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Introduction – Dyslexia Victoria Support (DVS)

DVS is a non-partisan, parent-led dyslexia support group that-endorses evidence-based teaching approaches and programs that have been independently, scientifically peer-reviewed and published in reputable scientific journals.

In 2014, Heidi Gregory and three other mothers of dyslexic children were looking for answers to their children’s reading struggles and realised that there was no local support. This prompted them to create DVS as a way to connect with other parents in the same situation.

DVS has since grown to a membership of 4500+ parents, teachers, principals, educational psychologists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, students, and people living with dyslexia and includes 17 affiliated dyslexia support groups across Victoria.

DVS advocates for change in our education system for children with reading difficulties. We aim to ensure all schools use evidence-based initial reading instruction, to ensure early identification of children with reading difficulties and to ensure such children are provided with evidence-based early intervention.

DVS supports the recommendations made by AUSPELD: “Understanding Learning Difficulties, a guide for parents”, the Five from Five Initiative, the Australian Dyslexia Association (ADA), International Dyslexia Association (IDA), Learning Difficulties Australia (LDA), and Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists (RANZCO)

Dyslexia can be defined as “A *specific learning disability that is neurological in origin. It is characterised by difficulties with accurate and / or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities. These difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language that is often unexpected in relation to other cognitive abilities and the provision of effective classroom instruction. Secondary consequences may include problems in reading comprehension and reduced reading experience that can impede growth of vocabulary and background knowledge.” (1)

DVS members met with The Hon. Minister Tehan on 7 February 2019 to discuss dyslexia in Australian state government schools. During this meeting, Minister Tehan invited us to make a submission to the Inquiry into the Status of the Teaching Profession.
DVS Submission Summary and Terms of Reference

This submission focuses on the status of our teaching profession in relation to learners with dyslexia/specific learning difficulties and initial reading instruction.

It is our hope that our submission provides the impetus for our Federal Education Ministry and Department to implement well-overdue change in our education system in relation to initial reading instruction. Our submission content is not new. Numerous government inquiries, roundtable discussions, and panels have pinpointed initial reading instruction in Australian schools as substandard.

We urge individual committee members to think introspectively and consider the privilege afforded to you of being able to read this submission. The children and adults that this submission is written for have been afforded no such privilege. We urge you all to place these members of our society at the forefront of your decisions. Dyslexia is a heritable reading difficulty that will not disappear by ignoring it.

Firstly, we address Terms of Reference **Number 2. Provision of appropriate support platforms for teachers, including human and IT resources** in the body of our submission.

Secondly, we address Terms of Reference **Number 4. Investigating ways to increase retention rates for the teaching profession, and avoid 'burn out' among early-career teachers** in Appendix 1.

We have identified four key areas for opportunities for your committee to report on in relation to providing better support platforms to our teaching profession -

1. **Provide teacher training in evidence-based initial reading instruction**
2. **Provide teacher training in early screening for reading difficulties**
3. **Provide teacher training in targeted evidence-based intervention for reading difficulties**
4. **Ensure transparency in funding for dyslexia**
DVS Recommendations from a Victorian Context

We acknowledge there are members of our teaching profession who are qualified in evidence-based initial reading instruction and are achieving positive measurable outcomes in reading skills for dyslexic children.

One such example is the teaching staff at Bentleigh West PS who introduced systematic synthetic phonics in 2015 and “has been vindicated by the latest NAPLAN results, revealing its Year 3 mean spelling score has risen 16 per cent over the period. Reading and writing scores are up 7 per cent and grammar and punctuation have risen 10 per cent.” Principal Mr. Capp said, “The upshot of the change was happier and less stressed teachers, and students who wanted to read”.

We also acknowledge, the “lack of clarity as to what constitutes evidence-based research, and how this translates into student outcomes”. (3) DVS urges your committee to consult language and reading experts who can demonstrate evidence of measurable gains the reading skills of dyslexic learners. DVS is able to provide a detailed list of reputable experts in evidence-based initial reading instruction on your request.

It’s well-established that we have a literacy problem in Australia. According to the ABS “44% of adults lack the literacy skills required to cope with the complex demands of modern life”. (5) It’s also well-established in dyslexia circles that “When unsupported belief guides practice, we risk inconsistency at the individual teacher level and disaster at the education system level.” (4). DVS welcomes your committee to meet with a sample of DVS members to hear first-hand such ‘disastrous’ experiences of initial reading teaching for their dyslexic child.

Despite instances of dyslexia being recognised and supported by our teaching profession, our main contention is that –

The Australian Federal Government must ensure our teaching profession is trained in evidence-based initial reading instruction so our dyslexic children can learn to read at school.

DVS urges our Australian Federal Government to investigate the following four key areas for improvement in relation to our teaching profession and dyslexia –
1. Provide teacher training in evidence-based initial reading instruction

Knowing ‘how to read’ does not beget knowing ‘how to teach reading’. “Teachers tend to erroneously believe that their implicit knowledge about reading is sufficient for them to instruct others explicitly.” (6)

Professor Pamela Snow links the paucity of pre-service teacher training in evidence-based initial reading instruction with “the fact that too many children exit primary school with reading, writing, and spelling skills that are years below the level they will need to make the transition to secondary school and succeed academically and vocationally.” (7) Snow states “Teacher knowledge of how phonemes, graphemes, digraphs, trigraphs, schwa vowels, syllables (stressed and unstressed), morphemes, words, and discourse-level text work in a linguistic sense is way too low.” (7)

DVS acknowledges that some children learn to read effortlessly. However, as illustrated in Nancy Young’s infographic below, 40 – 50 % of children require a structured literacy approach. In order for our teachers to use this approach, they need explicit knowledge in our English language system, an explicit understanding of early reading development and how to teach reading and an explicit understanding of why 10 – 15 % of children have reading difficulties, how to screen for reading difficulties, and how to intervene early and effectively.
A DVS member from regional Victoria exemplifies the need for teacher training in evidence-based initial reading instruction in the following post - “Feeling disheartened and in need of support! I met with my child’s teacher this morning and told her that my child had a diagnosis of dyslexia and told her she has been having intensive support outside of school (tutoring and MSL club over summer) using a synthetic phonics approach and the teacher said "Is that a program?" She did not know what phonics was! Where do you go when the teacher is at such a low base? This is the second year in a row that we have had a teacher that has no idea. I just feel gutted and angry. I want to talk to the principal but I know she also has no idea because she taught my older child. Any suggestions on where to begin? What SIMPLE but evidence-based articles/resources can I give the teacher that explains systematic synthetic phonics and provides evidence of its effectiveness for all children but especially those with dyslexia? I can point them in the direction of Pam Snow’s blog but I doubt they will read it. I know it won't help with my kid, but maybe for future kids 😔”(8)

DVS membership includes numerous teachers working in our education system such as the two Victorian primary school teachers quoted below who say their teacher training in initial reading instruction was insufficient -

“I think one key way to support teachers is to have teacher education courses which actually taught you how to explicitly teach your subject. For example, when I started teaching Prep in 2005 as a graduate teacher, I had received no instruction on how to teach reading. I learned on the job from my peers who had also not been instructed on how to teach children to read. We taught children initial sounds in alphabetical order, taught them to memorise high frequency words and to look at the pictures and guess. It was only when one of my own children failed to learn to read using this approach that I realised that I had not been taught to teach children to read. This is a systemic problem and many schools still use and promote strategies, which do not harm the lucky children who acquire reading skills. Teaching children to memorise high frequency words, use the first letter to guess and to use the pictures to guess a word are inefficient and do not actually teach children how to read a word from left to right and decode the letters with the appropriate sounds. Children who struggle to learn sound/letter associations grasp onto and use the ineffective strategies above. It can take years for children to unlearn the skills and learn their sounds if they are trying to play catch up all the time.”

“I am a VIT registered primary school teacher currently working as a private tutor teaching children with dyslexia/specific learning difficulties how to read and write. My teaching method is based on a Multisensory Structured Language (MSL) approach, which is evidence-based. The approach explicitly teaches reading and spelling applying a systematic and cumulative method focusing on phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.
Twenty-five years ago, when I did my teacher training I was taught a whole language approach to reading. Over the years, I found that many students with learning difficulties struggled to read using the whole language approach.

The catalyst that made me move away from the whole language approach was when my son at the end of Grade 2 was diagnosed with dyslexia and after 18 months of reading recovery and other whole language intervention, his reading level was only at the end of Foundation (two years behind).

Alongside the intervention at school, I also did a lot of work with him at home. At this stage, both my son and I were experiencing high levels of stress and anxiety. My son’s self-esteem was plummeting and he began showing signs of depression. It was then that I decided to retrain in an evidence-based proven approach to teach dyslexic children how to read and write.

I began tutoring my son in the MSL approach in Grade 3. Within months, his reading levels and spelling began to improve. The incorporation of decodable books was crucial to not only his success with reading but also to his self-esteem and mental health wellbeing. By the end of Grade 5 with continued tutoring since Grade 3, my son was at level for reading! He is now in Year 8 and is at Year 8 level. Due to his dyslexia he still requires accommodations of extra time for reading and essay writing, copying from the whiteboard and in maths. He talks about wanting to go to university and this is now a possibility!

I also began tutoring other students from my son’s school when other teachers saw the success of my teaching approach. Each year so many teachers come to me feeling stressed and exasperated in not being able to effectively teach students with dyslexia/specific learning difficulties. Our Federal government needs to take responsibility in training our teachers in effective initial reading instruction—so all children can learn to read and write in school.” (Simone Mitchell-Nolan, Victorian Primary School Teacher, DVS member, parent of two dyslexic children)

In accordance with the Australian National Inquiry into the Teaching of Reading, DVS asserts that our initial reading teachers must be able to draw on techniques most suited to the learning needs and abilities of the children in his/her classroom. (9) In the case of dyslexic children, this means our initial reading teachers must be trained in Systematic Synthetic Phonics. (10) DVS supports the creation of a nationally mandated manual on evidence-based initial reading teaching approaches and programs to be provided to all principals and foundation teachers

**Recommendation 1**

Mandatory inclusion of ‘Evidence-based initial reading instruction’ core units in all Initial Teaching Education course curricula.
Recommendation 2 -

Specific Federal government funding for a mandatory ‘Evidence-based initial reading instruction’ course for all existing school principals and foundation teachers in Australian state government schools

2. Provide teacher training in early screening for reading difficulties

It is well-established that pre-reading phonological awareness skills are essential to becoming a ‘good’ reader. (11) While most children implicitly develop phonological awareness skills, dyslexic children commonly do not.

According to Bentleigh West PS Principal Steven Capp, “Early screening of phonemic awareness is essential to determine whether children have the fundamental skills in early reading and spelling acquisition. Screening all students before they start their foundation year or at the very beginning of the foundation year allows teachers to identify skills to explicitly teach and devise practice that enable the transition to decoding.” (12)

Findings from the 2017 Victorian study ‘The experiences of parents of children who have dyslexia in Victoria, Australia: a social justice perspective’ validate the need for the provision of teaching training in early screening for reading difficulties. Author and DVS member, Dr. Katherine Levi found, “there was no instance in which a teacher approached a parent to raise concern for the child’s slow progress with reading or the manifestation of symptoms of anxiety or low self-esteem”. (13)

DVS member and Melbourne speech pathologist Alison Clarke likens reading development with good tree health - “A child’s word-level reading system is like a tree, and the part above the ground is like the letters. When we look at a tree, all we see is the part above the ground, and it can be easy to forget about the roots, or take them for granted. The roots of our reading system are the sounds/phonemic awareness, and if they’re weak, we need to strengthen them, or the tree will just keep falling down. Many teachers, because of the way they have been taught and the prevailing culture in schools, have very little knowledge of the roots; let alone how to strengthen them. They are often busy trying to prop up the tree, not develop the roots, and need better training in how to do this, as people with dyslexia have problems with phonemic awareness, they are very responsive to high-quality teaching.”

Recommendation 3 -

Establish a mandatory early screening program for reading difficulties via Health and Maternal centres, Day Care centres, Pre-schools, Kindergartens and primary schools.
3. **Provide teacher training in targeted evidence-based intervention for reading difficulties**

The choice of reading intervention programs by our teaching profession plays a crucial role in the success or failure of early intervention.

Professor Margaret Snowling states that evidence-based interventions for language and reading difficulties such as dyslexia must be “…systematic, well-structured and multi-sensory, and…incorporate direct teaching, learning and time for consolidation, with frequent revision to take account of the likely limited attention and learning difficulties of the child. For dyslexia, effective interventions should include training in letter sounds, phoneme awareness, and linking letters and phonemes through writing and reading from texts at the appropriate level to reinforce emergent skills. In contrast, poor comprehenders require a different ‘diet’ attuned to their needs and can benefit from training in oral language skills particularly vocabulary training. Of course, it is important to bear in mind that many children will have problems with decoding and comprehension, in which case a mixed approach is needed.” (14)

According to feedback from DVS members, the prevailing reading intervention program is Reading Recovery, which fails as an effective intervention for dyslexic children. Please see 500+ comments in the two DVS petitions handed to Minister Tehan on 7 February 2019 titled [More Support Needed for Students with Dyslexia/Learning Difficulties](https://www.dyslexiavictoriasupport.com) and [DECODABLE BOOKS for Victorian State Government prep children in 2019](https://www.dyslexiavictoriasupport.com) (15)

DVS findings are supported in the recently published study by Dr. Joanne Quick who found 52% of schools offered Reading Recovery. (16) Furthermore, the Victorian Principals Association (VPA) - Early Years Reading Approach position paper, states “Reading Recovery (is) to be the recommended early intervention strategy for schools”. (17)

Reading Recovery does not meet the criteria outlined above for evidence-based interventions for language and reading difficulties such as dyslexia and has been evaluated as providing no positive long-term effects. The NSW Education Department no longer provides system support for Reading Recovery as per Reading Recovery: A Sector-Wide Analysis, NSW Government, NSW Government, Centre for Education Statistics and Evaluation. (18)

**Recommendation 4 -**

Inclusion of an ‘evidence-based language and reading intervention’ core unit in all Initial Teaching Education course curricula.
Recommendation 5 -

Inclusion of an ‘evidence-based language and reading intervention core unit’ in federal government funded mandatory ‘Evidence-based initial reading instruction’ courses for all existing school principals and foundation teachers in Australian state government schools (recommendation 2)

4. Ensure transparency in funding for dyslexia

DVS members report a lack of funding as a barrier for their dyslexic child at school. DVS members also report a lack of transparency in how their school is using state funding. Could the committee account for how the states are dispersing the NCCD funding under which our dyslexic children are being reported?

In Victoria, the Language and Learning Disabilities Support Program claims to provide schools with resources to support the delivery of teaching and learning programs for students with autism, dyslexia, language or other learning disabilities yet DVS knows of no verified instance of a dyslexic child benefiting from this targeted funding. (19)

Recommendation 6 -

Apply accountability measures in how state governments are using NCCD funding and how principals are using the consequent state government funding.

Conclusion

Our children deserve better. Our dyslexic children are suffering needlessly, as they are not being taught to read in their early years of school. This suffering is not new. Parents of a dyslexic child are likely to speak of adult family members who experienced the same struggles during their school years over previous decades.

It is time our Federal Government took responsibility for our failing literacy rates. It is time to act on evidence-based research into initial reading instruction and it is time to use taxpayers’ money on evidence-based initial reading approaches and evidence-based intervention programs.

Please do not hesitate to contact DVS for further information or clarification on any aspect of this submission.
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Appendix 1

Dr. Kerry Hempenstall, Retired teacher and educational psychologist

I plan to address mainly the fourth of the Terms of Reference. Investigating ways to increase retention rates for the teaching profession, and avoid 'burn out' among early-career teachers.

It is my contention that teachers are being ill-prepared for the challenges inherent in education in this 21st century. This has the effect of requiring many teachers to employ solely inner resources, to each reinvent the wheel, in order to do the best for their students. That is a great shame, because for every teacher who finds a way through this maze, there are others who are not by nature adequately equipped to do so. This represents a sink-or-swim model that leads to various outcomes: excellent teachers, surviving but disillusioned teachers, those who leave the profession because of a perceived sense of failure, and sub-optimal outcomes for students. Certainly, there are also other causes of burnout and premature career endings. However, there is a disconnect between much of current classroom practice and the rich field of educational research that could be readily employed as a basis for effective teaching.

Predictably, among those who elect to remain, there is a marked variation in teacher effectiveness across the education system. This dramatic variation is a consequence of the sink-or-swim model of teacher education that eschews evidence-based practice in favour of a constructionist model that promotes a learner-based curriculum. In this guide-by-the-side approach, there is little need for instructional or management skills. The expectation is that as long as teachers make their classrooms engaging, students will naturally progress. Unfortunately, when this assumption proves unjustified, few teachers know what to do because they haven’t been adequately trained. The problem that arises from failing to develop teachers’ knowledge of effective teaching is a wide variation of teacher effectiveness. Since training is inadequate, some teachers will bootstrap themselves and become excellent teachers, others will achieve less self-direct learning, and do reasonably well, while too many will not be able to fill the void left by poor preparation. The overall impact is an unacceptable variation in the quality of education experienced by our nation’s children.

“[Researchers] studied the correlation between teacher effectiveness and student performance on formal assessments. They found that the average reading scores of students assigned to three highly effective teachers in a row rose from the 59th percentile in fourth grade to the 76th
percentile by the end of sixth grade, and students of similar ability assigned to ineffective teachers for three consecutive years fell from the 60th percentile in fourth grade to the 42nd percentile by the end of sixth grade. ... The average math scores of students assigned to three highly effective teachers in a row rose from the 55th percentile in third grade to the 76th percentile by the end of fifth grade. The scores of students of similar ability assigned to ineffective teachers fell from the 57th percentile in third grade to the 27th percentile in fifth grade. Students of similar ability and performance in third grade, therefore, were separated by nearly 50 percentile points just three years later.”


“The relationship and interaction between teachers and students has a significant impact on students’ educational outcomes. Consistent with Hattie’s findings reported above, research by McKinsey shows that teacher quality affected student performance more than any other variable, and that on average, two students with average performance (50th percentile) would diverge by more than 50 percentile points over a three year period depending on the teacher they were assigned.

* Among the top 20% of teachers **Among the bottom 20% of teachers*

I present two areas that should be considered and acted upon. Each would require a significant change in teacher education for them to produce viable improvements in student success and teacher retention.

1. **Shifting initial instruction from a predominantly learner-centred to a teacher-centred teaching approach.**

   “Evaluations in numerous countries have shown serious problems with initial teacher education (ITE). These include: A lack of evidence-based content, inadequate training in subject knowledge, an insufficient focus on data collection and analysis skills for clinical teaching practice, limited integration of theory and practice. In most systems around the world, addressing these issues will be central to reforms to improve ITE and end the pattern of under-prepared teachers turning up in schools. ... Evaluations of ITE [initial teacher education] programs from the US and Australia have shown that some courses are teaching obsolete or ineffective practices and strategies. ... Reforms should focus on ensuring teachers are using methods known to improve student learning. ... Conclusion  Our goal is to improve student learning by improving teacher preparation” (p.25)


“The Need for Explicit Instruction. When academic literacy skills are taught, explicit instruction should be provided. Explicit instruction involves direct teaching including teacher modeling,
guided student practice with feedback, and independent student practice (Hock, Deshler, & Schumaker, 2000; Marchand-Martella & Martella, 2013; National Institute for Literacy [NIFL], 2007). Biancarosa and Snow (2006) and Kosanovich et al. (2010) list explicit instruction as the chief way to promote student learning. This systematic instructional process provides a framework for the gradual transfer of responsibility for student learning from the teacher to the student as the student becomes increasingly successful (Marchand-Martella & Martella, 2013). Each step of comprehension (i.e. strategies, monitoring and metacognition, teacher modeling, scaffolding, and apprenticeship) requires the use of explicit instruction by teachers in order to be successfully implemented by readers (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006). The key to explicit instruction is ongoing interaction and communication between the students and the teacher (Rupley, Blair, & Nichols, 2009). Only then can students learn to comprehend, understand, and interact with written text (Rupley et al., 2009).

Research almost universally supports explicit instructional practices (Archer & Hughes, 2011; Kirschner, Sweller, & Clark, 2006; Klahr & Nigam, 2004; Marchand-Martella, Slocum, & Martella, 2004). Explicit instructional approaches are considered more effective and efficient as compared to discovery-based approaches (Alfieri, Brooks, Aldrich, & Tenenbaum, 2010; Ryder, Tunmer, & Greaney, 2008), particularly when students are naïve or struggling learners.”


"Teaching should be viewed more as a science like engineering, medicine, or plumbing which all have codes of practice that you learn and apply. Teachers are very autonomous, particularly in Australia, which makes it hard to manage their accountability."

“Based on available data, our review indicates how little we know about the outcomes of individual teacher education programs in Australia, not only with respect to each other, but internationally. Australia’s teacher education system currently lacks the capacity and the measures to monitor its own performance and, therefore, to promote improvement. There is little evidence that the current accreditation system is having an impact on the quality of teacher education or graduate outcomes.” (p.x)


The gap between research and practice in education is nowhere more stark than in literacy, arguably a prerequisite for future student knowledge growth and a successful education.

“Teacher education is the logical solution to solving the issue of teacher knowledge. Providing effective preservice teacher education programmes for the teachers of future generations can address the gaps that exist in current teacher knowledge. The adequate provision of education about planning for differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all individuals must be at the forefront of all teacher education programmes, rather than many current training programs that are based on ideological beliefs and a mistrust of science. Pre-service teachers must be skilled in the content knowledge of each component of reading to enable them to choose appropriate classroom-level instruction, to adequately assess the components of literacy acquisition and to use that information to make appropriate instructional decisions that better meet the needs of all learners.” (p.19)


Initial instruction in literacy: Teachers are inadequately trained.
“Consistent with a number of earlier Australian and international studies, teachers’ explicit and implicit knowledge of basic linguistic constructs was limited and highly variable. … Teachers were most likely to rate their ability to teach skills including spelling, phonics, comprehension or vocabulary as either moderate or very good. This was despite most respondents demonstrating limited knowledge and stating that they did not feel confident answering questions about their knowledge in these areas. The findings from this study confirm that in the field of language and literacy instruction, there is a gap between the knowledge that is theoretically requisite, and therefore expected, and the actual knowledge of many teachers. This finding challenges current preservice teacher education and in-service professional learning.” (p.28)


“Several researchers have argued that teachers need to have explicit knowledge about the structure of language in order to teach reading effectively to all students (Moats, 1994, 1995, 2003, 2009; Podhajski, 1995; Snow, Griffin, & Burns, 2005). Using survey approaches, several studies have found knowledge levels for language concepts – chiefly at phonological and morphological levels – that are low enough to warrant improved professional development, both among PSTs (Moats, 1994; Washburn, Joshi, & Binks Cantrell, 2011a) and in-service teachers (Moats & Foorman, 2003; Washburn, Joshi, & Binks-Cantrell, 2011b). … More recent Australian research (Fielding-Barnsley, 2010; Mahar & Richdale, 2008) similarly found that PSTs considered phonics important in teaching reading but many lacked confidence to do so. PSTs’ knowledge of the definition of a phoneme was stronger than their proficiency at counting phonemes in words. For example, 4.3% of Queensland PSTs (Fielding-Barnsley, 2010) and 9% of Victorian PSTs (Mahar & Richdale, 2008) correctly counted four phonemes in box, not three.”

“Our results show that in both reading comprehension and writing, all teachers reported not receiving sound evidence-based pre-service preparation and they were not currently employing any evidence-based approaches. Most teachers reported using the basal reading series with very little variation from the lesson scope and sequence. Teachers and administrators frequently reported that skills were being taught in isolation (e.g., skill of the week is summarizing) and that writing was neglected. The interviews showed very interesting patterns of curricula decision-making by school administrators and these findings were further confirmed through the artifact reviews. Based on these results, we recommend that any review of teacher practices focus also on administrator decision-making and school level factors that are driving what happens in the classrooms. The review showed that the teachers themselves do not feel empowered to learn and deliver evidence-based literacy practices and feel constrained by the system.” (p.1)


“Given the complexity of the English writing system and disconnect between explicitly and implicitly held knowledge of it, being a proficient reader is no guarantee that a person can directly (i.e., explicitly) teach the elements of the English language that foster reading acquisition in young children and struggling readers (Joshi et al., 2009). This is particularly true for the relationships between the orthographic and phonological structures and directly teaching letter-sound correspondences, as well as the relationships between larger letter clusters and sound patterns that support the acquisition of accurate and automatic word recognition skills (Ehri, 1999; Perfetti, 1992; Share & Stanovich, 1995). Moreover, students with word reading deficits, including those with dyslexia, benefit from direct and explicit instruction in the phonological structure of spoken language and letter sound correspondences (Ehri & McCormick, 1998). Yet, these are among the areas identified as weaknesses in teachers’ knowledge (Cohen, Mather, Schneider, & White, 2017; Cunningham, Perry, Stanovich, & Stanovich, 2004; McCutchen & Berninger, 1999). For example, Cunningham et al. (2004) observed teachers to have limited knowledge of phonemic awareness and phonics, despite the large body of research demonstrating the importance of these areas in teaching the alphabetic
principle to developing readers. Additionally, McCutchen and Berninger (1999) noted that explicit knowledge of phonology and phonics, or the lack thereof, was evident in teachers’ instructional practices.

Gaps in the knowledge base of teachers charged with providing reading instruction to children are not limited to phonemic awareness and the aspects of the language directly taught as part of phonics instruction. Teachers also have been documented to have limited knowledge of morphemes and selecting targeted instruction based on student errors (Carreker, Joshi, & Boulware-Gooden, 2010). Given the strong association between morphology and orthographic patterns as well as the contribution morphemic knowledge makes to decoding, spelling, and vocabulary knowledge for students (Castles, Rastle, & Nation, 2018; Kessler & Treiman, 2001; Rastle, 2018), teachers’ knowledge of the morphological structure of the language is also important. Indeed, Carreker et al. (2010) observed teachers with greater levels of knowledge in these domains to be better able than their less knowledgeable peers at selecting appropriate targeted instructional activities intended to remediate student weaknesses. These documented deficits in teacher knowledge are disconcerting given that they are linked to questionable teaching practices and suboptimal student learning outcomes (Cohen et al., 2017; Lyon & Weiser, 2009; McCutchen et al., 2002; McCutchen, Green, Abbott, & Sanders, 2009; Piasta, Connor, Fishman, & Morrison, 2009). For example, McCutchen and Berninger (1999) identified limited knowledge of phonics and the sound symbol relationships that undergird the use of this instructional approach as a major obstacle to teachers meeting the needs of struggling readers. Indeed, as teachers’ phonological and orthographic knowledge deepened, their use of explicit instruction to directly teach these components of the English language increased, which was associated with improved student reading outcomes (McCutchen et al., 2002). Moreover, struggling readers benefit more from instruction provided by teachers who possess knowledge of early literacy constructs (McCutchen et al., 2009). Similarly, Piasta et al. (2009) observed instruction provided by more knowledgeable teachers to be associated with greater levels of word reading in their students. Collectively, these findings highlight the value added of a knowledgeable teacher providing reading instruction (Cohen et al., 2017; Piasta et al., 2009).

While the associations between teacher knowledge, practice, and student learning outcomes have been well established, several challenges have hindered efforts to address the real and pressing need to provide teachers with training to equip them with this knowledge. For
example, a low knowledge base in literacy constructs in graduates of teacher preparation programs could be perpetuated by their instructors not possessing knowledge of phonology, phonics instructional concepts, spelling patterns, and morphology to share with their students (Joshi et al., 2009). Another challenge to meeting this need could be insufficient coverage of empirically validated instructional methods in all areas of literacy in college-level reading education textbooks (Joshi et al., 2009). Yet another obstacle to increasing teacher knowledge in reading constructs could arise from the difficulty in bridging scientifically rigorous research findings in reading and literacy to classroom practices. Recently, Castles et al. (2018) suggested the gap between research and practice may be attributed to “variations and biases in teacher training” (p. 6). No matter the cause for the gap between research and practice, additional training over and above initial teacher certification appears warranted, motivating a clear need for research investigating the extent to which the investment made in such training efforts is bringing about change in teacher knowledge.” (p. 2-3)


2. Classroom management strategies

Classroom management strategies are not adequately addressed in Australian teacher education courses. This leaves too many newly graduated teachers floundering - vulnerable to distress and early burnout – prompting a desire to leave the profession, often because of feeling as failures. There is ample evidence for classroom management strategies that enable teachers to achieve their teaching objectives. Without these strategies, many spend an inordinate and unsuccessful amount of time in attempting to impose order on their classes. Unfortunately, too often in training they are led to believe that simply making their classes engaging is sufficient to manage classrooms. Further, they are told that encouraging student self-discipline is the key. However, student self-discipline is usually a consequence of effective classroom management – not simply an alternative means.
There is increasing acknowledgement in education that evidence-based teaching is both valuable in increasing student academic and social development, and also an important means for supporting teachers in their teaching practice.

The evidence-based teaching rationale emphasises the importance of an educative approach to classroom management. An educative approach aims to teach all students social, behavioural and academic skills in an explicit and systematic manner, and assumes that their difficulties stem largely from a dearth of strategies which would allow them to cope with the demands of the classroom organisation and of inter-personal relationships. This model contrasts with a coercive approach which assumes that students have these skills, but choose not to exercise them. The practical implication of this latter assumption tends to be an over-reliance on punishment in attempting to increase motivation and appropriate behaviour. In classroom management there are no magic formulae; however, establishing productive classroom behaviour expectations can be achieved by most teachers by the use of specific research-proven strategies.

Below are some of the findings of research into effective classroom management that are not addressed in teacher education:

“In the classroom, teachers consistently report dealing with student behavior to be among the most challenging issues they face on a daily basis (American Psychological Association, 2006; Rose & Gallup, 2005; Westling, 2010). Whereas the popular press might lead one to believe that the most common behavioral issues confronting teachers involve weapons, drugs, and violence, in reality, teachers in both general and special education regularly report student disengagement (i.e., off task) and simple disruption of the learning environment as the most common misbehaviors with which they deal on a daily basis (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Evers,
Tomic, & Brouwers, 2004; Westling, 2010). In fact, there is evidence that these types of common misbehaviors often consume more than 80% of teachers’ instructional time (Simonsen, Britton, & Young, 2010). In perhaps the largest paradox confronting teacher education, while teachers report behavior to be their greatest challenge, they also view behavior management as the skill with which they feel least prepared (Melnick & Meister, 2008; Westling, 2010). Alarmingly, the literature shows a long history of pointing out that, on average, teachers are not well trained in effective classroom and behavior management strategies (Coyne, Kame’enui, & Simmons, 2001; Oliver & Reschly, 2010). As a result, most novice teachers have a limited repertoire of responses to misbehavior (Jones & Chronis-Tuscano, 2008). This insufficient preparation also leads to teacher burnout and a tendency to leave the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Evers et al., 2004), an issue that is especially problematic in special education (B. S. Billingsley, 2002; Hawe, Tuck, Manthei, Adair, & Moore, 2000). There is, however, strong evidence that teachers trained to develop effective management practices report less emotional stress and exhaustion in dealing with student misbehavior (Aloe, Amo, & Shanahan, 2014; Tsouloupas, Carson, Matthews, Grawitch, & Barber, 2010). In sum, as part of a vicious circle, poor training leads to high rates of teacher burnout and turnover, creating a shortage that is too often filled by even less qualified teachers—a phenomenon most pronounced and common when considering teachers for students in special education (Sawka, McCurdy, & Mannella, 2002).” (p. 97)


“All in all, we would like to stress the importance of having a strong focus on classroom management in every primary school and classroom: Our study showed that all students may benefit from it. Implementation of effective classroom management interventions could be further stimulated (e.g., by the government) by providing schools with adequate information on those interventions with strong evidence on their effectiveness and those without. Moreover, teacher training programs should, in our view, integrate the existing knowledge about effective classroom management more strongly into their programs. By doing so, they can train their student teachers to manage classrooms effectively. Improving current teachers’
classroom management skills is another element to incorporate. As our results showed, it is very plausible that this will increase students’ academic outcomes.” (p. 28-29)


“Academics and behavior are inextricably linked, and as such, management of behavior should be considered not as an addition to the teacher’s repertoire of skills but as an integral foundational component of effective instruction. Paradoxically, teachers report that students with challenging behavior are both their greatest challenge and that behavior management is the skill with which they are least prepared in their teacher preparation programs. In this article, the authors first review a rationale for considering high probability practices as those that provide the best probability for student success. Next, they present a set of key teacher-implemented management strategies as an essential part of the curriculum for any prospective teacher.” (p.102)


“Difficulty managing classroom behavior is a frequently recognized problem for teachers, especially teachers early in their careers. Classroom rules are identified as an integral part of effective classroom management as they are relatively simple to implement and focus on preventing challenging behaviors before they occur. Sources such as classroom management textbooks and practitioner-oriented journal articles recommend a number of characteristics that make classroom rules effective; unfortunately, these sources have not been uniform in their recommendations. The purpose of this review of effective practices is to compare what information teachers are being given either in their preservice coursework or in-service training via textbooks and practitioner-oriented articles with actual empirical research that used classroom rules as an independent variable. Results indicated that the two most important
Characteristics of effective classroom rules are teaching the rules to students and tying rules to positive and/or negative consequences. Other characteristics recommended in secondary sources remain equivocal in the research. Implications for effective teacher preparation in classroom management are discussed."

*Teacher Education and Special Education, 40*(2), 114–127.

“A long history of research on teaching suggests that effective teachers may be better at capturing more time for academic instruction and keeping students focused on their tasks than less effective teachers. Effective teachers may have more efficient routines for transitions between activities, and better classroom management that result in more time for instruction.”


“In this article, the authors provide an overview of empirically supported practices and techniques for monitoring and assessing teachers’ use of effective behavior support practices. They focus on how teacher preparation programs, administrators, and supervising teachers provide preservice teachers with helpful feedback on their teaching performance. In addition, they describe a behaviorally based conceptual model for assessing teachers’ fluent and sustained use of empirically supported classroom behavior support practices and provide recommendations for enhancing the preparation of pre-service educators.”

*Teacher Education and Special Education, 40*(2), 97-101.
“Effective classroom instructional and behavior management is essential to ensure student academic and social success. Foundational strategies such as clear expectations and routines, specific feedback, and high rates of opportunities to respond have strong empirical support, yet are often missing from educator repertoires. In this article, the authors provide a brief rationale for the inclusion of evidence-based practices accompanied with recommended resources to identify current and future practices. In addition, they also provide an overview of effective inservice educator professional development, to ensure evidence-based practices are implemented with fidelity, and recommended systemic strategies that schools and school districts can adopt to support teacher learning. Implications for teacher preparation programs also are discussed.” (p.140)


Some other relevant quotes from the research:

“A challenging part of the process that beginning teachers undergo, from learning how to teach to actually starting to teach in a real classroom, has been called many names, such as “praxis shock” (Veenman, 1984), reality shock, “the survival phase” (Huberman, 1989), “transition shock” (Corcoran, 1981), and even “shattered dreams” (Friedman, 2000). What these various labels have in common is that they refer to the collapse of ideals or expectations developed during teacher education, following a teacher's first confrontation with classroom reality (Friedman, 2000). As a result of such confrontations, strain or burnout, reflecting a prolonged and occupational-specific form of strain as the result of repeated long-term exposure to stressors, can occur (Veenman, 1984). Despite the considerable differences in teacher preparation programs worldwide, all share a common factor: As beginning teachers learn to apply their theoretical knowledge in a practical context, international research indicates, they seem to struggle with this transition from learner teacher to beginning teacher: for example, in Israel (Friedman, 2000), the Netherlands (Stokking, Leenders, De Jong, & Van Tartwijk, 2003),
the USA (Veenman, 1984) and, most importantly for the present study, in Germany (Klusmann, Kunter, Voss, & Baumert, 2012).

Recent research shows that strain and low levels of well-being in teachers are in large part caused by student disturbances (Bakker et al., 2007, Evers et al., 2004, Friedman, 2006). Thus, giving teachers special training in how to manage their classroom should allow them to deal with disturbances more efficiently (Emmer & Evertson, 2008) and, in effect, increase their well-being.

We conducted an experiment with three groups, who received classroom management training, stress management training, or no training, respectively, and observed the effects on short- and long-term levels of well-being and classroom management capabilities. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that has investigated the relationship between strain and classroom management skills experimentally, allowing us to investigate causal relationships. The results from this innovative comparison allow for conclusions on the effectiveness of pre-empting the major teacher stressor of classroom disturbances, as opposed to learning how to deal with teacher stressors when they occur. In addition, our results provide direct evidence of the importance of classroom management skills for reducing reality shock and supporting teachers' well-being, thereby creating a better-prepared teacher workforce. In summary, our paper addresses a pressing issue in the contemporary Western world: how to prevent strain as a symptom of reality shock and thereby to retain beginning teachers by providing them with adequate classroom management skills.” (p.1)


“A second finding of this meta-analysis was that the interventions that focused on changing teachers’ classroom management (e.g., keeping order, introducing rules and procedures, disciplinary interventions), we found a tentative result that these interventions had a small effect on students’ academic outcomes (p = .05). Classroom management is considered a precondition for learning; effective teaching, and learning cannot take place in poorly managed
classrooms (V. F. Jones & Jones, 2012). These findings can be explained through improved time-on-task, improved instruction practices, and increased opportunity-to-learn, but this hypothesized causal chain needs to be further explored and validated in future research. ... All in all, we would like to stress the importance of having a strong focus on classroom management in every primary school and classroom: Our study showed that all students may benefit from it. Implementation of effective classroom management interventions could be further stimulated (e.g., by the government) by providing schools with adequate information on those interventions with strong evidence on their effectiveness and those without. Moreover, teacher training programs should, in our view, integrate the existing knowledge about effective classroom management more strongly into their programs. By doing so, they can train their student teachers to manage classrooms effectively. Improving current teachers’ classroom management skills is another element to incorporate. As our results showed, it is very plausible that this will increase students’ academic outcomes.” (p.28-29)


“Students with learning disabilities (LD) experience pervasive academic deficits requiring extensive academic intervention; however, they may also engage in problem behaviors that adversely affect teaching and learning, thus lessening the potential impact of specialized instruction and supports. The learning deficits of students with LD are prevalent in the extant research, but behavioral needs appear to receive less attention. The authors report the results of a systematic review investigating the evidence-base for function-based interventions for students with LD using the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) criteria for evaluating single-case studies. Fourteen studies with 17 participants met inclusion criteria, with the majority occurring in elementary settings. Although interventions tended to be effective, few included maintenance and generalization measures. Because of the small number of studies (n = 4) that met WWC design and effectiveness standards, the authors conclude that function-based
interventions, although promising, cannot currently be considered an evidence-based practice for students with LD. Implications for practice, areas for future research, and study limitations are reported.” (p.15)


“Overall, teachers’ multi-component classroom management programmes have a significant positive effect in decreasing aggressive or problematic behaviour in the classroom. Students in the treatment classrooms in all 12 studies reviewed showed less disruptive or problematic behaviours when compared to the students in control classrooms without the intervention. (p.2)


“This meta-analysis examined school-based intervention research based on functional behavioral assessment (FBA) to determine the effectiveness of key individualized positive behavior support (IPBS) practices in school settings. In all, 83 studies representing 145 participants were included in the meta-analysis. Intervention, maintenance, and generalization effects were measured by computing the percentage of nonoverlapping data points (PND). Overall, FBA-based interventions were found to be equally effective across diverse student populations and educational settings, including inclusive classrooms. In terms of key IPBS practices, results indicated that team decision making during intervention planning led to significantly larger PNDs. Descriptive analysis revealed that there has been an increase in the use of IPBS practices in school-based FBA-based intervention.” (p. 271)

“Classroom management practices are clearly related to reading outcomes for boys with behavior problems, but not girls, and therefore, further investigations into more nuanced approaches to managing a classroom are warranted. Similar to previous research (Nelson et al., 2004; Rice & Yen, 2010), the current study found no significant differences in reading achievement between boys and girls with or at risk for EBD. This leads to the question of why boys, and not girls, benefited from classroom management quality in relation to reading achievement, especially when no significant differences were found in the quality of classroom management they had experienced. The girls in our study scored significantly higher on internalizing behaviors and lower on externalizing behaviors than boys. Although correlations do not allow for causal inferences, externalizing behaviors, but not internalizing behaviors, were negatively correlated with classroom management quality, and classroom management quality was positively correlated with third-grade reading achievement. Internalizing behaviors may go unnoticed or, if identified, unaddressed because teachers are unsure how to intervene (Conley, Marchant, & Caldarella, 2014).” (p.14)


**Conclusion:**

Teacher education is a major economic investment. It needs to be effective if teachers are to be able to meet society’s expectations for our children’s education. However, teacher education is ineffective for a number of reasons, including an ideological rather than evidence-based perspective on what constitutes effective teacher education. Is it any wonder we have such problems in retaining teachers when we send them out ill-equipped to perform the task we set them? Teacher education requires a radical overhaul.