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We in Reading Recovery sometimes think and talk about our work with a focus on children’s learning and on how teachers encourage and facilitate that learning. At other times we focus on how teachers are trained and how to continue to refine teaching through continuing contact sessions. We also focus on how to get good results when Reading Recovery is implemented. But what each of us does is only part of the overall design that makes Reading Recovery work as an intervention—an overall design that is complex and elegant and is continually being revised and improved. Without this design, over 100,000 children a year would still be struggling as readers with inadequate systems of instruction.

The purpose of this article is to consider the design of Reading Recovery and our role in its future development. In the first part of the article, we will describe the nature of the overall design and a set of qualities that must be embodied in any successful design. Then we will examine a case study of a teacher training site in Prince George’s County, Maryland, through the lens of the overall design, pointing out what is functioning well and what the teacher leaders, teachers, and administrators are working to improve. Finally we will close with some thoughts that teacher leaders and site coordinators might ask when they examine how their sites are functioning. Each of us sees Reading Recovery from our own perspective and within our own worlds; however, we must be careful not to have tunnel vision. As Reading Recovery professionals, each of us contributes to our common purpose in immeasurable ways. Let us keep this broader vision in mind as we implement Reading Recovery and work to improve it.

The Design of Reading Recovery

The true design of Reading Recovery is not commonly understood. It is consistently described as a tutoring program or an early intervention program. In reality, as part of a comprehensive literacy program, Reading Recovery is a systemic intervention created for the lowest-achieving first graders. Its purpose is to significantly reduce the number of these children at risk of literacy failure in first grade. It has an elegant structure consisting of four components:

1. an instructional component for the teaching of children,

2. a three-tiered staff development component for training teachers, teacher leaders, and university trainers,

3. an implementation component with guidelines and standards that help ensure effective implementation of Reading Recovery in school districts and schools, and finally

4. a monitoring and evaluation component that provides data used for evaluation and improvement. (See Smith-Burke, 2000, for a more detailed description of the four components.)

These four components interact synergistically to produce consistently effective results. Combined, they have the potential to integrate information
from new theory and research
and new insights from practice to
continually improve the program.
Any Reading Recovery implementa-
tion must have all four components
in place.

Often administrators who are not
fully aware of the design are critical of
Reading Recovery without under-
standing its complexity. For example,
some attack it as too expensive, fail-
ing to understand Reading Recovery’s
role in a comprehensive literacy pro-
gram and confusing coverage with
effectiveness. Others say it is too hard
to implement, finding it hard to
understand why teachers need a full
year of training or that teachers need
to bring children to training class ses-
sions in order to teach for their peers.
Indeed, very few other interventions
require live demonstrations. Even we
ourselves sometimes get a kind of
tunnel vision and focus only on one
component without keeping the total
design in view. The better we as
Reading Recovery professionals
understand the overall structure and
design features of Reading Recovery,
the more effectively we can commu-
nicate with administrators and teach-
ers to work for better implementa-
tion. Further study of the design can
help us to see when adaptations in
implementation are warranted and to
hypothesize how such adaptations
might affect the design.

In our large-scale, rigorous research
study at The Ohio State University,
published in Reading Research
Quarterly (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, &
Seltzer, 1994), we explored the ques-
tion: What makes Reading Recovery
work? Our complex research design,
using empirical methodology, nested
experiments within schools. We
randomly assigned students to
treatments. Our analysis of the data
revealed

• One-to-one Reading
  Recovery tutoring made a
difference. Students per-
  formed strikingly better in
  the one-to-one tutoring as
  compared to small-group
  instruction. The differences
  between single and group
  treatments could not have
  happened by chance, nor
  were they explained just by
  the one-to-one setting.

• The lesson framework and
  instruction in Reading
  Recovery made a difference.
  When Reading Recovery was
  compared to other one-to-one
  tutoring, the results were
  again significantly different.
  The Reading Recovery lesson
  framework and instruction
  epitomize the characteristics
  identified by a large body of
  research as effective teaching:
  a large amount of reading and
  writing; continuous letter-
  word, letter-sound learning;
  teaching for phonological
  awareness; word analysis;
  direct teaching with support
  for independence; and little
  time wasted. This teaching is
  all accomplished in a close
  and trusting relationship. As
  with the one-to-one setting,
  the lesson framework alone
  did not fully explain the
  results of Reading Recovery;
  that is, the framework was
  necessary but not sufficient.

• Reading Recovery training
  made a difference. We com-
  pared the results of Reading
  Recovery teachers with teach-
  ers trained by Reading
  Recovery teacher leaders in a
  10-day intensive, summer
  course (partially trained
  teachers). Students of fully
  trained Reading Recovery
teachers performed in a strik-
ingly different manner and
made accelerated progress,
while students of the partially
trained or untrained teachers
only made some progress.

Results of this large-scale study pro-
vide important information about
how the instructional aspects of
Reading Recovery contribute to its
success. However, information about
these elements provides only a few
answers to the larger question. It is
the total design, including all of these
aspects of Reading Recovery and
more, that creates and ensures the
effectiveness of the program.

What is design? Design makes some-
thing work. Wilson and Daviss
(1994) describe design as the way fea-
tures of any human endeavor are con-
structed and work together. Design
includes elements such as tools, time,
human resource allocation, functions
and attitudes of staff and stakehold-
ers, communication and education,
concepts, and philosophies. Within
the design there must be mechanisms
for redesign so that ongoing growth
and development can lead to
improvement—what the authors call
the “redesign process.” Six qualities
relate to the effectiveness of a design:
functionalism, efficiency, effective-
ness, scalability, dissemination, and
diffusion. We will consider these six
qualities, focusing on the four com-
ponents of the structure of Reading
Recovery discussed earlier in this
article: instruction, staff development,
implementation, and monitoring
and evaluation.
**Functionalism**

Functionalism means that the design is closely related to the purpose or function. Does the design work towards the purpose with no unnecessary features? Is it do-able? Is it possible for Reading Recovery to serve as a systemic intervention for lowest-achieving first graders?

From the instructional and implementation perspectives, Reading Recovery occurs in school settings before failure takes hold. Clinic settings usually take the child after failure has occurred. Working to prevent further failure, Reading Recovery reaches the lowest-achieving first graders before the extensive testing or labeling required for Special Education services. Also, Reading Recovery is not hard to implement. It actually fits the school day quite well as something extra for children and takes only a short amount of time each day. The materials are minimal, requiring only books, pencils, magnetic letters, and paper. When implemented appropriately by trained teachers, Reading Recovery works toward effective and efficient teaching of children, successfully discontinuing their lessons as soon as the children can read and write and benefit from classroom instruction independently.

**Efficiency**

Using the criterion of efficiency we can pose the following questions. Is the desired effect produced with a minimum of effort, expense, or waste? How much energy is used to get the desired effect? Are minimum resources and energy expended to achieve high-quality performance? Is the result actual, not merely potential or theoretical?

Using a staff development, instructional, and data collection lens, Reading Recovery is efficient teaching because it is done in a one-to-one setting. A teacher works with precisely what the child already knows as strengths to learn new literacy behaviors. Time is not wasted going over old learning. The daily lesson is just 30 minutes because earlier research showed that longer lessons provided no discernable benefit. By focusing on one child, the teacher is able to determine the next, most beneficial teaching point to move the child’s learning forward. When the child has learned to read and write, lessons are discontinued for that child and another child is brought into the teaching slot.

Teacher training is efficient as well. Teachers learn as they actually teach children without long lectures. Training sessions and continuing education sessions last about 2 to 2.5 hours and include much interaction that helps create a communication network among teachers. By examining evaluation data, Reading Recovery personnel monitor whether time is being used appropriately.

**Effectiveness**

For the criterion of effectiveness we can ask: Does it work? Are the results of staff development and student learning evident and clear?

Reading Recovery personnel monitor data collection at every level. We examine every component, using as our viewing lens the total design of Reading Recovery. Thus, we monitor how well the overall purpose of Reading Recovery is achieved, namely the significant reduction of children who are at risk of literacy failure in first grade. We accomplish this goal by examining the two positive outcomes of Reading Recovery: 1) children who successfully learn literacy skills, and 2) children who are referred for further assessment (a very small percentage of those served).

Moreover, teachers monitor each child’s progress daily through standard record keeping. In addition, teacher leaders monitor progress at their training sites through systematic examination of teachers’ records. This process allows for problem solving to more effectively teach those children who are not making progress.

Reading Recovery is unusual in linking staff development to student outcomes over time with the aim of improving the teaching of children. Teacher leaders also report data to administrators and board members in their districts. Administrators use analysis of the data to inform their decisions about implementation.

Trainers monitor teacher training sites in order to determine if support is needed to improve implementation. Data on every child served annually are also reported nationally. Clearly, data use is ongoing. A design that promotes effectiveness does not just monitor the innovation; it enables improvement and change. In this vein, four years ago, the data collection system was redesigned in order to collect additional information about implementation factors to aid the work of Reading Recovery professionals.
Scalability

Scaling means changing size according to a fixed ratio or proportion while maintaining quality. When the scale changes, does the design allow the intervention to remain true to the original purpose, producing quality results?

A remarkable characteristic of Reading Recovery is its successful adaptation to various settings of scale and size. Researchers find Reading Recovery training classes and lessons are replicated with remarkable fidelity across cultural and regional groups, countries, and continents with remarkably similar results (Hiebert, 1994).

In terms of staff development and implementation, Reading Recovery has a key scaling-up mechanism: the preparation and work of teacher leaders. Clay (1987) calls teacher leaders the redirecting system that allows Reading Recovery as an innovation to be integrated into a system (a district or a school, or both). They not only train teachers, but also continue to teach children; communicate with stakeholders; collect, analyze, and report data; and problem-solve to ensure a quality implementation. Reading Recovery training classes are the basis of instructional quality, along with the continuing education sessions that help teachers constantly refine their teaching.

Dissemination

Dissemination means scattering seeds far and wide, propagating widely. Does the design allow the endeavor to spread widely?

The Reading Recovery design provides for dissemination in many different ways. Reading Recovery professionals contribute their live teaching for colleagues and anyone interested in learning more about Reading Recovery. Each teacher training site disseminates an annual report of its activities and data showing results with children. Both university training centers and teacher training sites welcome interested visitors. In addition, the Reading Recovery Council of North America (RRCNA) facilitates the dissemination of information through its publications, Web site, and national conference. Trainers and teacher leaders publish articles related to teaching and implementation in The Journal of Reading Recovery and research articles in Literacy Teaching and Learning. They publish in other national journals and books as well. The National Reading Recovery Institute, sponsored by RRCNA, and regional conferences, sponsored by university training centers across the country, also spread the news.

Diffusion

Diffusion means an intermingling of molecules. In anthropology, it means spreading a cultural or technological practice or innovation from one region or people to another. The innovation becomes so much a part of a system that the people there begin to believe that they invented it themselves. Some researchers might use the label institutionalizing, which means that the innovation is no longer perceived as an innovation but instead as an integral part of the system. The question is: Does the design allow the innovation to become an integral part of the system?

From an implementation perspective we could ask, “Can Reading Recovery achieve this kind of diffusion? Can it become an integral part of a system without losing its integrity, its rigor, or the essential aspects of its design?”

Although we’re at varying stages of institutionalization district-by-district in the United States and Canada, the Reading Recovery design does have the potential for diffusion because all of the other design elements are in place. Full diffusion has been very nearly realized in New Zealand only after years of continuous work to monitor and improve the instruction of children; the staff development of teachers, teacher leaders, and trainers; the data collection process; and the conditions of implementation.

Now let us turn to a case study of the Prince George’s County, Maryland, district in the United States, where the educators are working toward diffusion.

### Table 1.
Demographic Profile of Prince George’s County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reading Recovery Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993–1994</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–1995</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–1996</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–1997</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–1998</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–1999</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–2000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2001</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.**
Status of Reading Recovery Teachers and Teacher Leaders in Prince George’s County Site, 1993–2002
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**Information About the District**
Prince George’s County is the largest school system in Maryland and the nineteenth in the nation, serving more than 127,000 students in 182 schools. The current population is extremely diverse, with approximately 75% African-American, 15% Caucasian, 6% Hispanic, 3.5% Asian, and 0.5% Native American students (see Table 1). The district has a bi-modal population of middle-class and low-income families. Although the county has the largest middle-class African-American population in the nation, the poverty level of the student body (as measured by the number of students receiving free and reduced price lunches) is approximately 65% at the elementary level. The system is experiencing rapid growth, adding to the student population by over 3,000 children in 2000–2001. It currently employs approximately 24,500 individuals, including more than 8,200 teachers. The district is planning to open six new schools in 2002–2003.

**Implementation of Reading Recovery in the District**
The district started to implement Reading Recovery about nine years ago. At approximately that same time the superintendent implemented a fact-finding mission about intervention and prevention programs in literacy for young children. The district had strong and committed leadership for Reading Recovery, which was selected to be implemented as the early intervention in their literacy initiative. The district was extremely lucky to find a trained teacher leader who had recently moved to the area. The county then trained three more teacher leaders in 1994–1995. When the first teacher leader had to leave the district because of her husband’s transfer, the district not only replaced her but also added another by training two more teacher leaders in 1997–1998.

In the first year of training of 12 Reading Recovery teachers, the participating principals used several available funding sources to pay for their training. The cost was the half-salary (teachers taught Reading Recovery children for one-half of their duty day) plus benefits for each teacher trained. The funding sources used were Goals 2000, Evenstart, Equity 2000, AmeriCorps, other Title funds, and staff development budgets. In 1994–1995, 13 more teachers were trained. Between fall 1995 and spring 2001, a total of 248 additional teachers were trained (see Table 2). In all districts there is a turnover in teachers, and Prince George’s County is no exception. Some Reading Recovery teachers have moved into...
other roles such as principal or staff developer; some have retired or are on maternity or sick leave; a few have moved back into classroom teaching; others have left Reading Recovery as an assignment. When Reading Recovery teachers move into other positions they bring their knowledge about early literacy with them, adding expertise in whatever new role they play. Other districts, which often offer higher salaries, have enticed 77 Reading Recovery teachers to leave the district (see Table 3). Of this group, 27 are teaching as Reading Recovery teachers in their new school systems.

Currently, the district has a 5-year plan for Reading Recovery as the early intervention component in their literacy initiative. The goal is to reach full implementation by 2001–2002 in “a minimum of 100%” of the elementary schools with dedicated positions to ensure program effectiveness and with continued monitoring and evaluation to determine Reading Recovery’s impact upon student achievement. The vision is to maintain this level of coverage from 2002 to 2005. A new policy of reducing class size in the primary grades caused a shortage of primary classroom teachers in the fall of 2000 and some Reading Recovery teachers had to shift to classroom teaching. The class size reduction policy, while important and critical to the system, is an extra challenge to the goal of full implementation, as is the 15% attrition rate in Reading Recovery teachers each year.

In this district, Reading Recovery has been very successful in student outcomes. Discontinuing rates range from 65% (in the first year) to 78% of total students served. For example, if a teacher discontinues two rounds of children (a minimum of 8 children) and then takes in a third round (4 more children) the discontinuing rate would be 66.7%. This percentage of total children served will vary depending on the level of teacher coverage in a school and on how many children fall into the other categories: children with an incomplete program, children referred after 20 weeks for further assessment, children who have moved, or children who have been removed from the program for other reasons and for whom a memo of explanation is required. Most of the years the district has implemented Reading Recovery, the percentage of children discontinued has been in the 70% range. Also, the number of children served has steadily increased as the number of county schools involved in the implementation has continued to grow (see Table 4).

Implementation of Reading Recovery in the district began in only 12 schools but has expanded to include

### Table 3. Analysis of Status of Reading Recovery Teachers Not Active in Prince George’s County as of June 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Maternity/ Sick Leave</th>
<th>Left School System*</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Returned to Classroom</th>
<th>Left Reading Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993–1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–1997</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–1998</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–1999</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* of the 77 teachers who have left the system through 1999, 27 are teaching Reading Recovery in their new school systems.
Table 4.
Reading Recovery Program Data: Children Successfully Discontinued in Prince George’s County, 1993–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Children Served</th>
<th>Total Number of Children Discontinued</th>
<th>Discontinued as Percentage of Total Served</th>
<th>Total Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993–1994</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–1995</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995–1996</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996–1997</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997–1998</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–1999</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–2000</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2001</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
posed and offered. The trial was carefully evaluated. As a result, the modules were offered district wide in the next academic year. In 1997–1998 the modules were expanded for second- and third-grade teachers, adding topics such as Readers and Writers Workshop and Fluency Reading, and placing more emphasis on topics like State Standards. With an emphasis on improving primary classroom teaching and with Reading Recovery as the early intervention component, the county now has the foundation of a comprehensive literacy program in place and can continue to build up through the elementary grades. Reading Recovery’s value to the district has increased through its support of the early literacy staff development. The teacher leaders, however, walk a fine line, always placing priority on their role in Reading Recovery, while simultaneously supporting ongoing staff development for classroom teachers.

District Challenges to Reading Recovery in Prince George’s County

Despite the multilayered investment, Reading Recovery is quite fragile in Prince George’s County. It won’t disappear tomorrow, but it could be seriously challenged without constant vigilance and problem solving by the teacher leaders and administrators as issues arise. For example, given the new policy of class size reduction and the primary-grade teacher shortage, the teacher leaders had to do some creative problem solving in order to provide coverage in schools in which Reading Recovery teachers were needed for classroom teaching. Also with attrition at approximately 15%, the teacher leaders have made a case each year to replace Reading Recovery teachers who have moved to other responsibilities. The challenge in the past three years has been to serve the expanding number of teachers and students with a shortage of teacher leaders. In 1999, two teacher leaders left the system too late to train replacements for the academic year 2002. Consequently the teacher leader team had to set priorities and be even more efficient to cover the workload, as well as make a case to train two more teacher leaders. This year two teacher leaders are in training to meet that need.

Another issue that surfaces when individuals want to help the intervention look better is the questioning of a foundational standard of the design, namely to take the lowest-achieving children. Teacher leaders have had to intervene and explain that without taking these children, the effectiveness of the design is seriously threatened. If the lowest-achieving children are not taken, they are the ones who will come back to haunt the district in later years on state testing, since they will never catch up. In order to implement the design effectively, teacher leaders have had to

- continue to teach the lowest-achieving children themselves,
- monitor the selection process,
- be available early in the children’s series of lessons to assist teachers, if needed,
- strategically target their visits and continuing contact sessions to help teachers with children who are hard to teach, and
- work with teachers who are less successful in discontinuing children.

In addition, the teacher leaders work hard to ensure good communication across the district about Reading Recovery. Communication is the glue that helps make the design work, and it is never finished. Every year new staff must be educated about Reading Recovery. To accomplish this goal, a plan is built into the system, along with a system to recruit next year’s class for Reading Recovery.

Administrators also come and go. Given the central office administrators’ role in setting literacy policy for the county and the importance of the principals’ leadership and commitment in schools, the teacher leaders must work to educate and communicate with all of these stakeholders.

With the advent of site-based management in the county has come another communication challenge. Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leaders have had to educate intermediate-level teachers, parents, and specialists as well as primary teachers about the important role of Reading Recovery as early intervention. This can be a difficult task when any one of these constituencies has limited resources and other programs that they would like to see implemented. Without knowledge and commitment, Reading Recovery may be threatened in any one of the arenas previously mentioned. The overall design must include constant communication, as the teacher leader team in Prince George’s County knows well.

The Critical Roles of the Teacher Leader Team

Monitoring the Reading Recovery personnel within the county and keeping communications among the groups current can generate an overwhelming workload. So the teacher
leaders in the county have developed ways of tracking students’ progress. Efficient systems for getting out to teachers in need of support have been developed as well. Monitoring activities and continuing contact with teachers must be visible so that the district leadership understands that they are part of an ongoing process that contributes to the success of Reading Recovery. Teacher leaders must always anticipate the need for more teachers, replace teachers who leave, add new teachers to bring schools closer to full coverage, and advocate for replacing and training more teacher leaders. Long- and short-term planning is crucial, as are revisions in response to new district policies or modifications in the district budget, or both. They also keep an eye on budget deliberations in the district so that a case can be made to implement the superintendent’s goals for Reading Recovery. Wild-card curricular issues such as the current pendulum swing towards phonics may arise and must be addressed in a balanced and timely manner.

Part of the uniqueness of Reading Recovery is its extensive data collection at multiple levels, which becomes yet another responsibility for teacher leaders. They use data to monitor teacher and student progress. It is their job to help Reading Recovery teachers use their lesson data to make more powerful teaching decisions to shift student learning forward during training and in continuing contact sessions. Teacher leaders also help teachers write the school reports that help principals and administrators focus on how the lowest-achieving children are doing in each school, the level of coverage, and what school needs will be in the next year. As compared to other programs, a major difference in the design of Reading Recovery is that the data are not used for evaluation alone. Data are also used to improve the teaching of children, to improve teacher training, and to improve implementation of the program.

The interaction of the four design components gives the total design of Reading Recovery its power. The teacher leader plays a key role in making the system work. Teacher leaders provide the professional development that enables teachers to provide excellent teaching. They monitor the results closely. They work with classroom teachers, school administrators, and district-level personnel to examine and monitor the delivery systems that make Reading Recovery work efficiently. It takes leadership, communication, collaboration, and commitment among all of these individuals—administrators, Reading Recovery professionals, classroom teachers, specialists, and parents—to achieve the integration of an innovation into the system so that it can be available to all children who need it.
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