference or cite the supplementary reading. So that's kind of how it is at the moment with literary perspective. Students don't have to explicitly cite the reading.

So, I just think that that's something to note. They could, but they don't have to, okay? Students need to come to terms with the ideas and positions or contention and claims in the piece. And as I've kind of intimated, this could either be by showing how the reading holds true. So, through their own close reading, can they show that the ideas, the claims, the contentions being presented in this supplementary reading actually have weight? Can that actually enrich and extend their own reading? Or has the reading that they've been given, once they undertake rigorous close reading of the text, can they say, "Actually, you know what? "I don't think that supplementary reading's quite right. "I think that the language of the text "is actually revealing this about the author's intention. "I think the portrayal of the context "is actually like this."

So, I think that you need to decide which way you're going to go. Now, of course, there'll be pieces that are a little bit in the middle, a little in the grey. The students might say, "I agree with that, but not with that." But I think purposeful selection, knowing why you are selecting the supplementary reading and what you want students to get out of it, will they find that it holds true? Will they find that it doesn't really hold true? Or will they find a space of negotiation in the middle? I think is really essential. So, they'll need some guidance around appropriate structures for writing their responses, which we're going to talk about in a little bit. But I think, depending on the text and the reading you're providing, that requirement of comparison and interweaving could look different. So, again, I'm not going to say it's a case-by-case basis, but depending on what you're working with, how students' writing will look will vary.

So, providing models for students, and different models for students at different entry points and skill level, will be really important. And I do think that, to come back to that language around discussion and/or debate, you will need to give students things like sentence stems to prompt that critical analysis. Or language that signals that, for example, how they're negotiating those ideas, will be really important. How they're picking up the ideas in that supplementary reading and challenging those, or themselves using those to continue their interpretation.

So, I think vocabulary of discussion and debate within their writing to present the cogent interpretation will be pretty essential. Okay, so, I'll get through this little part. I'm looking at the time and going, "Yikes." Okay, so Outcome 2, as discussed on page 21 of the study design, it's worth 50 marks. It has two elements. It can be done as one SAC, or it can be done as two SACs. Part A is an initial interpretation of the text's views and values within its historical, social and cultural context. Part B is a written response that compares and interweaves. Oh, sorry, and slash interweaves. And analysis. An initial interpretation with the subsequent interpretation, using a key moment in the text. And also with the reminder, students can do an oral presentation for this, as well, if they choose.

So, questions. If you were to split the outcome, things that you would have to ask yourself. So, if you wanted students to do Part A and Part B as two different tasks within Outcome 2, so Outcome 2A and Outcome 2B, when are you going to introduce the reading? When would each SAC be? How long will each SAC take? How to divide the marks, I think, is an interesting one. Certainly, if I was to be splitting them, Part A is a more straightforward task than Part B, so I don't know if I would necessarily be weighting them evenly. I would think about the kind of, the intellectual and cognitive workload required. That Part B, it's a more challenging task and it'll certainly probably end up being a more lengthy task, I could imagine.

So, I don't think I would be splitting those marks evenly, but Annelise might have something to add to that. And then, also, how will students be given the opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills between the two SAC tasks? So, if you are splitting the SAC, are you giving enough time in between for students to actually develop their knowledge and skills, or will they just end up having two SACs butting up against each other? And that key scaffolding of the supplementary reading and how that's adding to their own interpretation, will there be enough time for that or not?

So, some ideas for Part A could be responding to a passage. Now, I've suggested here, early in the text may be ideal because I think it provides an opportunity for an early but established interpretation to then be enriched by the supplementary reading. They could do this as an oral, and they could also submit a written piece. You may also think that it could be a good idea, if they're just doing a written piece, to give students a kind of topic or prompt to guide that piece of close reading for Part A. Then for Part B, if you were to do that as a separate part, they could draw on and build from their Part A response. There is the requirement, as it says, to compare and interweave their initial interpretation with a new one.

So, students could possibly respond to the same passage. Use a topic or a prompt to guide that. I could imagine, and I could see this working quite well, that the topic or prompt you give them includes a quote from the supplementary reading, because then it is actually prompting them and reminding them to engage in a critical manner with that, even if it's something that they're going to want to challenge. They don't necessarily have to agree with it. I could also see working really well students actually using a different passage to the first one.

So, if in Part A, you've used a passage early on, I could imagine then for Part B, using a second passage. So, students are traversing the text a little bit more. And that their comparison isn't just like, oh, I thought this, but then that. I thought this, but then that. Initially, this was their interpretation, and now it's been enriched. And what is the new understanding they can bring to this later part of the text? I think that if I was to be splitting them, I would be doing that. I wouldn't want students necessarily doing two SACs just on the same passage. If you're not splitting the outcome and you just want to do it as one 50-mark SAC, that same thing exists, when will the reading be introduced? But I think most importantly is what preparatory assessment hurdles will you be asking students to do? If you're not staggering their skills and their knowledge in a really explicit way through them doing practise writing, I think their SAC could be messy.

There's so many moving parts that they need some things. More than just prac SACS, I guess, is what I'm saying. And what I think is most essential, and I'm going to definitely be considering this, because I haven't fully decided, but maybe I'm thinking of just doing it as the one task, I'm not sure, is how will students keep a record of their learning? Because in this task, they have to do their initial and then subsequent reading, how are we going to ensure that they actually have a record of those initial interpretations, that kind of gut reader response and then their negotiation?

So, a reading journal, note-taking, question, initial passage analyses that they can look back on, that will be essential. So those are those hurdle tasks that they're really going to have to meet. And, again, you would know your cohort best and whether they will be able to sustain that. How will they be given an opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills across of it? How long will it take, and how will their responses look? What does a logically sequenced and cogent and fluid piece look like?

So, I guess this is my, I think, my second to last slide, which is responding to a passage in the text. So, this is a requirement. It says, "A key moment in the text. "Students compare their initial reading of the text "with a subsequent one." And, again, they could do this in oral presentation and then submit a piece of close reading to accompany it. You could give them a topic or a prompt to also guide them. I think that's it. I think that's all I wanted to say. I've already said so much about this like text selection and canvasing supplementary reading. So, I think that's it. Yeah.

**Annelise Balsamo** - Amazing. Thank you so much.

**Lee McQueen** - I haven't time there at the end. Sorry, everyone.

**Annelise Balsamo** - No, it's fine. It's really inspiring to hear the kinds of thinking that you've got for your classes and your classrooms, and the way that you're really considering the sort of nuance and the vision, I guess, of this area of study. So, it was just great. Thank you so much. You've got a little bit of love in the chat here. Just, there's one final question about sample responses. We don't publish sample responses. We will be publishing performance descriptors or rubrics, and there will be advice for teachers coming. And any responses that we publish would be part of the external assessment reports that come at the beginning of next year. If you want to get in contact with me. Is there a contact slide? Is there a contact-

**Lee McQueen** - There is.

**Annelise Balsamo** - Lee? You can get in contact with me. There are my details there. I'm really happy for you to call me or to email me, and happy for you to get in touch whenever. Thank you so much for all attending. As Lee suggested, it's a difficult time. We're aware of that but thank you for your time. This will be recorded, and it will be up on the implementation website in about two weeks. Thanks again for everybody, and thanks again, Lee.
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