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Introduction

The State Government's *NSW 2021 Plan*, a 10-year plan, sets out seven targets aimed at improving education and learning outcomes for all students. Two of the targets are aimed at increasing the proportion of students in Years 3, 5, 7 and 9 above the national minimum standard for reading and numeracy, and at increasing the proportion of students in the top two performance bands. To achieve this, the Government has agreed to implement a *NSW Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan*.

The Ministerial Advisory Group on Literacy and Numeracy (Advisory Group) was established in July 2011 for a three year period in order to provide expert advice on early literacy and numeracy learning. This includes developing an *Initial Framework* (Framework) and the *Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan* (Plan) and reporting on the performance of the Plan.

In August 2011, the Minister approved the Initial Framework in order to progress the development of the Plan. Step 1 of the Framework included a structured process to seek evidence from the three education sectors, stakeholders and providers of literacy and numeracy intervention programs.

This report examines the evidence submitted with the view to providing the Minister with advice on which interventions in literacy and numeracy work best with children with different types of learning needs, and which of them give best value for money.

Chapter 1 details the consultation process, noting in particular the iterative nature of consultation undertaken with the three educations sectors - Association of Independent Schools of NSW (AIS), Catholic Education Commission of NSW (CEC), and the Department of Education and Communities (DEC).

Chapter 2 provides a commentary on the responses from the education sectors in response to the key questions posed in Step 1 of the Framework.

Chapter 3 provides a synthesis of the evidence received from stakeholders and a range of providers of literacy and numeracy intervention programs. This chapter also discusses advice submitted by stakeholders which was outside the scope of the first step of the Framework.

Chapter 4 outlines the conclusions reached by the Advisory Group and suggests a strategy through which to produce real growth in literacy and numeracy performance for all students, including those students at risk of not achieving national minimum standards in literacy and numeracy.

Chapter 5 suggests a way forward for action in 2012.

In proposing this action the Advisory Group notes that students in NSW continue to perform well in National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) assessments in comparison to students in other states and territories. In 2011, NSW ranked in the top three for mean scores and percentages in the highest band on all National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) assessments except Year 7 and Year 9 writing. NSW students also had the highest NAPLAN participation rates.
Nevertheless, the Advisory Group considers that there is room for further improvement, in particular for those NSW students who are below or just above the national minimum standard.

With stronger literacy and numeracy skills students are better able to engage effectively in a broader range of subjects and can better acquire those higher order skills vital for learners in the 21st century.

The conclusions reached in this report are positioned within broader reforms occurring in the implementation of educational programs both within New South Wales, nationally and internationally. Of particular significance is the Council of Australian Government’s initiative aimed at establishing a national evidence base of effective literacy and numeracy practice in Australian schools.

The Advisory Group has also noted the concurrent Auditor-General’s Performance Audit of Aboriginal Literacy in NSW public schools; the concurrent evaluation of eight literacy and numeracy interventions implemented in NSW schools as part of the Smarter Schools National Partnerships; and the move to local decision making in schools and greater principal autonomy.

Within this context, NSW performance in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 assessment of students reading, mathematical and scientific literacy skills was noted, as was Australia’s overall ranking and assessment results. Also considered of significance for the work of the Advisory Group was the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 2012 report, *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools* and the Grattan Institute’s 2012 report *Catching up: Learning from the best school systems in East Asia*.

---


5 Accessible from [http://www.oecd.org/document/42/0,3746,en_2649_39263231_49477290_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/42/0,3746,en_2649_39263231_49477290_1_1_1_1,00.html)

1. Consultation

1.1 Education sector consultation

Following the release of the Initial Framework, evidence was sought from chief executives of each sector on current approaches to addressing low attainment in literacy and numeracy, with particular, although not exclusive reference to, the early years of schooling. The four key questions asked of each sector are included in Appendix 1.

Initial evidence from sectors was provided in a number of ways:

- presentation of evidence by senior officers from the CEC, AIS and DEC at Advisory Group meetings in 2011
- submission of written evidence following initial invitation in August 2011
- submission of written evidence in response to individual questions for each sector as requested in October 2011.

A draft report on the evidence provided by the education sectors was prepared by the Advisory Group. In November 2011 it was referred to each of the chief executive officers for confirmation of the accuracy, comprehensiveness and fairness of the summary of responses.

Following receipt of the chief executive officers’ responses, in December 2011, the sectors were provided with a further opportunity to submit evidence:

- telephone interviews were conducted with CEC Diocesan offices
- discussions were conducted with the CEC Education Policy Subcommittee
- discussions were held with AIS officers
- submission of additional DEC advice in response to specific questions regarding evaluations of literacy and numeracy interventions and Best Start.

A final draft report incorporating all evidence submitted from the education sectors and stakeholders was prepared by the Advisory Group. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of this draft was given general endorsement by the chief executive officers of the education sectors.

1.2 Stakeholder consultation

In addition to the education sector consultation 40 stakeholders and providers of literacy and numeracy intervention programs nominated by the Advisory Group were invited to submit evidence.

Twenty written submissions as summarised in Table 1 were received (50 per cent response rate). Appendices 2 and 3 provide further details of the respondents.

In addition to submissions from invited stakeholders and providers, submissions were received from two commercial interests and an individual school volunteer (see 18-20 in Table 1). Of the twenty written submissions received, the Advisory Group invited eight respondents to make formal presentations at the 14 November 2011 meeting of the Advisory Group:
- NSW Primary Principals’ Association of NSW (Mr Geoff Scott and Mr Phil Seymour)
- Public Schools Principals’ Forum (Ms Cheryl McBride)
- Australian Literacy and Numeracy Foundation (Mr Eric Brace)
- The Exodus Foundation (Rev. Bill Crews, Ms Glenys O’Riley, Mr Jim Munro)
- *Reading to Learn* program (Dr David Rose)
- Australian Association of Special Education (Dr Meree Reynolds, Ms Heather Martin)
- Multilit Pty Ltd (Professor Kevin Wheldall, Dr Robyn Beaman -Wheldall and Mr Iain Rothwell)
- International *Reading Recovery* Trainer Organisation (Ms Jann Farmer-Hailey).

### Table 1: List of stakeholder respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals’ groups</th>
<th>1. NSW Primary Principals’ Association of NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. NSW Secondary Principals' Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Schools Principals’ Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Association of Heads of Independent Schools Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSW/ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent organisations</td>
<td>5. Federation of P&amp;C Associations of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PARED Foundation (Parents for Education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher union</td>
<td>7. NSW Teachers’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory authority</td>
<td>8. NSW Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education interest groups</td>
<td>9. National Independent Special Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Association (NISSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. NSW/ACT Synod Uniting Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Australian Literacy and Numeracy Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Australian Association of Special Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. International Reading Recovery Trainer Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Multilit Pty Ltd, Macquarie University Research Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reading to Learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Learning Links</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community provider</td>
<td>17. The Exodus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual volunteer</td>
<td>18. Manly Village Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial enterprises</td>
<td>19. LEXIA Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Kinetic Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **What did the education sectors say?**

2.1 **General comments**

Each of the sector responses provided specific contextual information in relation to:

- demographic profile of students, teachers, regional or diocesan and local communities, including learning outcomes data trends (eg, NAPLAN, Best Start), other quantitative data (eg, AEDI, ICSEA) and qualitative data
- decision making capacity/levels of autonomy of schools or dioceses (ie, models for administration and governance structures)
- policy contexts, including priorities and targets.

The documented efforts of schools, dioceses, regions and the sectors themselves are useful contributions for consideration in the building of an evidence base.

In response to the *Framework* the CEC and AIS stated some concerns about the allocation of the available resource within the *Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan* and the relative numbers of government and non-government schools that may receive benefits under the Plan.

Each sector noted the need for the identification of individual students or cohorts of students at risk in schools, to be based on available data, including, but not confined to, NAPLAN data. Other data cited by the AIS and CEC included student background characteristics (disability, language background, socio-economic status, geo-location) and relevant K-2 data. The CEC in particular noted the possibility of cross tabulating community and school data available from the Australian Early Development Index (AEDI) with NAPLAN data.

Generally, there was more evidence provided in terms of literacy interventions than numeracy interventions. Sectors provided a range of information related to a small number of specific evaluations or reviews of literacy and numeracy intervention programs. This information was provided in support of sector judgements of the effectiveness of the particular intervention program, or to show how intervention program implementation improvements had been made. Increasing attempts to embed intervention programs within school improvement processes were noted within the DEC submission and a number of Catholic diocesan discussions.

The three sectors outlined approaches consistent with a three tiered approach to intervention:

- **tier one** - personalisation of learning in the classroom with instruction aligned to syllabus outcomes
- **tier two** - small group or individual intervention for students at some risk of not achieving expected levels in literacy or numeracy.
- **tier three** - intensive work with individuals at high risk. Such interventions are longer term, individualized and sustained.

---

7 All sectors noted that this approach was often referred to as the *Response to Intervention* model. For a detailed description see [http://www.rti4success.org/](http://www.rti4success.org/)

---

Outcomes of consultation
The DEC, AIS and a number CEC diocesan offices submitted details of costings for a number of interventions programs. The bases on which the costings were estimated varied extensively – some included per student costs while other costings were calculated on a per teacher or per school basis, but generally without on-costs. Little comparative data on the efficacy and cost effectiveness of interventions programs was provided.

There was a suggestion by the CEC that low performing schools should seek to reflect the approaches taken by high performing schools. The DEC acknowledged this, noting however that it may be a challenge to replicate all the circumstances of high performing schools in low performing schools. The DEC argued that the characteristics common to high performing schools worth replicating included high standards and expectations for all students, effective leadership, high levels of collaboration and communication, curriculum, instruction and assessment aligned to the quality teaching framework, supportive learning environment and effective family and community involvement.

Substantial additional information8 on the possible use of cost benefit analysis and econometric cost functions in assessing the effectiveness of education programs was provided by the AIS and the Catholic Education Office, Lismore.

2.2 Instructional leadership and teaching and learning

Cornerstones of instructional leadership and classroom and school practice that were common in the sector responses have been summarised as follows:

Leading quality teaching and learning

- evidence-based literacy and numeracy strategies/interventions that reflect the principles of explicit and systematic planning and instruction
- literacy and numeracy assessment tools and practices that are curriculum-based and located within a known standards framework (eg, literacy and numeracy continuums)
- authentic, connected and culturally appropriate learning experiences that take account of variables related to the learner (eg, ESL, special needs) and context (eg, geographic location)
- supportive learning environments for students and teachers that promote knowledge integration, intellectual rigour and high expectations for students, teachers and parents
- sound approaches to program monitoring, evaluation, reporting and dissemination.

---

8 Of particular interest to the Advisory Group:
Building classroom and school community capacity

- integrated, whole school approaches to implementation of teaching and learning practices, reflected in “school-based improvement plans, supported by improvement strategies”

- ready availability and access to a range of evidence-based and well critiqued interventions from which to select (with support materials and teaching resources), to address the particular needs of identified students

- provision of ongoing and high quality professional learning for teaching staff to support improvements in literacy and numeracy, including professional learning, data analysis, innovative pedagogical practices and access to mentoring and coaching from expert classroom practitioners strong home, school and community partnerships to support improvements.

The Advisory Group agrees strongly with the importance of these cornerstones.

2.3 Key Questions

The following is a summary of and commentary on the responses sectors made to each of the four key questions asked by the Advisory Group (see Appendix 1).

Question 1:

*How is low attainment in literacy and in numeracy first identified in schools? Are you confident that all children requiring special attention are identified, and are subsequently given such attention? If not, what proportion do you think is being reached?*

- The sectors outlined the diverse ways in which schools and systems use NAPLAN as a key source of data for the identification of students needing additional support in literacy and numeracy.

- The CEC and AIS submissions indicated that there was no single systemic or common approach to the identification of low attainment in literacy and numeracy in schools. However, overviews of various programs and strategies that teachers use to assess students, including formal diagnostic tests, were provided. Both the CEC and AIS noted that analysis of NAPLAN performance was critical to decisions made at school authority and school levels with regard to resourcing interventions and support.

- Assessment on entry to kindergarten of children’s skills in literacy and numeracy was undertaken using a diversity of assessment instruments. No standardised measure was common across sectors. Greater emphasis is placed on the assessment of literacy skills than numeracy skills.
• Half of CEC dioceses use Observation Survey of Literacy Achievement. In 2012 six of the dioceses have adopted the use of Best Start assessments – either through piloting with a small number of schools or full implementation with all schools. The use of ESL Scales is also common in dioceses.

• The DEC gave a detailed description of the ways in which schools use the Best Start Kindergarten Assessment, ESL Scales, the Literacy Continuum, the Numeracy Continuum and the School Measurement and Assessment Reporting Toolkit (SMART) to assess and then to support student improvements in literacy and numeracy.

• The value of the Australian Early Development Index (AEDI) was affirmed, as was the potential for it to be more closely linked with other data, including NAPLAN, to assist teachers and schools to better understand the needs of children as they begin school.

• The AIS noted that since the Association did not hold these data, only individual schools were in a position to answer this question appropriately and that consequently the overall sector proportion of students not receiving attention was not known centrally.

• The AIS noted that through the targeted support the Association provides to schools, in particular to schools in disadvantaged areas or with students at risk, independent schools use data to screen student’s needs to target student level achievement, and to demonstrate progress.

• The CEC’s response noted that the dioceses included frequent reference to structured data analyses (NAPLAN), implementation of Best Start (although not universal across dioceses) and implementation of strategies such as the placement of Learning Support Teachers in schools as effective in supporting students at risk.

• Some dioceses were confident that the assessment procedures being used in schools were effective. Other diocesan responses made no mention of their confidence of assessment procedures being used, nor of the proportion of students not receiving, but who needed, special attention.

• The DEC was confident that the Best Start suite of resources, including the assessment tools and follow up materials (software to support Early Learning Plans), was widely and appropriately used and useful in terms of identifying students at risk in the early years. DEC states that because systemic quantitative data were not kept centrally for Kindergarten students, it could not quantify the proportion of students receiving timely and effective intervention to the level required.

• The DEC also noted that while it did not hold a central database of all students receiving support through intervention programs it did collect and hold data on students participating in Reading Recovery, one of its key initiatives.
• The CEC also noted that where Reading Recovery was implemented student achievement and participation data in the program were submitted to the DEC for monitoring purposes. The Catholic Education Office, Sydney noted that its model of implementation was closely aligned to the research of the teaching of reading with a focus on embedding the program within a whole school approach to literacy.

• The DEC flagged the future uses of the proposed Student Administration and Learning Management system for tracking and monitoring individual student learning data. This is an initiative with considerable potential to support evaluation, practice and policy.

• The DEC also reported that its Literacy and Numeracy policies are well supported through targeted professional learning opportunities, including leadership development, access to appropriate teaching and learning materials, including SMART, and infrastructure support through regions and state staffing and resourcing mechanisms.

• A number of CEC dioceses noted the embedding of annual literacy and numeracy plans within both school improvement and Diocesan effectiveness processes.

Question 2:

What intervention programs are in use in schools, in literacy and in numeracy? Follow up questions to sectors required, for each individual literacy and numeracy program: the name/aim, target year level, implementation issues, background, scope and scale of implementation, internal/external evaluation information including outcomes, program link with National Partnerships, funding information, cost considerations and total expenditure.

• All sector responses relied on some notion of differing levels of intervention – universal, targeted and intensive. The DEC and AIS defined the approach to intervention drawing on the Response to Intervention model.

• While some numeracy interventions were common across the sectors (Taking off with numeracy, [TOWN], Quicksmart, Count Me In Too), there was a clear emphasis on literacy interventions in submissions.

• Up to 24 individual literacy programs and initiatives were stated to be in use across the three sectors. Of these, the Focus on Reading (Years 3-6), Language, Literacy and Learning (L3), Accelerated Literacy, Reading Recovery, Reading to Learn and Multilit programs were the most common.

• Although there were comments about, and some discussion of the impact and cost of a range of these programs, there were few data provided to indicate the total expenditure on individual literacy or numeracy programs.

• The DEC argued that the models for implementation of various programs and the mechanisms for allocating funding made it difficult to disaggregate costs and to give a total overview of all costs associated with delivery. The Advisory Group was not persuaded by this argument.
In terms of scope and scale of program implementation, sectors reported that decisions on the interventions best suited to their students’ needs are made by schools, and based chiefly on:

- Information regarding the apparent efficacy of programs through either peer networks, system-provided information (regions or dioceses) or through eclectic access to summaries of research.
- Access to professional learning, to ensure program fidelity at implementation, and support teaching materials.
- Availability of appropriately trained teaching staff (which may or may not depend on targeted support, such as National Partnership funding).

The Advisory Group noted that in terms of the evidence submitted in relation to program evaluations:

- Sectors anticipated that the final evaluations for the Literacy and Numeracy and Low SES School Communities National Partnerships would be a source of information regarding Question 2 (the scope of implementation, including the number of schools implementing particular interventions and the number of students supported through particular interventions).
- Sectors often referred extensively to program evaluations conducted in other countries or to evaluations conducted by the developers or supporters of a particular intervention, such as MultiLit and QuickSmart. Although there were references to national evaluations, the Advisory Group was not provided with compelling evidence of substantial evaluations of program efficacy or cost-effectiveness undertaken in New South Wales, despite the availability of Basic Skills Tests results over a long term and the longevity of many of the interventions in use.
- Generally, the evaluation and research evidence provided was explained insufficiently by sectors and in at least one instance, the summarised conclusion included in the evidence was not supported by the cited evaluation itself.

The Advisory Group was of the view that the while the sectors provided a quantity of data tracking student performance, it had not been presented with evidence of comprehensive analyses of the long term effect of literacy and numeracy interventions.

The Advisory Group noted, but was not persuaded by, the DEC’s view that the tracking of the performance of Reading Recovery students in Basic Skills Test and NAPLAN over time did provide evidence of the success of the program. The Catholic Education Office, Sydney provided substantial data analyses of the performance of Reading Recovery students; having reviewed implementation of the program in 2005, it believed it was a successful intervention strategy. The Catholic Education Office, Broken Bay noted that its review of Reading Recovery conducted in the same year had shown that the program was meeting the needs of only a limited number of students. As a result the diocese had ceased its support for the program, instead moving to support student achievement in literacy and numeracy through focusing on lifting the capacity of teachers.

The CEC submitted a range of evidence that a number of dioceses approached the question of the efficacy of intervention programs through use of evaluation data. Such data were usually obtained through participation in university conducted research. Some
examples include the CEO, Armidale involvement in the University of New England evaluation of *QuickSmart*; CEO, Bathurst involvement in research being undertaken on the *DIBELS* program by Charles Sturt University in conjunction with the University of Oregon; and CEO, Broken Bay collaboration with the universities of Toronto, Auckland and the Australian Catholic University in order to improve student literacy and numeracy levels while improving teacher quality. No comparative data on the efficacy of cited or preferred intervention programs were provided by the CEC.

- The DEC advised that its approach to reviewing and evaluating K-2 literacy and numeracy programs was targeted to program improvement (both efficacy and durability). In 2001 and 2002, it had examined the impact of the *Count Me In Too* program on Basic Skills tests results in numeracy. Two other evaluations of the program conducted in 2004 and 2006 were used to further adapt implementation models to ensure long term sustainability of the programs.

- There was no analysis of the outcomes of targeted access and equity funding to schools. In its evidence, the DEC included a number of access and equity programs as literacy and numeracy intervention programs, such as the ESL program, Learning Assistance, Country Areas, Schools in Partnership and Priority Schools Programs. It did not, however, include an analysis of the impact of these access and equity programs on literacy and numeracy outcomes over time.

- In summary, the Advisory Group was not provided with adequate or sufficient evidence to identify the literacy and numeracy intervention programs that:
  - can be shown to have increased demonstrably literacy and numeracy learning relative to standard classroom practices, in NSW classrooms
  - have demonstrated immediate and sustained effects on literacy and numeracy learning relative to the other interventions
  - can be shown to work differentially for individual students or groups of students
  - are beneficial and “relatively” cost-effective.

Question 3:

*For each program, what is your judgement of its success as a strategy, the durability of its outcomes, and its cost-effectiveness as an intervention? Is it possible to rank the various interventions in literacy and numeracy in terms of these dimensions? Are there particular interventions which, in your view, should be expanded or reduced in scope and investment?*

- The Advisory Group was not presented with evidence to compare the various literacy and numeracy interventions in terms of efficacy or cost-effectiveness. The Advisory Group does not accept that comparative evaluation in these terms is inappropriate or impossible.

- The Advisory Group notes that DEC has done little to address the 2008 Auditor-General’s concern that DEC has not evaluated the efficiency and effectiveness of its literacy and numeracy programs.
DEC and a number of CEC dioceses reported a limited range of costs for implementation of some of the initiatives, but no specific evidence relating to the cost-effectiveness of either individual interventions or the total cost of interventions.

Where costings were provided, the basis on which they were calculated was unclear, and hence the real costs of different interventions could not be compared. There was no systematic or useful aggregation of:

- salary-related costs
- program implementation costs at school level and/or system level (administrative support, teacher release)
- costs associated with training/professional learning (materials/manuals, teacher release, travel, accommodation).

The AIS argued that, in demonstrating the cost benefit of a specific intervention, variations to implementation at the local level needed to be considered. Possible cost benefit approaches to assessing the effectiveness of literacy and numeracy interventions models were provided to the Advisory Group. These models have future potential for the development of a standardised approach to cost benefit and efficacy analyses of literacy and numeracy intervention programs.

The sector responses did not give a clear indication of the interventions that they thought should be expanded or reduced in scope and investment, although DEC stressed that scope existed for the expansion of the Best Start program.

The Advisory Group notes that the Best Start program is a relatively new suite of strategies and that DEC is collecting data from schools on an ongoing basis. While this is the case the Advisory Group is concerned that the DEC has not yet undertaken research or commissioned an external evaluation of the suite of Best Start strategies, although it does have a working proposal. The Advisory Group also notes that the six dioceses implementing Best Start have chosen to adopt a coordinated approach to the monitoring of student progress separate and independent to that used by the DEC.

The Advisory Group is not convinced that there is a sufficient body of valid research from within NSW to support the current heavy investment in Reading Recovery.

The role of schools in choosing to expand or reduce programs as necessary was acknowledged by all sectors.

The Advisory Group noted that no cross-sectoral data system was available to support the capture, storage and interrogation of student performance in external assessment programs. Nor was there capacity for correlation of such performance data with program efficacy.
Question 4:

*Having regard to our terms of reference, do you have any additional advice for the Advisory Group, particularly in relation to low attainment in literacy and numeracy in the early years of schooling?*

Each of the education sectors drew attention to some key issues for the Advisory Group to consider as it progressed with the development of the *Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan*. The key issues listed below are taken directly from the written evidence provided by each of the education sectors:

**Association of Independent Schools of NSW**

- Importance of context - impact of size of school, leadership, teacher capacity and community involvement
- Role of the principal as an instructional leader
- Building capacity of leadership - evidence based decisions, situational analysis, analysis of data to inform decisions, whole school community approach, mentor support and developmental leadership courses
- Teacher quality and choice of “programs” - building teacher capacity through professional learning, programs where appropriate (eg. *Multili* not suitable for comprehension intervention), mentoring and professional support
- Supporting leadership teams in using data within a situational analysis
- Building capacity of teachers in a whole school approach to literacy and numeracy in the syllabuses and across key learning areas
- Providing specialist mentor support (ESL, Special Education) for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions based on syllabus
- Tier 1 strategies need to support the maintenance of tier 2 and 3 approaches
- Accountability - ongoing monitoring and refinement, financial management
- Overcoming vulnerability - structured professional support to empower schools
- Need for effective literacy and numeracy instruction in schools to be guided by outcomes of research (for example, the Australian Government National Inquiry into the Teaching of Literacy (2005) and United States Government, Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children (1998).

**Catholic Education Commission of NSW**

- Efficiency should not be pursued at the cost of equity
- High-performing schools are those that attain higher outcomes than would be predicted from their demographic profile.
- High-performing schools can be identified and their achievement characteristics documented, shared and promoted
- Strategic intervention should enable low-performing schools to take on the characteristics of high-performing schools
- Individual schools can and do make a difference
- Systems can take a strategic approach to literacy and numeracy teaching and learning and each system can support whole-school change
• The particular needs of rural areas require focused support
• The particular needs of ESL students and schools require focused support
• External, self-contained literacy and numeracy programs may be helpful but they cannot substitute for holistic school-based improvement plans supported by system wide improvement strategies.

The CEC also advised that an effective intervention strategy can be developed applying the following ten propositions:

• NAPLAN and AEDI data can be used to identify high-performing schools.
• Best practice can be modelled and transferred from high to low-performing schools.
• School authorities can apply available performance data to implement interventions based on whole-school development strategies.
• Applying OECD advice from PISA assessments, successful strategies should include a focus on greater school autonomy.
• Strategic interventions should be consistent with an integrated, school-focused approach to teaching and learning.
• Strategic interventions need to be praxis-based and informed by school-based field studies.
• Strategic interventions need to address the particular needs of rural students.
• Strategic interventions need to address the particular needs of ESL learners.
• The key to successful strategic interventions is the deployment of teacher educators.
• School-based strategies need to be supported by intervention programs appropriate to student needs.

Department of Education and Communities

• Coherent systemic expectations for all students and a high performance and learning culture
• Closing the achievement gap linked to socio-educational disadvantage lies firmly in the continuous improvement of school cultures, characterised by:
  – High quality teaching
  – Effective instructional leadership
  – Evidence based action
  – Collaboration and commitment from all staff.

• An explicit framework to guide, scaffold and measure school improvement
• Coherent systemic support to provide, guide and evaluate their effectiveness of school, and classroom intervention
• Targeted professional learning strategies that build teacher and school leader effectiveness
• Student outcomes data that inform both student learning targets and teacher and school leadership strategies
• Conceptually rich evidence-based strategies to address the needs of those not achieving well and build teacher pedagogical content knowledge and instructional leadership
• Intervention strategies that are based on strong curriculum, assessment and pedagogical understanding and support students to succeed within the classroom
• Customised and differentiated strategies for all students underpinned by strong evidence
• Learning that leverages advances in communication technologies
• A strong and inclusive public education system that is enabled to ensure literacy and numeracy achievement for our highly diverse range of students.

The DEC also presented a possible model to support a coordinated systematic approach to improving literacy and numeracy learning in the early years which would include:

• building the capacity of school leaders to make informed decisions about how to best support the literacy and numeracy needs of students in their schools
• building the capacity of teachers to deliver quality teaching and assessment
• providing schools with the flexibility to enhance their delivery interventions
• building the capacity of teachers to identify, plan, program and implement teaching that personalises learning according to individual needs.
3. **What did the stakeholders say?**

3.1 *Diversity of views*

- Written submissions varied in the level of information provided in relation to literacy and numeracy interventions. Overall, there was a more intensive focus on literacy interventions than on numeracy interventions. There was general:
  
  - Support for the three tiered model of intervention at the school level encompassing universal, targeted and intensive provision. A number of submissions highlighted the *Response to Intervention* model.
  
  - Agreement on the primacy of timely, reliable and accessible student learning outcomes data, including school based and NAPLAN data sets, to drive selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of literacy and numeracy programs, strategies and interventions.
  
  - Support in submissions for the early identification of children at risk in literacy and numeracy. The principals’ organisations, for instance, submitted evidence regarding the commitment of school executives and teachers to make assessments of students’ skills and understandings in literacy and numeracy at Kindergarten and Year 1.
  
  - Commitment to implementation of evidence-based programs and interventions, appropriate to student needs, and of high quality teacher professional learning, provision of appropriate resources and teaching tools and implementation of data analysis and school monitoring and evaluation processes.

- Different views were expressed in relation to commonly implemented programs, strategies and interventions, including *Reading Recovery, Best Start Kindergarten Assessment, Count Me In Too, Multilit, Quicksmart* and *Reading to Learn*. To illustrate the diversity of commentary provided, the following summarises the views of the *Reading Recovery* program made by two separate respondents:

  1. The submission from the *International Reading Recovery Trainer Organisation* included data to attest to the program’s efficacy and cost effectiveness. The data presented showed that 75 per cent of students participating in the program exited having achieved improvements in reading ability, that is, students exited at peer age reading levels.

     In addition, data were presented to indicate that the *Reading Recovery* program had been continually modified since its introduction in order to better meet the needs of students. Changes had been made related to the:

        - complexity of texts children needed to be able to read
        - inclusion of word attack and phonics within the program
        - tailored approaches to meeting the needs of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.
The organisation also argued that the trajectory of growth in reading ability seen for individual students in Reading Recovery could not be expected to be shown through examination of NAPLAN data at a school level as the program is delivered to small groups of students. What was required, the organisation argued, was an examination of growth data for individual students.

2. The submission from the Australian Association of Special Education described Reading Recovery as “a popular intervention in NSW and other education systems, but, being a one-to-one program, is an expensive Tier 2 option. It does not have a systematic approach and is not as effective as often claimed.”

Commenting on the effectiveness of the Program, the organisation noted that in recent research⁹, some one third of the students in Reading Recovery would have made gains in reading without the intervention, and that phonics within the program was not taught systematically.

- Support was expressed in a number of submissions for a range of tools used in schools to support the implementation of literacy and numeracy intervention programs. These tools included:
  - Individual Education Plans (IEPs) or personalised learning plans
  - Support Teachers
  - Literacy and Numeracy continuums
  - other diagnostic tools to assess student need.

3.2 Efficacy of literacy and numeracy programs, strategies and interventions

- A range of data was presented in support of claims of immediate or shorter term positive impact of individual interventions on improved student outcomes. Longitudinal data to support claims of the success or effectiveness of interventions, in isolation from all other strategies that may impact on achieving durable student outcomes, were not as clearly evident in submissions.

- Particular submissions cited evaluations of literacy and numeracy interventions. Also cited was research, case study material or school testimonials. These citations were included to support claims of the effectiveness or success of the literacy and numeracy intervention that was the focus of the organisation’s submission. Not all citations however were independently derived, related directly to NSW schools or systems, or related to the early years of schooling.

- A number of submissions commended the quality of the resources available under Best Start program, including the assessment packages, strategies and the appointment of Literacy and Numeracy leaders. However, these commendations were not accompanied by relevant evidence.

---

3.3 Cost effectiveness of literacy or numeracy interventions

- A number of submissions provided data on the cost of programs, however no submission quantified the total cost of development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation at school or system level. Comparative analysis of the total cost or cost effectiveness of specific literacy or numeracy interventions programs was not included in any of these submissions.

- Submissions from The Exodus Foundation, Kinetic Education, and the International Reading Recovery Trainer Organisation provided a per student cost. In addition, a per teacher cost for professional learning was provided in the Reading to Learn submission. These per student and per teacher costs related to the delivery of the intervention by the organisation and did not include the costs borne by the school, for example, teacher costs associated with release from face to face teaching, release for professional learning or purchase of resources.

- A number of submissions also referred to issues associated with cost effectiveness in more general terms. Of note are the following comments from two principals’ groups:

  ... some current programs, such as Reading Recovery, will continue to operate because, irrespective of their cost effectiveness, they remain a government priority and include already established staffing arrangements (NSW Primary Principals' Association of NSW).

  “it is difficult to determine which is the most cost effective approach as there are so many variables to control” (Association of Heads of Independent Schools Australia NSW/ACT).

3.4 Issues raised in responses outside Step 1 of the Initial Framework

In addition to providing advice in relation to Step 1 of the Initial Framework, a number of stakeholders provided advice in relation to other Steps within the Initial Framework. Issues discussed in the submissions related to the identification of schools, the targeting of resources and matters associated with the implementation of the Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan.

Identify schools with the highest proportions of low performing students (Step 2)

- There were a number of views expressed in relation to the methodology to be used to identify schools with the highest proportion of low performing students. These views related to the use of a range of data sources rather than relying solely on NAPLAN data.

- Other views focused on the need to distribute available resources to schools that were not in receipt of additional equity or National Partnership funding. These views supported the notion that resources should not be solely concentrated in low socio-economic status school communities but be available to all schools with underperforming students. Views were also presented of the need to equitably distribute resources to government and non-government schools equitably in the basis of demonstrable need.
**Target resources against needs (Step 3)**

- A small number of respondents presented the view that under-performing students should be targeted rather than under-performing schools.

**Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan - Roll out (Step 6)**

- Detailed commentary was provided in a large number of submissions related to the future development and implementation of the Action Plan. Many of these submissions saw the Plan as a strategy to complement current literacy and numeracy practices in schools, as well as staffing arrangements and existing provision of resources for literacy and numeracy interventions.

- It was argued that schools should maintain the capacity to decide on the most appropriate literacy and numeracy interventions for their students, that is, there cannot be a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach. Schools should have the option to select from a list of recommended programs in light of their judgements concerning the needs of their students. The selection of literacy and numeracy interventions by schools, it was argued, should be based on sound, data-driven teacher professional judgement.

- A number of respondents also suggested that professional learning support for teachers to develop expertise in early literacy and numeracy interventions, be enhanced. Comments were made on the quality, accessibility and sustainability of professional learning in literacy and numeracy interventions.

- Other respondents suggested the need to provide incentives for specialist literacy/numeracy teaching experts in remote areas or to establish itinerant teaching positions within communities of schools. A view was also presented that existing Reading Recovery teachers be retrained to focus on numeracy as well as reading. In addition, mention was made of the need for greater use and support of occupational and speech therapists in schools and smaller class sizes.

- Early career teachers were also highlighted as requiring particular support in developing their capacity to identify and deliver appropriate literacy and numeracy interventions.

- Building students’ literacy and numeracy skills that align with 21st century learning practices was seen by some respondents as being a priority. In particular, digital literacy was seen as a key component of effective literacy and numeracy interventions. Other respondents commented on the need to integrate information and communications technology (ICT) into intervention strategies in literacy and numeracy.
4. Conclusion

Early identification

Schools and systems are committed to the early identification of children who are at risk of not progressing appropriately in their literacy and numeracy learning. They endeavour to make a thorough assessment of attainment in literacy and numeracy at Kindergarten and Year 1, and to intervene appropriately where needed.

Despite this, the Advisory Group is not convinced that all students requiring special attention are identified and are subsequently given such attention, nor are there verifiable data provided regarding the proportion of students being reached. Further, although training in the use of assessment tools by teachers is a high priority, it is not yet fully implemented.

The use of a unique student identifier to track individual students in terms of achievement throughout the years of schooling is a very important initiative, having the potential to more effectively monitor students’ literacy and numeracy needs.

Program efficacy

The effective implementation of literacy and numeracy interventions for children at risk requires sound planning and instructional support from principals and school leaders. To be able to fully integrate the interventions into effective literacy and numeracy teaching and learning practices, teachers need to be fully acquainted with the appropriateness of specific literacy and numeracy interventions. Further evidence is required of the interventions that work best in NSW schools.

The Advisory Group has been shown only very limited evaluative and research data on the efficacy and cost effectiveness of different literacy and numeracy intervention programs or strategies, and their suitability for children with different types of learning needs. Longitudinal student learning outcomes data need to be systematically collected by all sectors for all intervention programs to evaluate program efficacy.

Having examined the evidence, the Advisory Group believes the sectors themselves are uncertain about the efficacy of different programs. The exceptions are Reading Recovery and Best Start, which are held by some protagonists to be highly effective, although in the absence of solid NSW based evidence.

Reading Recovery is a long-term intervention which has not been externally and independently evaluated in NSW, and hence its local efficacy, durability and cost-effectiveness is simply not known.

It is essential that the relatively new Best Start program, which conceptually appears promising, be subject to a rigorous, independent and external evaluation, and that this be commissioned immediately.
The Advisory Group acknowledges that a number of literacy and numeracy interventions implemented in NSW schools have undergone continuous improvements. These improvements have generally been based on evidence collected by the developers of, or advocates for, a particular intervention, and have not generally been subject to external scrutiny. High quality, rigorous and independent evaluation of literacy and numeracy interventions in NSW schools should be a priority.

Fuller analyses of literacy and numeracy interventions that have been effectively implemented over time in schools operating in challenging and different circumstances are required. These descriptions should also reflect the full range of complex student, community or staffing needs.

Further evidence is also required, for example, that relates to the specific literacy and numeracy needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, culturally and linguistically diverse students and students with disabilities.

The voice of parents, in the selection and implementation of literacy and numeracy interventions, should also be considered.

No statewide, systematic, rigorous and reliable data based on external evaluations of intervention programs in NSW schools were reported to the Advisory Group, although some promising work has been undertaken by individual schools, regions and dioceses. Great store is placed in the forthcoming evaluations of programs implemented through National Partnerships. The Advisory Group is concerned these evaluations will be related primarily to Years 3-6 (the focus of the Literacy and Numeracy National Partnership) and not the early years of schooling, nor will they provide an overall Kindergarten to Year 12 literacy and numeracy overview.

Evaluation data on the outcomes, take up and sustainability of literacy and numeracy interventions implemented as part of the National Partnerships on Literacy and Numeracy and the Low SES School Communities need to be included in the evidence base of effective literacy and numeracy interventions.

The Advisory Group had hoped, as set out in Step 4 of the Interim Framework, to provide “on the basis of the evidence and evaluations it is about to receive [from sectors]…….. a ‘plain English’ compendium on the available intervention programs”, giving independent information for schools on the aim of each intervention program, its evaluated effectiveness for particular groups of students, and its cost and availability in different parts of NSW. The evidence provided to the Advisory Group does not contain the clarity, precision and completeness necessary to do this. It remains an aspiration worth striving for in the years ahead, and will be supported by the work of the Commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, National Literacy and Numeracy Evidence Base.

Cost and cost effectiveness of interventions

Just as efficacy of the various interventions has not been sufficiently evaluated, neither has the cost. The Advisory Group believes there must be systematic and rigorous modelling of the total costs involved in all the current interventions, so that they may be compared on a common basis. This should be done by the DEC and CEC, with AIS support, or referred to the NSW Treasury for independent modelling. The need is urgent.
The costs of different literacy and numeracy interventions, based on a standardised approach to the identification of all costs, should be triangulated with learning outcomes data from a number of sources to measure cost effectiveness of individual interventions. A number of models for determining cost effectiveness and efficacy need to be examined.

No sector gave the Advisory Group convincing information on the cost-effectiveness of current interventions.

The further advice offered by the sectors was sound, but does not go to the thrust of the Interim Framework. To take the Government sector alone, there are 2,230 public schools in NSW, of which 1,679 take the Year 3 NAPLAN tests. In 2011, 6.4 per cent of Year 3 public school students were below the national minimum standard in Reading, and 5.3 per cent in Numeracy.

Taking NSW schools as a whole, 5.3 per cent of all Year 3 students in NSW schools were below the national minimum standard in Reading, and 4.4 per cent in Numeracy.

The percentage for Reading represents 4,495 eight year-olds who are significantly challenged in Reading after three years in NSW schools. That number is equivalent to the total enrolment of more than 17 average size primary schools. There are 3,704 children who have (or also have) significant challenges in Numeracy. For those children and their parents, this situation is critical. It is not a matter of funding: most of the schools in which there are high concentrations of under-achieving children have been well funded through State and Commonwealth programs for years.

On the basis of its consultation, the Advisory Group is not interested in simply recommending the disbursement of money under yet another funding stream. It believes that an approach of focusing on personalised learning, diagnostic assessment and teacher professional development in the classroom under the direction of an instructional leader is the way forward to improving all students’ performance in literacy and numeracy.
5. A way forward

It is important that the additional teachers available under the Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan be targeted strategically to raise literacy and numeracy performance. The poor performance of many of the underachieving schools in NSW is not caused by lack of resources. Over the past two decades at least, class sizes have been reduced as additional teachers have been appointed and specialist teachers have been recruited and deployed, in particular Reading Recovery teachers. Such performance data as are available show that much of that effort seems to have produced no commensurate result. Many of our presently underperforming schools have been in that condition since at least the early nineties.

The additional 900 teachers under the Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan provide an unparalleled opportunity to deliver real change, if they are targeted strategically to produce genuine and lasting improvement.

Despite the inadequacy of data on the efficacy, cost and cost-effectiveness of particular interventions, there is a solid base of evidence in NSW and internationally about the necessary steps to produce real growth in literacy and numeracy performance, which can be summarised as follows.

a. **Identify, on entry at Kindergarten, the level of attainment in literacy and numeracy for each child, and tailor a specific program of learning to meet that child’s needs.**

Much is now being done in NSW to achieve this: *Best Start* in public schools and half of the Catholic dioceses; *Learning in Early Literacy and Numeracy* in some independent schools; the use of the Australian Early Development Index in schools. These initiatives should be strongly supported.

b. **Change teaching practice from a focus on the whole class to a focus on the needs of the individual.**

There are three key elements to this, each backed by very substantial research.

Personalised learning: each child is set short-term learning tasks which are challenging but achievable, so that the child is continually engaged in learning without being either bored or frustrated.

Diagnostic assessment: as a matter of routine, each child takes frequent low-stakes, non-reportable assessments, often on-line, so that the teacher can determine the stage of learning reached, and decide on the next learning task to be set for the student - not next year, nor next term, but tomorrow.

Teacher professional development in the classroom, under the direction of an instructional leader: research has shown that real and lasting improvement in learning is achieved when skills in the personalisation of learning and the use of diagnostic assessment are acquired by teachers under the direction of an instructional leader or mentor, working in the classroom with the teacher, and with the children for whom that teacher is responsible.
c. Where remediation in literacy or numeracy is needed, use tiered interventions according to need

The first and normal tier is the personalisation of learning in the classroom; the second tier is withdrawal of children into small groups, for work with a specialist teacher, and often using a program such as Count Me In or Reading Recovery; the third tier is intensive work with individuals in school, or in group withdrawal programs such as the Exodus Foundation version of Multilit.

On the basis of its consultation and consideration of evidence, the Advisory Group recommends that the first 200 FTE positions available for 2012 under the Literacy and Numeracy Action Plan should focus strategically on the above aspects of classroom practice; should do so within the framework of whole school instructional leadership and the building of teacher and school capacity; and should target those schools that are identified by sectors as schools most urgently in need.
APPENDIX 1: INITIAL FRAMEWORK QUESTIONS

1. How is low attainment in literacy and in numeracy first identified in schools? Are you confident that all children requiring special attention are identified, and are subsequently given such attention? If not, what proportion do you think is being reached?

2. What intervention programs are in use in schools, in literacy and in numeracy? It would be helpful for this information to be presented in tabular form for literacy programs and for numeracy programs. For each individual literacy and numeracy program, the following information is sought.
   a. The name and aim of the program.
   b. The target year level.
   c. How the program works.
   d. The year the program commenced in schools; its growth over time; and the number of students and schools now covered by the program.
   e. Whether or not the program is specifically targeted to students, schools or regions.
   f. What internal or external evaluations of the program (including evaluation of programs implemented through National Partnerships) have been undertaken in schools? Are you willing to make these available to the Advisory Group on a confidential basis? What have they shown, and have any changes to the program been made as a result?
   g. Outside the specific NSW context, what evaluations of this program do you regard as having high reliability and validity? Copies would be appreciated if these evaluations are not available on the internet. Are there any evaluations you believe to be unsound?
   h. What is the funding mechanism: by formula per student, by formula per school, by specified student entitlement, or by some other means?
   i. What is the total expenditure on the program, taking into account salaries and salary-related expenses, training and professional development, and all other recurrent costs? Are you willing to make these data available to the Advisory Group on a confidential basis?

3. For each program, what is your judgement of its success as a strategy, the durability of its outcomes, and its cost-effectiveness as an intervention? Is it possible to rank the various interventions in literacy and numeracy in terms of these dimensions? Are there particular interventions which, in your view, should be expanded or reduced in scope and investment?

4. Having regard to our terms of reference, do you have any additional advice for the Advisory Group, particularly in relation to low attainment in literacy and numeracy in the early years of schooling?
## APPENDIX 2: LIST OF INVITED STAKEHOLDERS/PROVIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mr Geoff Hewitt</td>
<td>Christian Education National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ms Vicki Danvers</td>
<td>Christian Schools Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ms Tracey Puckeridge</td>
<td>Steiner Education Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mr Daniel Goulburn</td>
<td>NSW Committee of Jewish Day Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mrs Elizabeth Kloeden</td>
<td>Lutheran Schools of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mr Jim Mein</td>
<td>The Uniting Church in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dr Laurie Scandrett</td>
<td>Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ms Anne Crabb</td>
<td>NSW Parents Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dr Jean Carter</td>
<td>Seventh-day Adventist Schools (Greater Sydney) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mr Ralph Luchow</td>
<td>Seventh-day Adventist Schools (Northern NSW) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ms Frances Reed</td>
<td>Forestville Montessori School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ms Jacqui Van De Velde-Gilbert</td>
<td>Meadowbank Education Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dr Intaj Ali</td>
<td>Malek Fahd Islamic School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ms Elizabeth Gadek</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mr Andrew Mullins</td>
<td>PARED Foundation (Parents for Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Mr Bob Johnston</td>
<td>Australian Association of Christian Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dr Bryan Cowling</td>
<td>Anglican Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Mr Jim Cooper</td>
<td>NSW Primary Principals’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Ms Cheryl McBride</td>
<td>Public School Principals’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ms Chris Cawsey</td>
<td>NSW Secondary Principals’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ms Glynis Jones</td>
<td>Association of Catholic School Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Dr John Collier</td>
<td>Association Heads of Independent Schools Australia, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Dr Geoff Newcombe</td>
<td>Association of Independent Schools, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dr David Cameron</td>
<td>Isolated Children's Parents' Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mr Bob Lipscombe</td>
<td>NSW Teachers’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mr Dick Shearman</td>
<td>ACT/NSW Independent Education Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Mrs Helen Walton</td>
<td>Federation of Parents’ and Citizens’ Association of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ms Danielle Cronin</td>
<td>Council of Catholic School Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Anne Crabb</td>
<td>NSW Parents’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Bill Crews</td>
<td>The Exodus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Wendy Field</td>
<td>The Smith Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Eric Brace</td>
<td>The Australian Literacy &amp; Numeracy Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Kevin Wheldall</td>
<td>Multilit Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr David Rose</td>
<td>Reading to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Janice Farmer-Hailey</td>
<td>International <em>Reading Recovery</em> Trainer Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Paul Whiting</td>
<td>The Specific Learning Difficulties Association of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Simon Osborn</td>
<td>Learning Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kevlynn Annandale</td>
<td>First Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof Jennifer Stephenson</td>
<td>Australian Association of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Tom Alegounarias</td>
<td>Office of the Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3: LIST OF STAKEHOLDER/PROVIDER RESPONSES RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Malecki</td>
<td>NSW Primary Principals’ Association of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Newman</td>
<td>NSW Secondary Principals’ Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Chudleigh</td>
<td>Public Schools Principals’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Greenhalgh</td>
<td>Association of Heads of Independent Schools Australia NSW/ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Jane Macdonald, Policy &amp; Research Officer</td>
<td>Federation of P&amp;C Associations of NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Mullins</td>
<td>PARED Foundation (Parents for Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Diamond</td>
<td>NSW Teachers’ Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Gadek</td>
<td>National Independent Special Schools Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Mein</td>
<td>NSW/ACT Synod Uniting Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Kevin Wheldall, Chairman &amp; Director</td>
<td><em>Multilit</em> Pty Ltd, Macquarie University Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Brace</td>
<td>Australian Literacy and Numeracy Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Stephenson</td>
<td>Australian Association of Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jann Farmer-Haley</td>
<td>International <em>Reading Recovery</em> Trainer Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Munro</td>
<td>The Exodus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rose</td>
<td>Reading to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Duncan</td>
<td>Manly Village Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Johnson</td>
<td>Learning Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dyson</td>
<td>LEXIA Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arun Sanghvi</td>
<td>Kinetic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Alegounnarias</td>
<td>NSW Board of Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>