Hide and seek
Where are all the specialists?
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Foreword

Driver Youth Trust’s mission is to help young people who struggle to read and write. We have, through our advocacy and research remit, recommended that knowledge of literacy difficulties is embedded in teacher training (*Fish in the tree*, 2013), examined the impact of the 2014 reforms on learners with SEND (*Joining the dots*, 2015) and challenged the educational sector to ensure that learners with SEND are prioritised by school leaders and policy-makers (*Through the looking glass*, 2017). Read our research reports at driveryouthtrust.com/research.

Our fourth report, *Hide and Seek*, casts attention over the specialist provision available to learners with literacy difficulties. It is timely, coming as it does just after the ten-year anniversary of Sir Jim Rose’s landmark review, *Identifying and Teaching Children and Young People with Dyslexia and Literacy Difficulties* (referred to as the Rose Review for the rest of this report), and following the number of reports about SEND specialisms in recent years, including speech, language and communication¹ and educational psychology².

It is an important piece of research and goes to the heart of why, despite some progress with literacy levels generally (see section 1.3), for some progress is not being made and, as a society, we are seeing the consequences of this (see section 1.5).

We see specialists in the medical field, consultants supporting GPs, and in the legal world, barristers alongside solicitors, and they exist in the education world too, for example, speech and language therapists. However, when it comes to the need for specialists for those with dyslexia and literacy difficulties, a Specific Learning Difficulty (SpLD), there is confusion. Unlike speech and language therapists or psychologists there is no central system of training, no governing body, no regulated Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and, indeed, no common language as to what a specialist is.

Long after the government made promises to provide a SpLD specialist for every cluster of schools, this report seeks to determine where we are. We seek to analyse the current system, identify strong and weak areas of provision, recognise new opportunities for specialist support and make recommendations to the government and sector on effective ways in which we can move forward.

Our aim is always to be collaborative and engage with the wider sector so your feedback on our findings and proposed solutions is very welcome. It is my hope that this report will act as a call to action to ensure that learners with literacy difficulties receive the support they require so that all children can access their education and thrive to the best of their ability.

Sarah Driver
Chair and Founder
Driver Youth Trust
Executive summary

Despite progress made in improving literacy in England over the past ten years, it is still not good enough. Literacy difficulties can be a significant barrier to young people's educational success and subsequent life chances. In 2009, a landmark government report led to a £10 million fund to train 4,000 specialist teachers in dyslexia and literacy difficulties to support the education system to better meet the needs of pupils. Ten years on the government had spent over £6 million, yet there is no official record of how many specialists have been trained or the work they carry out. This report seeks to address this.

We find a complicated and opaque landscape. Despite the existence of a Professional Development Framework, specialist teacher qualifications are available at different levels and are offered by multiple providers, accreditation boards and professional organisations and it is confusing as to what specialist teachers are qualified to do. As a result, specialist qualifications are under-valued and misunderstood by schools.

Despite this, there does not seem to be a shortage of specialist teachers. Whilst there are no official figures, we estimate that 3,500 have been trained in the past ten years; one specialist for every nine schools in England. However, few specialists are employed in state schools.

Where they are working in schools, they are frequently deployed as one-to-one support for pupils and are not sharing their expertise with their school-based colleagues. Now more than ever is the time to utilise specialist teachers who have the skills to not only impact individual pupils who struggle with literacy but entire school workforces. We hope that the government and the sector will take serious note of the issues we raise in this report.

To improve access and deployment of specialist teachers, Driver Youth Trust calls for:

1. An agreed definition for specialist teachers and the tasks they are qualified to undertake.
2. An identifiable specialist qualification and a single accrediting body.
3. A single register of specialist teachers.
4. A fund for maintained schools and academies to spend on specialist teachers.
5. Deployment of specialists to support their peers as well as pupils.

As the education system comes to terms with the challenges posed by the coronavirus (COVID-19) restrictions that led to widespread school closures, and tries to provide opportunities for pupils to learn and develop their literacy skills, this report is timely.

Outcomes for learners with literacy difficulties have remained significantly below the national average for a decade and it is all but certain this situation has become much worse over 2020.

The government has committed to spending hundreds of millions of pounds through the National Tutoring Programme and many schools will need to provide additional help to pupils through targeted support.

Yet the skill set of many specialist professionals – teachers, therapists and psychologists – seem absent from this agenda precisely at a time when they could take a lead in this national endeavour. We know that support is most effective when it is informed by a thorough analysis of the needs of pupils and is linked to a clear and well-structured curriculum. Catch-up lessons and private tutors are no substitute for what schools can provide and achieve in the longer term.

However, even though the supply of specialist teachers has increased, demand from schools is in decline. Despite the work which followed the Rose Review, specialists remain underutilised, in part due to the government's changing priorities, and a failure to join up initiatives.

---

i Persistent difficulty in reading, writing, speaking and/or listening that may not be responsive to standard education approaches and requires further intervention.

ii The framework standards are not widely known within the sector.
Introduction

The Rose Review was a landmark report recommending that the government fund teachers to undertake specialist training in teaching children with dyslexia and literacy difficulties.

£10 million was committed by the then Secretary of State for Education, Ed Balls, to train 4,000 specialist teachers. His ambition was to see at least one specialist dyslexia teacher (also referred to as specialists or specialist teachers in this report) for each local group of schools.

Almost ten years on the government has spent over £6 million. However, a Freedom of Information request by Driver Youth Trust in 2017 found that the Department for Education (DfE) did not record how many specialists were trained or collate the information of where the specialists now reside or what work they carry out.

We sought answers to the following questions:

1. How many specialist teachers are there?
2. Who are the specialist teachers and what is their background?
3. Where are the specialist teachers?
4. How are specialist teachers deployed?
5. What ongoing training/CPD do specialist teachers receive?

These questions form the basis of this report. We review the recommendations of the Rose Review in relation to specialists and use a mixed methods approach (as summarised in Table 1) to review current provision of specialists across England to see if Rose’s recommendations were ever met.

We examine how changes to the political and educational landscape have impacted on specialist provision and, from all this, we examine the gaps in the system and recommend the way forward in order to improve the literacy levels of those in our society.

The research did not seek to measure the impact, effectiveness or quality of specialist teachers. To understand this, further research will be needed.
Table 1. Summary of research methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many specialist teachers are there?</th>
<th>Interview with training providers and professional associations</th>
<th>DfE Freedom of Information request</th>
<th>Analysis of local authorities (LA) Local Offers</th>
<th>Survey of specialist teachers</th>
<th>Survey of teachers in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many specialist teachers are there (in each region)?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a need for more specialist teachers?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are the specialist teachers?</th>
<th>Interview with training providers and professional associations</th>
<th>DfE Freedom of Information request</th>
<th>Analysis of local authorities (LA) Local Offers</th>
<th>Survey of specialist teachers</th>
<th>Survey of teachers in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What training have specialist teachers received?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of specialist teachers? (e.g. age, gender etc.)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did the specialist teachers train?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background of specialist teachers? (e.g. former primary teacher)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where are the specialist teachers?</th>
<th>Interview with training providers and professional associations</th>
<th>DfE Freedom of Information request</th>
<th>Analysis of local authorities (LA) Local Offers</th>
<th>Survey of specialist teachers</th>
<th>Survey of teachers in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are specialist teachers spread across the country?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which types of schools do they work in?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How are specialist teachers deployed?</th>
<th>Interview with training providers and professional associations</th>
<th>DfE Freedom of Information request</th>
<th>Analysis of local authorities (LA) Local Offers</th>
<th>Survey of specialist teachers</th>
<th>Survey of teachers in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are specialist teachers managed (who by)?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What ongoing training/CPD do specialist teachers receive?</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1. Outlining the problem

1.1 What do we mean by literacy difficulties?

Literacy is the ability to read, write, speak and listen in a way that lets us communicate effectively and make sense of the world. For some young people, compared to their peers, the skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening are more difficult to acquire. This difficulty is not necessarily related to intellectual ability, but it does make life more challenging and often impacts on lifetime opportunities and success.

**DYT’s definition of literacy difficulty**

Persistent difficulty in reading, writing, speaking and/or listening that may not be responsive to standard education approaches and requires further intervention.

Literacy difficulties are not solely about trouble accessing English lessons, but rather the whole curriculum; therefore they are a great strain on the educational experience and life chances for these learners. The causes of literacy difficulties are an area of ongoing academic conflict and debate, particularly around definitions of specific disorders and how these are diagnosed. However, there is general agreement that some learners will have difficulty achieving the automaticity and proficiency required to be literate.

When is a literacy difficulty a special educational need?

Special educational needs and disability (SEND) refers to a learning difficulty or disability that makes it harder for children to learn than most children of the same age.

When literacy difficulties are recorded as a SEND, they most frequently fall into one of two categories:

- **Specific Learning difficulty (SpLD)** is a term that refers to a difference or difficulty with particular aspects of learning. The most common SpLDs are dyslexia, dyspraxia, attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder and dyscalculia.

- **Speech, Language and Communication Needs (SLCN)** is an umbrella term that relates to a wide range of difficulties. Some of these may relate to a specific condition, such as Developmental Language Disorder which affects the way learners understand and express language, but equally some children may experience difficulties due to other developmental reasons.

4% of the population have ‘severe’ dyslexia³
1.2 How many learners have literacy difficulties in England?

It is difficult to define the precise number of learners that have literacy difficulties. Literacy difficulties exist on a continuum scale of severity; all should be recognised and supported. Different approaches have been taken to try to determine the scale of the problem.

5% of learners in mainstream education have a diagnosed SEND that will significantly impact their literacy skills.

12% of children leave primary school unable to read at a secondary standard.

Of the total percentage of learners with SEND, 13% are categorised as having SpLD, and 22% are categorised as having SLCN.

18% of learners do not meet the expected standard in the phonics screening check at the end of Key Stage 1.

49% of all classes have at least one student diagnosed with dyslexia.

These statistics are likely to be under reporting the prevalence of literacy difficulties. Official statistics about learners with SEND are collected by the DfE during an annual census. School staff are asked to record ‘primary type of need’ for learners with SEND. Literacy difficulties are most often grouped under the wider category of ‘cognition and learning’ or ‘communication and interaction’, however if a young person has another more apparent need, the literacy difficulty may not be identified and recorded at all under this system. In addition, this record relies on the timely and accurate identification of SEND which might include a range of educational, medical or psychological assessments, or none. We also know that sometimes, learners who have a literacy difficulty are not categorised as SEND at all.

1.3 What are the literacy levels in our country?

Despite progress made in improving literacy in England over the past ten years, it is still not good enough. Over half the adult working population (56%) in England are reported as having literacy skills below GCSE grade C with 5.2 million of these people reportedly lacking functional literacy. As a society, we are getting too used to hearing the following statistics recording the issues with literacy in our country:

10% of people in our country have dyslexia.

4% of the population have ‘severe’ dyslexia.

16.4% of adults in England, or 7.1 million people, can be described as having ‘very poor literacy skills’.

But what we are less aware of is that there is a group of children who have devastatingly low levels of literacy often with added social disadvantages that, if anything, make it even more imperative that they leave school with the literacy levels they deserve.

Hidden learners with literacy difficulties

Whilst those with more profound difficulties will have an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) or be on a school’s register for SEN support, there are many children at school who may not have an identified difficulty but are struggling all the same. The British Dyslexia Association (BDA) estimates that over 80% of young people with dyslexia are not identified at school. Learners with literacy difficulties are also often missed in national literacy statistics. Data from the 2016 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) revealed an increase in the number of low-performing learners reading well and subsequently boosted England’s position in the global rankings. However, this did not take into account learners with SEND, so presents only a partial picture of literacy in England.
1.4 Poor outcomes for those with literacy difficulties

Outcomes for learners with literacy difficulties have remained, without exception, worse than any other group, especially if they are from a disadvantaged background. National tests, at all levels of the education system, reveal that learners with literacy difficulties fail to attain the expected standards, or standards close to their peers (see Figure 1).

Eight out of ten children with a SEND are in our mainstream schools and here is how well they do in comparison to their peers.

- **Phonics screening check**: only 43% of pupils with SEND achieve the expected standard compared with 88% of pupils with no identified SEND (a gap of 45 percentage points). Look further, and for those pupils with SpLD and the gap widens to 52 percentage points\(^{14}\).

- **Key stage 2**: in 2019, only 22% of pupils with SEND reached the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics, compared with 74% of pupils with no identified SEND (gap of 52 percentage points). These outcomes drop to 21% for pupils with SpLD and 19% for those with SLCN\(^{15}\).

- **GCSE results**: in 2019, the percentage of pupils who got a ‘pass’ in English and maths GCSE (4–9) was 64.6%. For pupils with SEND this was just 26.7%; 35.6% for those with SpLD and 20.7% for those with SLCN\(^{16}\).

For many, the only issue is that they have a difficulty in reading, writing, speaking and literacy and not a cognitive problem, therefore they should not be significantly behind their peers.

**Figure 1. Attainment of learners with literacy difficulties is significantly below their peers**

- Per cent of pupils reaching the expected standard in the phonic screening check at the end of year 1.
- Per cent of pupils reaching the expected standard in reading, writing and mathematics at the end of KS2.
- Per cent of pupils with a standard ‘pass’ in English and maths GCSE (4–9).

- Pupils with SLCN
- Pupils with SpLD
- Pupils with SEND
- All pupils
1.5 What are the costs of poor literacy?

We are also complacent about the figures of what poor literacy costs us as a society.

**Low literacy costs the economy.** Low literacy is associated with lower earnings and employment rates, particularly for women. Failure to master basic literacy skills costs the economy **£2.5 billion each year**. Conversely, a 1% rise in literacy rates would ultimately lead to a 3% rise in Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

**Research shows there is a significant overlap between disadvantage and literacy difficulties.** One in five learners with SpLD and one in four learners with SLCN are eligible for free school meals. Children living in poverty face a much greater risk of falling behind: one in three (35%) do not have the age-appropriate language skills expected of a five-year-old.

**The link with poverty.** There is also a significant body of evidence that suggests that literacy can be delayed due to family circumstances and background, especially due to the ‘word gap’ where pupils enter primary school with a vocabulary far below age-related expectations. On average, primary school teachers report that 49% of Year 1 pupils have a limited vocabulary to the extent that it affects their learning.

**Impact on behaviour and mental health.** The result can often be poor behaviour and truancy. Research has linked reading difficulties to externalising behaviours, such as classroom discipline problems, bullying, and aggression, as well as ‘internalising behaviours’, such as depression and anxiety.

**A third of young people in Pupil Referral Units and Alternative Provision have SEND.** This provision costs £370,000 per young person in lifetime education, benefits, healthcare and criminal justice costs. Over half (54%) of people entering prison are assessed as having the literacy skills expected of an 11-year-old. This shows a link between literacy difficulties and problems with behaviour.

1.6 DYT improving literacy in schools, lobbying and research

At Driver Youth Trust we recognise that improving literacy in our society is complex and there is more than one answer. For over ten years we have approached the issue by working directly with schools and teachers, developing a programme, Drive for Literacy, that builds upon teacher capability and school capacity in an embedded sustainable way. Our experience of working directly with schools has shaped our thinking on how best to approach professional development for teachers, teaching assistants and school leaders. So that, not only do we make use of the best quality evidence to inform our work but also reflect on the practical constraints facing schools. Alongside this, our experience and expertise enables us to lobby effectively with stakeholders in the system and, finally, we carry out detailed research that highlights specific issues in the system which in turn impact on our nation’s literacy.
Part 2. The Rose Review – a solution for poor literacy

2.1 The Rose Review 2009 – the need for specialists

The Rose Review was a seminal document, based on a wide range of expertise and evidence, and much of it remains relevant today. In his opening letter to the then Secretary of State, Ed Balls, Sir Jim outlined the context of his review.

The Children’s Plan made it clear that the Government wants every child to succeed, and it hardly needs to be said that the ability to read well is key to success in education and an essential ‘life skill’. Moreover, reading and writing are closely related, and both are dependent on the development of children’s speaking and listening capabilities. As the review explains, responses to overcoming dyslexia and other developmental difficulties of language learning and cognition must be robust and set within high quality provision for securing literacy for all children, especially in primary schools.

He went on to recommend that the government should:

- Fund a number of teachers to undertake appropriately accredited specialist training in teaching children with dyslexia, in order to provide substantially improved access to specialist expertise in all schools and across all local authority areas.

2.2 The Rose Review’s recommendations

In the main findings of the Review, Rose cites the infamous McKinsey and Company 2007 observation that “the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers”, adding that “in other words success depends first and foremost on teachers who know what they are doing and why they are doing it”. In order to develop school workforce skills, a model of tiered expertise was envisaged as in Figure 2. In fact, this model was the precursor to that envisaged in the subsequent Children and Families Act 2014 and its accompanying SEND Code of Practice, which saw every teacher a teacher of those with a SEND. This also recognised that if evidence-based interventions were not having an effect, then additional support was needed. The National Literacy Strategy at the time described this as Wave 1 (delivered by the classroom teacher), Wave 2 (delivered by the SENCo), or Wave 3 (delivered by a specialist for more severe literacy difficulties). Although the national strategies were withdrawn in 2011, the principle of Wave 1, 2 or 3 interventions is still considered good practice.

Specialist skills in addressing literacy and dyslexic difficulties – those who:

- are up-to-date with best practice in promoting literacy for typically developing children
- have an expertise in a range of specific learning difficulties, including dyslexia
- can devise tailored interventions for children struggling most with literacy
- take a strong monitoring and training role in supporting other teachers, within a clear policy promoted by governors and headteachers.
Advanced skills in addressing literacy difficulties and dyslexia

Every school needs to be able to draw upon expertise in selecting literacy interventions, and on implementing, monitoring and evaluating them. Schools should ensure either that at least one of their teachers has, or obtains, this level of expertise – or that they have good access to such a teacher through partnership arrangements with other schools or trusted third parties.

Core skills for teachers in all schools

All teachers of beginner readers should have at least a working knowledge of what to look for that suggests a child may be at risk of dyslexia and know where to seek advice on what steps are needed to help them. This working knowledge should be a normal constituent of initial teacher training of those destined to teach beginner readers, and updated through in-service training.

Summary of key points from the Rose Review

Delivery of support

Individual tuition by specialist teachers alone is not always an essential requirement. Some studies have reported similar gains in reading whether an intervention is one-to-one tuition, teaching through small groups or a mix of both: the key factor being the quality of the teaching. Therefore, it is crucial for those implementing interventions (whether they are teachers or classroom support staff) to receive appropriate training, supervision and professional support, and that there are clear objectives against which each child’s progress can be rigorously monitored and evaluated.

Even under the best-known instructional conditions, response to intervention for some children with dyslexia can be variable and shows they are most likely to need intensive instruction, on an individual basis for as long as it takes to put them on the road to reading. They will invariably require the involvement of teachers with specialist training in dyslexia assessment and intervention.

Shared resources

The variable size and location of schools makes it difficult to recommend provision of a dyslexia only specialist in each of them. The important requirement is to make sure that schools can draw upon the expertise that is necessary to secure high quality mainstream programmes for teaching reading to all children, and equally high quality intervention programmes for those with dyslexia and other language difficulties.

49% of all classes have at least one student diagnosed with dyslexia
Part 3. The political context – what happened next and its effect on poor literacy

Having identified the role for specialist teachers within the education system, funding to train a new cohort was initially pledged for a two-year period. But less than a year after the commitment was made, there was a general election leading to the formation of the 2010 Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government, Michael Gove became Secretary of State for Education and the educational landscape changed dramatically.

Whilst it can be argued that these changes were aimed at improving educational outcomes, the fact is that they not only failed to provide support for those who struggle with literacy, in both direct and indirect ways, they actually made it harder for those children to register success. It is worth noting that for many the issues are not indicative of overall ability but just a specific difficulty in reading, writing, speaking and listening. This is a recurring pattern in the educational landscape; that the needs of those children with literacy difficulties are not accounted for.

In 2019, the latest Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) results showed that England’s reading scores have not changed significantly over successive PISA cycles, despite a rise in the overall country ranking.

Ending the funding to train specialist teachers was just one legacy of this era. Other policies, such as the 2010 Academies Act (changing the traditional Local Authority funded system for school support services) and the 2010 Schools White Paper (devolving power ‘to the front line’ to focus on standards through teaching and learning) created significant fragmentation in the system, as noted in our Joining the Dots report.27

There were substantive reforms to the SEND system following the 2010 Ofsted Report A statement is not enough28. The Children and Families Act 2014 led to the introduction of a new Code of Practice for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities changing the way primary areas of need were identified, reported and addressed in the classroom. Whilst this act was well intended, subsequent evidence, such as from the Education Select Committee’s enquiry into SEND29, shows continued systemic failings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed Balls</td>
<td>Michael Gove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>June Rose Review published, £10m pledged to train 4,000 specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June Academies Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November Schools White Paper: The Importance of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>March National Strategies end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March Green Paper: Support and Aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December First trial of phonics screening check (PSC) published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>June PSC starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>January £54m ‘catch-up premium’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March Children and Families Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June More rigorous SPAG elements to KS1 and KS2 SATs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The introduction of the phonics screening check marked a substantial change in approaches to teaching reading in England. First administered in 2011, the check is a compulsory assessment taken by all children in Year 1 attending state school in England. The test, which lasts 5-10 minutes and is taken individually as a child sits with their teacher, requires pupils to read aloud forty words. To ‘pass’, they must correctly read aloud 32/40 of the words.

In 2013, the UK government introduced the SPAG tests (Spelling, Punctuation And Grammar) which assessed children aged 7 and 11. The tests consist of two papers, one of which is entirely devoted to spelling. In the other paper, punctuation accounts for around 20% of the marks and the remaining 80% are related to grammar.

Most recently, the DfE announced in 2018 the creation of English hub schools. The aim of these ‘hubs’ is to “promote a love of reading and support schools across the country to provide excellent phonics and early language teaching”\textsuperscript{10}. Each hub includes ‘literacy specialists’, however these will not be specialists in literacy difficulties and it is unknown what sort of specialists they are and whether they have any qualifications to support children who struggle with literacy and may be dyslexic.

10% of people in our country have dyslexia
Part 4. Specialists in practice

4.1 What is a specialist teacher?

As highlighted above in the Rose Review said that specialists should have the following skills in addressing literacy and dyslexic difficulties:

- be up-to-date with best practice in promoting literacy for typically developing children
- have an expertise in a range of specific learning difficulties, including dyslexia
- be able to devise tailored interventions for children struggling most with literacy
- take a strong monitoring and training role in supporting other teachers, within a clear policy promoted by governors and headteachers.

However, in practice, the picture is very confused. There is no one clear definition of what exactly a specialist teacher is and, whilst the Rose Review references the skills that a specialist would be expected to have, it alternates between talking about ‘developing specialist skills in addressing literacy and dyslexic problems’ and ‘specialist training in teaching children with dyslexia’.

4.2 How are they trained and what are their qualifications?

The training and qualification landscape is extremely confusing

Specialist teacher courses are available at two different levels, qualifying recipients to undertake different tasks, and yet both qualifications entitle the recipient to call themselves a specialist teacher. The difference between levels 5 and 7 is unclear.

- Level 5 (equivalent to a foundation degree requiring no prior qualification) or
- Level 7 (equivalent to a Masters degree requiring prior qualifications at graduate level).

Within these levels, there can also be a significant degree of variation. For example, a level 7 qualification can be equivalent to both the first year of a Masters degree course and to a full Masters qualification.

A final complication is the existence of legacy awards, undertaken before credit and level ratings existed.

Furthermore there are a confusing variety of routes and multiple different courses that can lead to the title of specialist teacher. The BDA currently lists 14 different courses from 12 different providers on its website (see appendix C) which it has accredited. However, some organisations running courses may not have sought BDA accreditation, despite the Rose Review recommendation that “all providers of training for specialist dyslexia teachers to apply for BDA accreditation because it is only through consistent accreditation that parents, professionals and employers can be clear about what competences it is reasonable to expect of practitioners holding particular qualifications.”

Overall, little seems to have changed in the qualification and accreditation process since the Rose Review ten years ago which identified an array of National Qualification Framework level 7 courses with both Approved Teacher Status (ATS) accreditation, as well as level 4–7 courses with Approved Practitioner Status (APS) accreditation.

DYT’s definition of a specialist teacher

An individual who has received appropriately accredited specialist training in teaching children with dyslexia and literacy difficulties.
BDA Accreditation

BDA Accreditation was set up in conjunction with the other specialist teacher professional bodies to ensure that appropriate standards were put in place for specialist teaching courses. These standards were established in 2002/2003 and have largely remained unchanged.

The standards are not aligned to the criteria of credit and level that universities and regulated awarding organisations use. Instead they use the model of ‘flying hours’ aligned to a number of hours of lectures and school presence hours. They do not measure the competence standards of the teacher; this is left to the individual provider.

There has been a gradual reduction in the number of BDA specialist teacher accredited courses since the early 2000s.

Specialist membership

Associate Membership of the British Dyslexia Association (AMBDA) is available to level 7 specialists.

Approved Teacher Status (ATS), is an accreditation relating to certificate courses that are sometimes described as being at level 5 of the National Qualifications Framework Level, but actually range between level 4 and 7. These may entail 60 Masters-level credits if validated at postgraduate level.

Approved Practitioner Status (APS), equivalent to ATS but for those who do not hold Qualified Teacher Status (QTS), and have successfully completed a BDA accredited course for teaching learners with specific learning difficulties/dyslexia.

Once qualified, specialists can apply for further accreditation

- Teacher Practice Certificate (TPC) – a ‘professional recognition scheme’ to value the skills and knowledge of specialist teachers and their commitment to best practice, which includes a commitment to continuing professional development. Holders of TPC are current specialist teachers with relevant practical knowledge, skills and experience who are committed to maintaining best practice and ongoing development of their professional teaching skill. Applicants should be able to demonstrate that they have carried out a minimum of 20 hours specialist teaching/tuition that has been completed in the year prior to their application. A Teaching Practising Certificate is valid for three years.

- Assessment Practising Certificate (APC) – underpins a specialist teacher’s qualifications and competence to undertake full diagnostic assessments for dyslexia/SpLD. An APC is valid for three years and requires the holder to undertake regular and relevant continuing professional development (CPD) in assessment practice and is accredited by the SpLD Assessment Standards Committee (SASC).

SpLD Assessment Standards Committee (SASC)

The SpLD Assessment Standards Committee encourages cooperation and aims to forge links with institutions in order to support and advance standards in SpLD assessment, training and practice and encourage improvements in best practice in the assessment of specific learning difficulties. SASC has a responsibility for providing guidance on training and implementation of standards and for overseeing and approving processes of awarding SpLD Assessment Practising Certificates. This steering committee is a standard-setting group concerned with the diagnostic assessment of specific learning difficulties.
4.3 What are specialists qualified to do?

It is confusing as to what specialist teachers are qualified to do. Beyond 'specialist teaching' and support to learners and schools with issues such as access arrangements, the level 5 qualifications means the holder can conduct 'informal' curriculum-based assessments whereas some level 7 qualifications are suitable for Access Arrangements assessment only or involve diagnostic assessments. Specialists can also hold accreditation such as a TPC which 'overlays' the original qualification, making it even harder to clearly understand what they are permitted to do.

Furthermore, some courses refer only to dyslexia whereas others refer to specific learning difficulties, which include dyslexia, dyspraxia, attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder and dyscalculia. There can also be separate courses, qualifications and accreditations for different phases of the education system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What specialists can do depends on their qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist Teacher Assessor (BDA AMBDA, Dyslexia Guild MDG, Patoss Full Member)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct assessments¹.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver specialist teaching programmes to learners with SpLD/dyslexia up to, and including, 18 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist Teacher (BDA ATS/APS, Dyslexia Guild ADG, Patoss Associate)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct informal, curriculum-based assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliver specialist teaching programmes to learners with SpLD/dyslexia up to, and including, 18 years of age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Same as underlying qualification – BDA accredited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full diagnostic assessments for dyslexia/SpLD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An APC is a requirement of the DfE that specialist teachers who carry out assessments for eligibility for the Disabled Student Allowances hold a current APC at the time of assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ If a specialist holds a professional membership with the BDA, Dyslexia Guild or Patoss and does not hold an APC they have a professional responsibility to alert parents/carers to the fact that the assessment report will not be accepted as part of an application for DSA in the future.
In 2010, the Literacy and Dyslexia-SpLD Professional Development Framework was created. The BDA, Patoss and Dyslexia Action working as a part of the Dyslexia-SpLD Trust gained DfE funding to develop the framework as a part of the Rose Review initiatives. The framework was put in place to clarify the standards required for specialist teachers. This body of work was substantial and received significant government funding.

The framework identifies the knowledge, competencies and professional qualities required from specialist teachers. However, the framework standards have never been incorporated into BDA Accreditation and therefore are not widely known within the sector. None of the teacher participants involved in the research mentioned these standards.

The professional associations also have varying requirements for specialist teachers to undertake CPD. The BDA, for example, requires specialists holding ATS to prove that they have undertaken a minimum of 15 hours direct specialist teaching each year plus 15 hours of CPD over three years consisting of a minimum of 10 hours formal CPD (e.g. attendance at conferences, training events) and five hours informal (e.g. personal study, delivering training to colleagues). SASC has more stringent requirements for specialist teacher assessors.

4.4 Confusion

It’s clear the specialist teacher training landscape is confusing. The two qualification phases, and the multiple providers, accreditation boards and professional organisations make the route to qualification confusing for prospective specialist teachers, let alone for schools looking to ensure any specialist teacher they employ is appropriately qualified.

Busy school professionals find it hard to distinguish exactly what training and what skills a ‘specialist teacher’ can offer. Level 5 qualifications give only the right to conduct informal curriculum-based assessments whereas level 7 qualifications give the authority to conduct diagnostic assessments. Only those with a level 7 can conduct assessments for Access Arrangements for exams. Some courses make it clear that the qualification covers supporting learners in both primary and secondary schools. Some courses refer only to dyslexia whereas others refer to specific learning difficulties, which include dyslexia, dyspraxia, attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder and dyscalculia, and one refers to specific learning differences.

As part of our research we asked specialists themselves what they thought of the training landscape. It was universally acknowledged by research participants that there is a confusing array of qualifications. One of the professional associations told us ‘it’s a muddled picture’, whilst a training provider reported a ‘lack of differentiation between different levels of specialism.’

The situation is perhaps best summed up in an article in Dyslexia Review in 2018:

…many people are confused, as there are many examples of awards available in the specialist teaching and assessment arena where a clear determination of credit and level is not provided. In addition, if nationally defined course descriptors are not adhered to there may be added concern about the validity of such awards.
4.5 The effect of this confusing landscape

Specialist qualifications are under-valued and misunderstood by schools

It is not surprising then that this level of confusion around training and qualifications is reflected in the lack of understanding about specialist teacher’s role in the education system and the lack of value placed upon them.

Specialist teachers have the potential to offer value not just to individual learners but to school capacity, with their ability to be able to support teachers in the classroom, SENCos and teaching assistants. We are currently wasting the value these professionals can add to the system.

As one training organisation told us:

they are not just dyslexia specialists, they are also specialists in literacy and phonics. Maybe they [schools] see the dyslexia label as just something only for dyslexic children, but in fact a lot of the strategies that work, work for all children.

Survey respondents and training providers confirmed that regardless of the level at which training was undertaken the qualification was undervalued. Specialist teachers responding to our survey told us that they did not feel valued by schools:

they won’t pay a recognised salary for my qualification and give this work to untrained teaching assistants

schools don’t understand our qualifications or appreciate our credentials and potential use

we have been stripped of teaching status and are deemed ‘support staff’.

Professional associations also told us that they thought that specialist teachers ‘could be much more highly rated’, and explained that:

most people don’t know there are such things as specialist dyslexia training programmes... you get disparaging comments...but if you are trained [in dyslexia specialist teaching] you can do things that work for children across the piece. Things that work for children that have dyslexia and SpLD work for [all] children.

4.6 The current workforce

How many specialist teachers are there?

No one knows how many specialists there are. Our freedom of information request (see appendix B) revealed that since 2009 the DfE has spent £6,108,000 specifically for the training of dyslexia specialist teachers. However, it also revealed that the DfE does not hold records for the number of specialists that were trained or how many dyslexia specialists currently reside in state-funded schools.

Training providers and professional associations don’t hold records of this either. We spoke to seven organisations that provide training for specialist teachers (there are at least 16 currently accredited by the BDA) who between them train over 350 specialists each year. This equates to a conservative estimate of at least 3,500 trained during the ten-year period since the Rose Review was published, or one specialist for every nine schools in England.

Without any official records relating to the number or qualifications of specialist teachers, we turn to our survey of specialist teachers.
Methodological caveats related to the survey of specialist teachers:

1. Due to the lack of a systematic database of specialist teachers – as reported above – we had to rely on an opportunity sample, i.e. we advertised the survey and specialist teachers responded. We were not able to representatively sample the population before or after data collection.

2. We therefore cannot say with any certainty whether the data is representative of specialist teachers. However, the number of respondents (700) is large enough for us to identify clear trends and patterns.

3. In the absence of any other data, or contradictory information, we therefore report this data as the most comprehensive information possible about the views and attributes of specialist teachers.

Who are the specialist teachers and what is their background?

Our survey reveals that the profile of the specialist workforce is very limited. One of the membership associations we spoke to explained:

we often see people coming to the profession as a second career; that means that the demographic tends to be older.

The research also found that there is often a personal connection to dyslexia or literacy difficulties:

many of our specialist teachers have dyslexia in the family; it’s this that has raised their awareness and interest.

This raises issues not only in relation to specialist teachers being an ageing workforce, it is also one that is not closely aligned to the learners that they are often targeting. For example, nearly twice as many boys (23%) than girls (13%) have an identified SEND and a greater proportion of black learners (15.8%) have SEND than white learners (14.5%), whereas 96% of specialist teachers are women, and 95% are white.

3/4 of schools report no access to specialist teachers
Hide and seek: where are all the specialists?

- 96% female
- 61% hold a PGCE
- 41% have held their qualification for ten years or more
- 94% are currently using their specialist teacher qualification
- 95% white
- 87% aged 46 or older
Most specialists were formerly teachers (see Figure 3). Around a third (34%) had previously worked in primary schools and just under a quarter had previously worked in secondary schools (23%). Interestingly, a significant proportion (19%) had previously worked in further education. Just over one in ten (13%) had previously been employed as the special educational needs and disabilities coordinator (SENCo) in their setting. The most frequently reported role was class teacher (37%).

Regardless of how recently they trained, 30% admit that they have not undertaken any subsequent CPD. This is deeply problematic, as undertaking regular CPD is a criterion in maintaining many of the specialist accreditations. Most of those with a level 7 have held their qualification for over ten years (42%), in contrast 42% of those with a level 5 qualification trained in the past five years indicating that the workforce is at risk of becoming less qualified.
How are specialist teachers deployed?

Our survey reveals that few specialists are employed by schools. Nearly half (43%) were self-employed, this rose to nearly three-quarters (74%) in Yorkshire and the Humber. Qualification type did not appear to influence whether survey respondents were self-employed, for example, 41% of those with a level 5 as their highest qualification were self-employed whilst 42% of those with a level 7 were.

However, self-employment may not be through choice. As one specialist teacher explained:

[I was] made redundant from two schools. Most specialist teachers work as independents now as schools...can no longer afford a specialist.

Another wrote:

in order to get enough work...I work as an assessor and as a course tutor and see private pupils. I used to work in a state primary school... but due to reduced funding they decided they could not afford a specialist teacher.

And another explained how they work for free in the state sector:

I am self-employed and often get paid work in independent schools, but have to do voluntary work in state schools as they simply do not have the funds available to pay for this service.

Of those that were employed, most (66%) were on a permanent contract, however around one in five (19%) reported that they had zero-hour contracts, indicating that their roles were not secure.

Only 4% of specialists are employed in state schools. Of those specialists that are employed in schools, most are employed in independent schools (see Figure 4).

Specialist teachers undertake a wide variety of roles as shown in Figure 5. Of those that responded to our survey, 94% were actively using their specialist qualification.

Most specialists give one-to-one support to pupils and are not sharing their essential skills. Too frequently specialists are employed to work in isolation and are not sharing their expertise with their school-based colleagues. The tasks that specialist teachers undertake are also varied.

- Most tasks are at pupil level (Figure 6).
- Nearly all (91%) teach one-to-one and carry out assessments (Figure 7).
- Most (41%) specialists reported only working with one school.

This is problematic as expertise is not being shared across the sector. The Rose Review recommended that the specialist role be created 'in order to provide substantially improved access to specialist expertise in all schools and across all local authority areas.'

By working predominantly at pupil level, and not sharing their expertise through working with groups of teachers or groups of schools the role will only ever have a limited impact. As one training provider explained

the specialist teacher model works if they're allowed to train and upskill staff. It's about empowering class teachers.

Some schools are using specialists to carry out assessments they are not qualified to do. Worryingly, when we look at the assessment role of specialists, there is no difference in responsibility or authority whether they achieved a level 5 or 7 qualification. There are concerns that specialist teachers with level 5 qualifications are carrying out assessments that they are not qualified for, which calls to question the value of the level 7 qualification.
Figure 4. Of those that reported being employed, nearly a third were employed by private schools

- Independent School: 31.3%
- Local Authority: 27.3%
- HEI / Training provider: 21.7%
- Multi-Academy Trust: 8.3%
- Education charity: 7.2%
- Maintained School: 4.3%

Single response item. n=374

Figure 5. Key words in job titles of specialist teachers responding to our survey
Hide and seek: where are all the specialists?

Figure 6. Teaching one-to-one and conducting assessments are the most common tasks undertaken by specialist teachers

Figure 7. Specialist teachers are most often deployed at pupil level
Where are the specialist teachers?

There is a postcode lottery of provision of specialists across the country. Deployment of specialist teachers across the country appears to be extremely patchy. Our analysis of Local Authority (LA) Local Offer documents revealed that 30% of LAs do not offer access to a specialist teacher. Figure 8 shows that LA provision appears to be strongest in the North East and weakest in the East of England, the East Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber.

Three quarters of schools report no access to specialist teachers. Data collected from schools (Figure 9) shows that 75% of school leaders report that they do not have access to a specialist teacher.

Even when there is access to specialists, schools don’t know about it. The data reveals a clear discrepancy between provision and awareness – whilst our analysis of LAs showed the strongest provision in the North East, teachers in this region were the least likely to report access to a specialist – only 16% of teachers in the region reported having access.

Figure 8. LA provision of specialist teachers

Figure 9. Schools which report having access to a professional who is specifically designated as a “specialist teacher” for dyslexia and literacy
30% of LAs do not offer access to a specialist teacher
Part 5. What needs to change

The Rose Review said in 2009, that it is an ‘important requirement...that schools can draw upon the expertise that is necessary to secure high quality...intervention programmes for those with dyslexia and other language difficulties.’ It appears that this ambition has not been met.

Supply of specialist teachers has increased whilst demand has declined. Following the recommendations of the Rose Review, the government created training opportunities based on Rose’s recommendations. However, these specialists have not been utilised, in part due to the government’s changing priorities and a failure to join up initiatives, and also because the Rose Review itself did not take account of the emerging school-led system, nor recommend activities to stimulate school-level demand for specialist services.

As a national initiative, the training of specialists has been a failure. The deployment of specialists has not materialised in subsequent policy priorities and it is difficult to conclude that their training has provided wider benefits to the system; particularly those pupils with SpLD whose outcomes still lag behind their peers.

Our research has identified five key barriers to Rose’s vision being realised:

1. **It is confusing as to what specialist teachers are qualified to do.** Few stakeholders are aware of the Literacy and Dyslexia-SpLD Professional Development Framework. There is a lack of understanding about the specialist teacher’s role in the education system and a lack of value placed upon them.

2. **The specialist qualifications and accreditation landscape is too complicated.** The two qualification phases, multiple providers, accreditation boards and professional organisations make the route to qualification confusing both for prospective specialist teachers and for schools looking to ensure any specialist teacher they employ is appropriately qualified.

3. **There is no single register of specialist teachers, no record of their training or whether their CPD is up to date.** Regardless of how recently they trained, 30% of specialists admit that they have not undertaken any subsequent CPD. This is deeply problematic, as undertaking regular CPD is a criterion in maintaining many of the specialist accreditations.

4. **Only 4% of specialists are employed in state schools.** Most specialists are self-employed, of those that are employed in schools, the majority are employed in independent schools. This is compounded by a postcode lottery of provision of specialists across the country. As a result, there is no equality of access for those that need specialist’s skills.

5. **Specialists are not sharing their essential skills.** Too frequently specialists are employed to work in isolation, supporting pupils one-to-one, and not to share their expertise with school-based colleagues.

This must change. Outcomes for learners with literacy difficulties, have remained significantly below the national average. National tests, at all levels of the education system, reveal that learners with literacy difficulties consistently fail to attain the expected standards, or standards close to their peers and the gap is not narrowing. But timely support by specialist teachers could help.
To improve access and deployment of specialist teachers, DYT calls for:

1. An agreed definition for specialist teachers and the tasks they are qualified to undertake.

Without increased clarity, specialists may be working beyond their qualification remit and their professional association(s) need to work more closely together to regulate this and promote the work that specialists could do.

2. A streamlined specialist qualification and a single accrediting body.

The training of specialists needs to be reformed and the qualification easily identifiable; not only by those undertaking the training, but more importantly, by schools so they can clearly identify the skills that teachers have and how they can best be used. A streamlined specialist qualification is needed to ensure a clear training and career pathway. The accrediting organisation cannot also be a training provider.

Two questions for schools to ask about specialist teachers:

1. Do specialist teachers work with classroom staff?

Building capacity in schools is vital; these specialists should be supporting both children and staff. Advice for universal strategies in the classroom should be part of their remit.

2. Do any of your staff watch the specialist teacher work?

This is free CPD and will allow permanent members of staff – both teachers and teaching assistants (TAs) – to learn and transfer into their own teaching. Working alongside specialist teachers is a luxury but well worth the investment.
A single register of specialist teachers.

To help schools identify specialist teachers, their qualifications and ensure specialists have up-to-date knowledge and have participated in relevant CPD.

A fund for maintained schools and academies to spend on specialist teachers.

Provision of specialist teachers needs to be considered in terms of the wider changes to the SEND system and the academies programme. Future investment needs to include deployment of specialist teachers within and across existing programmes of work (e.g. English Hubs), centres for teacher training and education (e.g. Teaching School Hubs) and school groups (e.g. Multi-Academy Trusts).

Deployment of specialists to support their peers as well as pupils.

Specialists’ training needs to include approaches to enabling them to support teachers and SENCos, as well as pupils. Initial teacher training needs to prepare new teachers to be aware of the benefits of this level of partnership when supporting children with additional needs in line with the graduated approach.

Fitting specialist teachers into a whole-school strategy

Ensure that you have universal strategies for your classroom, based on knowing the child and an understanding of how to remove barriers.

Should it be needed, prepare a targeted response outside the classroom. But this must be precise, time-bound and monitored for progress. If results aren’t showing, put them back in the classroom or consult a specialist. Time in class is too important to waste.

Weaved into your approach, your specialist should be assessing, advising and implementing strategies both in the classroom and in interventions. Don’t forget to review: you want to know what works and why. You need this person to be having an impact across the school, upskilling your teaching staff and closing the gap for children with literacy difficulties.
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Appendix A – Methodology

In-depth interviews with training providers and professional associations

Interviews were conducted with eight organisations that provide training or support for specialist teachers to find out how many specialist teachers they have trained since 2009, either through government funded projects or through commercial training. We sought to learn more about when the training took place (i.e. was it more common whilst the government funding was still available) and what ongoing training provision (CPD) is offered by these organisations.

In addition, some organisations provided details about the demographic background of specialist teachers (e.g. age, gender etc.), background (e.g. former primary teacher), and ‘destination’ data. Where providers were unable to share full details of this, i.e. due to GDPR, commercial confidentiality, or the data not being collected, we asked senior staff at the provider organisation about their perception of these questions.

Interviews were recorded and data was transcribed into an analysis spreadsheet where a trend analysis was conducted.

Freedom of Information request to the DfE

In order to address the primary research question of how many specialist teachers there are, we asked the DfE via a freedom of information (FoI) request. We asked:

- Following the 2009 Rose Review - Identifying and Teaching Children and Young People with Dyslexia and Literacy Difficulties, the then Education Secretary Rt. Hon Ed Balls pledged £10 million to create 4,000 new “dyslexia specialists.” In light of this, I would like information on the following:
  - The amount of money the Department has spent on “dyslexia specialists” since the Review was published in 2009.
  - The number of specialists that were actually created.
  - How many dyslexia specialists currently reside in state-funded schools.

A response was received on 17 March 2017 and can be seen in full in Appendix B.
Analysis of LA Local Offers and provision

The Local Offer for SEND brings together information about education, health and care services for children and young people from 0 to 25 with special educational needs and disabilities. We reviewed all 152 LA Local Offers, LA websites and policy documents. We conducted a textual analysis to search for mentions of dyslexia and other specialist provision relating to literacy difficulties. Results were recorded in a specially constructed database and coded into three categories:

a) provision and support for dyslexia and mention of specialist teachers

b) provision and support for dyslexia but no mention of specialist teachers

c) lack of provision and support for dyslexia (e.g. just signposting of external support)

Every entry was checked by an independent reviewer for quality and accuracy.

Survey of specialist teachers

We contacted specialist teachers directly to address all our research questions. As there is no national register of specialist teachers, we were forced to rely on opportunity sampling. We used an online survey tool and shared the survey via training providers and professional associations, as well as via DYT’s own networks and social media channels. We included specially constructed questions to ensure that only specialist teachers responded to the survey. The survey was live for ten weeks in order to maximise the number of responses we received.

We received 702 responses to the survey. The survey was ‘cleaned’ to remove any inconsistent data and as a result the final sample size was 700. Survey responses were analysed using SPSS software to produce descriptive data and a small number of cross tabulations.

Survey of teachers in England

We used the TeacherTapp panel survey to ask a nationally representative sample of teachers three questions about specialist teachers. The questions, asked on the 2 of November 2018, were:

• Do you feel confident teaching young people with literacy difficulties (i.e. dyslexia, EAL, speech and language disorders)?

• Does your school have access to a professional who is specifically designated as a “specialist teacher” for dyslexia and literacy?

• Does your school have access to a professional who has received appropriately accredited specialist training in teaching children with dyslexia and literacy difficulties?

We received 2,273 responses to the survey. The survey was ‘weighted’ to make it nationally representative and as a result the final weighted sample size was 1,961. Survey responses were analysed using Excel and descriptive statistics were provided for: gender, age, job seniority, years since qualifying, school phase, school region (GOR), school Ofsted rating, school FSM quintile, school KS2 prog quintile, school KS4 P8 quintile, and subject taught.
Appendix B – Response to Freedom of Information request from DfE, February 2017

Thank you for your request for information, which was received on 17/02/2017 12:22. You requested:

Following the 2009 Rose Review - Identifying and Teaching Children and Young People with Dyslexia and Literacy Difficulties, the then Education Secretary Rt. Hon Ed Balls pledged £10 million to create 4,000 new “dyslexia specialists.” In light of this, I would like information on the following:

• the amount of money the Department has spent on “dyslexia specialists” since the Review was published in 2009;
• the number of specialists that were actually created;
• how many dyslexia specialists currently reside in state-funded schools.

I have dealt with your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (“the Act”).

On your first bullet point, I can confirm that since 2009 the Department for Education and its predecessor departments have spent £6,108,000 specifically for the training of dyslexia specialist teachers. The department has further invested £19 million to develop the capacity, skills and knowledge of the Special Educational Needs and Disability workforce. This includes the National Award for SEND Coordination (a framework creating nationally approved training for teachers new to the role of SENCO); and the National Scholarship Fund, which enabled teachers to develop their practice in supporting children with SEND and disabilities (including those with dyslexia). This fund allowed teachers to apply for funding to undertake postgraduate level qualifications in specific impairments. Many applied to undertake masters-level training in dyslexia.

On the next two bullet points, following a search of the Department’s paper and electronic records, I have established that this Department does not hold the information you requested. However, individual local authorities may hold the information. I suggest that you make a new request to those organisations.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact me. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are unhappy with the way your request has been handled, you should make a complaint to the Department by writing to me within two calendar months of the date of this letter. Your complaint will be considered by an independent review panel, who review panel, who were not involved in the original consideration of your request.

If you are not content with the outcome of your complaint to the Department, you may then contact the Information Commissioner's Office.
# Appendix C – Accredited courses

## BDA Accredited Level 5 courses (specialist teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course provider</th>
<th>Course title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Dyslexia Association (BDA) (blended learning/eLearning)</td>
<td>Level 5 Certificate in Dyslexia, Literacy, Support and Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyslexia Action (e-learning)</td>
<td>Level 5 Diploma in Strategic Teaching Support for Dyslexia and Literacy (CPD Standards Office Accredited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCR (until 2019)</td>
<td>OCR Level 5 Diploma in Teaching Learners with Dyslexia/Specific Learning Difficulties (Ofqual approved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Accredited Level 5 courses (Specialist Teacher)

- Gateway Qualifications Level 5 Diploma in Teaching Learners with Dyslexia, Specific Learning Differences and Barriers to Literacy
- Helen Arkell Level 5 Diploma Dyslexia in Teaching Learners with Dyslexia/Specific Learning Difficulties & SpLD

## BDA Accredited Level 7 courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course provider</th>
<th>More Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Dyslexia Association (BDA) (eLearning)</td>
<td>Diploma in Dyslexia Assessment and Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Dyslexia Centre, Bangor University of Wales</td>
<td>Advanced Certificate of Further Professional Studies in Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath Spa University</td>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulties/Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Birmingham (eLearning)</td>
<td>Language, Literacies and Dyslexia Postgraduate Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Brighton</td>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia) PGCert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church University</td>
<td>Specialist Assessment for a Specific Learning Difficulty: Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff Metropolitan University</td>
<td>MA Additional Learning Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chester</td>
<td>Dyslexia Research and Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyslexia Action (e-learning)</td>
<td>Level 7 Professional Certificate in Structured Teaching Intervention for Dyslexia and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Diploma in Dyslexia and Literacy (accredited by Middlesex University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Hill University</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Hope University</td>
<td>Post Graduate Certificate in Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College London, IOE</td>
<td>Specific Learning Difficulties (Dyslexia) MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU)</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate Specific Learning Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria University at Newcastle</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate Teaching Pupils with Dyslexia within an Education and Training Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCR (until 2019)</td>
<td>OCR Level 7 Diploma in Teaching and Assessing Learners with Dyslexia/Specific Learning Difficulties (Ofqual approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Wales</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma SEND Specific Learning Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranmillis University College, Belfast (eLearning)</td>
<td>Master of Education (MEd) Addressing Difficulties in Literacy Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrexham Glyndŵr University</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate in Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Accredited Level 7 courses (Specialist Teacher Assessor)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Qualifications</td>
<td>Level 7 Diploma in Assessing and Teaching Learners with Dyslexia, Specific Learning Differences and Barriers to Literacy (Ofqual approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northampton</td>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma in Specific Learning Difficulties and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About the Driver Youth Trust

The Driver Youth Trust is a charity dedicated to improving the life chances of children and young people, with a focus on those who struggle with literacy, particularly children with dyslexia.

Driver Youth Trust’s mission is to help young people who struggle to read and write. We do this by:

- Working in partnership with teachers and other educational professionals to equip them with the knowledge and skills they need to identify and support learners with literacy difficulties.
- Campaigning on behalf of young people, teachers and schools so that they have the resources and support they need to succeed.

DYT provides learning and development opportunities for teachers, teaching assistants and school leaders in core and advanced skills needed to better support learners who have literacy difficulties and SEND. Our offer to schools is designed to provide evidence-based classroom practice improvements that enable all learners to access the education that is responsive to their needs. More information is available at driveryouthtrust.com/programmes

For more information, please go to: driveryouthtrust.com
or email us at: info@driveryouthtrust.com

The Driver Youth Trust is a registered charity, number: 1120720.