

Brian Cambourne

I have carefully read the document "Lifting Literacy, Lifting Tasmania" and offer the following two-page critique:

1. I support the broad definition of literacy as being more than reading. Ditto the purposes of literacy in the Tasmanian context.

2. I have some concerns about:

- (i) the explicit/ systematic teaching of synthetic phonics
- (ii) the lack of emphasis on making meaning while reading silently.
- (iii) the implication that accurate word calling is the core of effective reading
- (iv) the narrow bibliography used to justify these allegedly "evidence-based" findings.
- (v) There is no reference to what the evidence from miscue analysis reveals about effective reading; no reference to retrospective miscue analysis as a powerful strategy for making students metacognitively aware of how reading "works" and how their strategies need to change to be effective.
- (vi) Then there's no theory of learning underpinning what is recommended. I have been conducting naturalistic inquiry into the teaching and learning of literacy in Australian schools for five decades. Fifty years of naturalistic observation of students learning supports my contention that teachers need to be able to articulate, in persuasive and coherent language, a theory of learning that makes learning to be literate as uncomplicated and barrier free as possible
- (viii) The role of embedded metaphors in teacher classroom language is not touched upon.