Summary of feedback from consultation – November 2011
2009 Resource Teachers of Literacy (RTLit) Annual Report and DRAFT Professional Practice Manual (PPM)

"Note that this document is intended to capture comments received in response to a call for submissions on a draft of an RTLit professional practice manual in November 2011. The information in the table consists of feedback received by Host Schools, Management Committees and the RTLit Executive and is not necessarily representative of Ministry of Education views."

RTLit collective submission	Specific feedback from Host Principals/Management Committees
General Comments	
• Lack of consultation prior to document being disseminated • Difficulty in comparing clusters – e.g. how is travel time included in calculations? • Question reliability of 2009 data, which is stated as the basis of PPM	• Child or fiscal driving change? • Need more evidence than this before any changes • Questionable data • Need to analyse contextual data also • Data collection seems to be driving process and forcing uniformity • Numbers rather than quality • Why the haste and lack of consultation? • There are some groups acting as if these changes are already in place e.g. Reading Recovery (RR) Tutors. • MOE will need to inform all schools of change of way of working and all other agencies • Why did RR get PPM before Host Schools? • PPM is presented as a done deal and not negotiable • Current practice is highly effective • Current size of clusters limits access • Why fix something that isn't broken? • Conclusions about effectiveness of service drawn from 2009

	• nationwide data without careful analysis • Guidelines/practice manual has inconsistencies/contradictory • Should be indicative only – management committees need to have discretion over how RTLit works in their cluster
• Good to have guidelines on how service operates especially re indirect instruction	• Review of service is timely - an inquiry approach that reflects current good practices desired • Good to see RTLits should not be doing playground duty • Agree it would improve effectiveness of service if matters are clarified/set of guidelines with common understandings developed
Ways of operating	
• Ongoing PD via supervision – available to some and variable in quality • Lack of training to teach hardest to teach	• RTLits would require training in working with teachers in this new model • RTLits will be advising those who are more highly paid – need to be on pay scale similar to other providers • Would need support and demonstration to implement inquiry model • Does the MOE acknowledge that working with referred students will require extra on-the-job training for current RTLits? Phillips and Smith is the only research that has demonstrated effectiveness. Will this be available to RTLits? • RR teachers get on-going training - will this be available to RTLit? • What specific training have RTLits had to provide an intervention for the hardest to teach (ex RR)? • Third Chance is the only programme that can teach these hardest to teach • Strongly suggest additional training in inquiry process be offered to RTLits; specifically in relation to Stuart

	McNaughton's work
• Overly prescriptive model • Guidelines for this in PPM are too constrictive • Need to look wider for appropriate ways of working • Flexibility needed going into and out of indirect instruction	• One size does not fit all • Want flexible approaches • RTLit need the chance to experiment with new literacy initiatives. • Needs assessment required and RTLit should meet community's specific needs • Flexibility (mix direct/indirect) is preferred • Want to maintain flexibility and direct teaching of students • What data says this overly prescriptive model will work? • Model presented at sessions does not fit rural clusters • Should look at other models before any changes made • Morning sessions are better learning times so indirect poses problems for RTLit trying to provide support within literacy time • Effectiveness is our primary concern - need to be timely, needs based and equitable
• Indirect instruction will not work for some students	• Emphasis on indirect instruction suggests teachers are not doing the best they can in class - some students need direct 1 to 1 • Is indirect model research based and does it show evidence of success for high needs schools? • TOP project was similar model to this, which was ineffective and a waste of resources • Concerned the role of RTLit seems to be developing into an advisor – with a move from emphasis on targeted individual students to emphasis on teachers • Group instruction will be given to small groups of children from same school if they fit into one group and if they can

	operate successfully in group instruction sessions
• RTLits providing professional development (PD) for dealing with students with literacy difficulties is a cost effective way of reaching students. • RtLits should be supporting teachers with professional learning • RtLits should be supporting teacher aides with professional learning	• Up-skilling teachers benefits many students • RTLits are knowledgeable and there are times when PD sessions from them for staff are needed and worthwhile • Agree we should not be doing PD for whole staff but for children on roll
• Concern re management of school not accepting RTLit will work cooperatively in inquiry with teachers – that it will insist on old direct instruction of students	• Needs school commitment
• Management Committees need discretion over how RTLits in their area operate	
• Can't lose direct teaching - component for credibility and maintains own skill level	
	• Issues around twice monthly visiting cannot ensure acceleration
Data collection	
• How to capture all the work of the RTLit to more fairly reflect their influence on student learning?	• Teacher discussion (outside teaching time) should be recorded in end of year data • Travel time might need to be considered to show why there is variability in overall unit time etc
• Difficulty with collecting information on seen Ready to Reads	
• Lack of consultation with RTLits on data collection forms	
• Need for consistency of language	
• Need to reduce amount of data collected – especially in whole class work – indirect instruction	• Why data in reading, writing and oral if only one area been focussed on?
• Other data needed – Burt, spelling data, gender	
• PPM is about data collection - not what is best for students	
• Why send data to regional ECP?	

	• Clarification needed over data for carried over students for annual reports
• Resources needed for working with groups instead of individuals– funding will be needed for this	
• Trial period needed	
	• Transience will make targets set meaningless.
• Can students be discharged for behaviour?	
Referral issues – what ifs?	
• Priority rights of students moving schools	• Will students already on RTLit have priority if they move school • Transient children transferred from another RTLit cluster should be given immediate priority
	• RTLit management committees need to have discretion as to which referred pupils should be placed on RTLit rolls
Access	
• What constitutes "On the roll" e.g. if I give help to the Literacy Intervention Pilot Programme, are those students on the roll?	• Our RTLit has always provided informal assistance but now can only help students on their roll
• Should Y2 students be excluded because they did not receive RR?	• Why restrictions for the number of Y3 to Y8 students? • There will be no room for older children.
• Why have Y1 been removed?	• Need flexibility here • There is a proven need for early intervention • Where is equity in excluding Y1/2? – should be available to all children
• Students should be neediest across cluster not from each referring school • Some clusters only work with students who are expected to make progress • RTLits have no mandate to insist on the lowest students being referred to them	• Proportional intake across cluster will disadvantage Māori in our cluster • RTLits need to have flexibility to respond to cluster needs in their own way • How will new model work with outlying schools e.g. Gt Barrier?

	• What happens to low and slow achieving children – do they come on to RTLit roll? Where do they go if they do not make progress? What is the next planned wave if they do not meet time criteria? • Should be neediest in school not cluster to remain child centred • Our cluster has developed a system that works well for us and gives access to those who need it • Proportional ethnic balance is pre-judging racial profile
• Some RTLIts work successfully without a waiting list – students go straight on to indirect roll	• All children are placed on waiting list
• Need clear criteria for selection • Management Committees and Principals need a shared understanding of selection criteria	• How will MOE ensure students will get help?
• Do ESOL students have access to RTLits?	• Why is this being reversed? Why are some students able to double dip? • Children who are ESOL funded can be admitted to the RTLit roll once their funding has finished
• Older students have greater needs and shouldn't be excluded	• Younger children are given priority over older children
	• Concern re access for rural students
	• Is it a requirement for daily literacy sessions before RTLit involvement? Many schools only have four or less 'formal' literacy sessions in a week (depending on class level)
	• Are students who are discharged with incomplete progress automatically enrolled by the RTLit for the following year, or does school have to make another referral?
Reading Recovery (RR)	
• How can RTLit keep enough places to accept RR referral? • Timeframes are not realistic for picking up RR students	• We support the priority focus on referred RR students • Figures are wrong of 10 RR per RTLit - and automatic

• There are a variety of "rules" about students referred from RR to RTLit roll (e.g. Page 20)	referral will increase this number • Should be a level playing field - RR students should not get priority • Not all children start at our school – don't have RR and need to be picked up when 2 years behind chronological age • Concern that there is not enough funding for RR and some schools choose more cost effective ways to reach more students and then they miss out on RTLit • Restraints on travel time if RR students have priority i.e. they could be all over cluster, which would mean greater travel time. • RR time should be extended and students not referred to RTLit • Some schools don't have RR and/or they are too small to train for RR so they are disadvantaged • Government funding is insufficient for low decile schools to offer RR • Non-RR students will be disadvantaged and small schools can't offer RR • What will happen to current students if bumped for RR within timeframe specified? • Contradicts guidelines for administration of clusters – the CoM advises on equitable provision vs. automatic for RR • Children who just miss out on RR will also miss RTLit • Timeframe is unrealistic • There is a flood of referred on children in our area in Term 3 – how will the RTLit cope? • Children from kohanga reo with limited oral language in English will miss out through not having had access to RR • RR students should have a gap between interventions to consolidate – e.g. not straight to RTLit

	• RR students may not be suitable for RTLit roll and may not be able to make accelerated progress • RR children to have had 100 sessions before referred to RTLit; have documentation to indicate they've had colleague and tutor visits
• If RR didn't work how will RTLits achieve this in short time frame?	• Not good enough to have limited time with literacy specialist and then refer to RTLB, who are not literacy specialist. • Can students who have had RR, RtLit and develop issues later be re-referred? • Is there evidence that children unsuccessful in RR will be successful in classroom-based intervention with an RTLit / any children with profound reading difficulties will be accelerated by classroom-based practice proposed?
• Why does MOE want RR data for all ages and not just those up to 8 years?	
	• Would it not be more useful for RTLits to help with raising literacy levels prior so children enter RR at higher level?
Lesson length and number	
• Increase guide of 45 sessions to 60, 85 etc. • 30 mins is too short a time frame for older students. If 1 ½ units used then 45 units are gone before accelerated progress is achieved • What falls into unit allocation – class observation, planning with teacher?	• How does this fit with intensity required for Tier 2? • Limits the hope of child closing gap - needs to be extensive and intensive • Where is the evidence to show that 45 units is most appropriate? • This should be minimum, with 80 as maximum • Need clarification on what constitutes a time unit – discussion with teacher, meetings etc.? • The number of lessons is too small – there is no time to establish rapport, build confidence etc. • Support 60 units of time mentioned in correspondence from RTLit executive

	• Direct tuition for 45 sessions (which is required before accelerated learning takes place) then extension of up to 100 sessions of direct tuition, depending on need post a review by the management committee
• What about students with global needs (e.g. those with foetal alcohol etc.)? Can they go directly to RTLB?	
• Class teachers need to have release times to work with RTLit	• Working collaboratively with class teacher will cause disruptions, lead to time lapses and undermine continuity. • Huge difficulties for class teachers to meet with RTLit – impacts greatly on school organisation • Amount of time spent 'co-constructing with teachers will impede ability of the RTLit to accelerate students' learning
• Team work is essential	
• Concerns about students who are "below" National Standards in reading / one year behind year group expectation deemed having completed the programme – they still need help	• Why is one level below National Standard considered to be achieving and therefore a basis for discharge? • Phillips and Smith show that ex-RR students can catch up - this manual is denying them their rights by saying it is OK if they are a year below
System Approach	
• It is unclear how links between RR/RTLits/RTLB work	• Comments re sub skill level work of RTLBs are offensive • Pyramid model shown [in the draft] is flawed as does not include RTLB • Will RTLBs receive specific training in literacy? • Why should students go to RTLB who have no specific literacy training? • It is not always necessary for another specialist intervention - good programmes for assisting students to make small steps might be most appropriate • RTLBs may not be able to increase roll to take referred students

	• Why would children be referred to yet another agency e.g. GSE, RTLB? • RTLB are taken aback to learn of this change to their roles • Will RTLits now receive referrals directly from RR tutors?
• Need clarity on the role of RTLB in literacy instruction • Proposed model suggests RTLB are the ultimate experts in literacy issues • Often conflicting advice provided by RTLB and RTLit • Who is responsible for which children and how is that decision made?	• 45 units will flood RTLB rolls • What happens to children who are globally delayed who seem not get any support because they don't have behaviour problems? These are often 5 year olds who need pre-RR • Do RTLB provide literacy instruction? • Does it mean RTLBs and RTLits cannot work together?
• Often dual enrolments can work really well to meet the needs of students	• In the past RTLit and RTLB have complemented each other's work to the maximum benefit of the child. • Sometimes students need dual enrolment
	• Dual enrolment is only appropriate if RTLB is involved to address behaviour issues • Children should have more than 45 sessions before referral to RTLB – RTLB are not specialists in literacy teaching like RTLits are • Concerned about the progress of children referred to RTLB from RTLit as RTLB are not literacy specialists
	• Should it say "alignment (with RR) will enhance the ultimate outcome for children who have previously received RR but failed to attain/maintain expected level of acceleration"?
	• How does a collaborative approach assist with the monitoring of a students progress?

	• Re commercial literacy programmes [page 21] – does this mean that programmes that are responsive to need and are backed by research can be used?