

Feedback – Paper One Setting the Scene: Tasmania’s Community-wide Framework

We are two retired Primary School Principals with a continuing interest in improving literacy. Although we do not possess detailed knowledge of current practice and approaches within all schools, we wanted to provide feedback on the paper, primarily in the form of questions. Given our experience, the focus of our response relates to the 4-5 year and 6–12-year categories.

The introductory section, what and why of literacy is comprehensive. However :

- Given the comprehensive definition of literacy on P4, is there enough emphasis on viewing, writing, and creating texts in the ‘How we learn to be literate’ and subsequent sections? The focus appears primarily on phonics/reading.
- Is there space/capacity/scope in the document for greater detail about actions/achievements in relation to ‘consistent and aligned practices that are informed by evidence’ actions from the Literacy Framework and Plan for Action 2019-22?

In relation to mapping existing practice in the Organisational Mapping section:

- The focus of this section is on ‘programs’. Would the inclusion of approaches provide a more comprehensive picture of practice? e.g., some elements relating to guidance, resources and professional learning of the Literacy Framework and Plan for Action 2019-22. The actions for impact appear once in the 4-5 years section. However, it would be valuable to include all actions for impact in subsequent school years sections. We particularly notice that the 6-12 years section highlights the teaching and learning of phonics but none of the other critical aspects of literacy learning across these years of schooling.
- Is there consistency of recording/detail between DOE and non-government providers? The introductory blurb suggests detail has been included once where possible, with headings in subsequent areas. However, the non-government section makes repeated reference to important aspects including the ‘ongoing professional learning and development support for teachers; pedagogical content knowledge and literacy teaching practice’.
- Could greater specificity to guides and resources be included in the School Years sections e.g., literacy component of School Improvement Plans, Literacy Progressions, current resources that are utilised including Good Teaching Guides Literacy, Learners First-A Pedagogical Framework, DoE Assessment Strategy, Systematic Curriculum Delivery: A guide for school leaders?
- Are there additional professional learning opportunities that could be included in addition to Phonics and Foundational Literacy - or is this encompassed within the Literacy Coaches role? Are there targeted programs within PLI?
- Are the programs included primarily state department initiatives? Is there capacity to include approaches that aren’t adopted universally – eg Story Dogs? Literacy Tutors? or is this level of detail not warranted in this type of document?
- Is it relevant to include ESL support, Gifted, Learning Plans?
- Literacy Coaching Initiative-this is referred to in the organisational mapping for 6-12 years, 13-16 and 17-18 years. A key theme from schools (what we heard P 30) is ‘consistency in approach to literacy instruction across the school’.

As the QTCs- Literacy are very important in achieving this consistency, what is in place to ensure common understanding and approaches amongst the coaching group? And across DoE schools? System wide understanding is referred to in the Literacy Framework and Plan for Action 2019-22. How will this be achieved through the Literacy Coaching Initiative?

- What is the future of the Literacy Framework and Plan for Action 2019-22? Many of the actions have been impacted by Covid in 2021/2022. Will the framework be updated? It is a critical reference throughout this paper.

Mandy Beard and Meredith Cashion
March 2022