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If children require special individual instruction, help can be gained from Reading Recovery professionals in exploratory trials. The new title for this book [Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals] acknowledges that these things have occurred and implies that further exploration of working with some special education children is appropriate. (Clay, 2005a, p. ii)

The primary purpose of this article is to describe one type of exploration that Clay mentioned in the above quote. Within this article, the focus is on the exploratory trials that have occurred with deaf children. When Clay’s Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals was published in 2005, what prompted searches within the text and captured the attention of many were changes in procedures. The attention-getter for me, however, was Clay’s nod to the notion that interventions might be tailored for children who have other learning concerns, including children who are deaf. While Reading Recovery adaptations have been attempted with this particular population for some time, it was reassuring to see this acknowledgement and approval in print. In fact, it is fair to say that a number of the professionals working with deaf learners had their hopes fulfilled by seeing their work referred to by Reading Recovery’s founder, Marie Clay.

As a Reading Recovery trainer and former educator of deaf children, I was fortunate to be able to discuss my interest in an intervention for deaf children with Marie Clay. In fact, she provided feedback on an article related to Reading Recovery with the deaf that colleagues and I had been invited to write for Odyssey, a Gallaudet University publication (Fullerton, Brill, & Carter, 2003). While the Odyssey article was the first to publish any adaptations in procedures for the deaf, the adaptations primarily came from the work of teachers of the deaf in California and Michigan who were doing Reading Recovery with the deaf. Melissa Brown and Sharon Margol were the first teachers of the deaf to be trained at the California School for the Deaf, Riverside in 1995, by teacher leader Gayle Hurt. Nancy Brill, another teacher of the deaf was also trained while working at the California School for the Deaf in Fremont. Christine Carter, who had worked at the California School for the Deaf, trained as a Reading Recovery teacher in Dearborn, Michigan. By the time I began work in this area during my previous position at Ohio State, Melissa and Sharon were in their last years as Reading Recovery teachers (1996–2001), but the early work they had done and their communication and collaboration with Nancy and Christine, in turn, provided much useful information for me.

For several years, these teachers explored ways to adapt the procedures to meet the needs of deaf children. In many ways, these teachers were the early explorers, thinking about Reading Recovery for their students almost a decade before Literacy Lessons was published. Much of what we know about Reading Recovery with the deaf in the United States has been built upon their efforts. As Clay suggested,

There are other groups of children who would probably also benefit from the use of Reading Recovery teaching procedures. It is because these procedures are designed for adapting the instruction to the learning needs of individual children that they can be applied to many beginning readers who are in some kind of special education. (Clay, 2005a, p. i)

We are still in the early stages of attempting to determine what procedures are appropriate for deaf children and which procedures may need to be adjusted. Just as we select procedures based on the needs of hearing children, the diversity of deaf children—in terms of their learning needs—will call for even greater flexibility and careful decision making. (The following section addresses the diversity of deaf children in more detail.)

Within this article, I discuss the diverse needs of deaf children and issues related to their education. Then I provide background information on
Literacy Lessons/Reading Recovery detailing how efforts began and why they are important. Next, I discuss some of the considerations and challenges related to training and implementation. Finally, I briefly discuss upcoming efforts to collect data on deaf children through the National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC) in order to more comprehensively study and evaluate progress as we have done with hearing children.

Linking Clay’s Work with Education of Deaf Children: Why Reading Recovery?
Within Reading Recovery, teachers encounter a broad range of diverse learners and clearly, there is much variability in these learner’s paths to literacy achievement (Clay, 1998). Clay explains Reading Recovery’s response to diversity: “We are able to produce efficient results for a diverse population of learners because we are able to design a set of lessons for a particular child” (Clay, 2005b, p. 1). Arguably, there is no population of children more diverse than those who are deaf. The following information represents some of the child-related variables that might influence instructional decisions:

- hearing loss (mild, moderate, severe, profound)
- onset of hearing loss (before or after language began to develop is of particular interest)
- cause of hearing loss (complications at birth or in utero, genetic/hereditary, childhood disease)
- parental/family history of loss
- communication method used at school and home—options may include Oral, American Sign Language (ASL), Simultaneous Communication (Signed English, SEE, any other English sign system combined with speech), Cued Speech
- predominant mode of communication during classroom instruction as well as Reading Recovery lessons (ASL, Simultaneous Communication, Cued Speech, Oral)
- language development
- educational context (state school for the deaf, day or residential school, mainstream or self-contained environment in public school, private school, etc.)
- identification of other learning difficulties
- cochlear implants

(For more information about these variables and demographics related to the deaf see Karchmer & Mitchell, 2003; Paul, 1998; 2001; Spencer & Marschark, 2006). The list above is not exhaustive, but these variables are some of the most-important factors that must be considered in the education of deaf children. Variability in relation to hearing loss, language and communication methods, and support at home and school are just a few of the factors that must be taken into account in addition to typical learner characteristics that we also consider with hearing children such as background knowledge, language development, motivation, and literacy achievement that will differ for each learner. Given that classrooms of deaf children often have less than eight students, one-to-one instruction may seem unnecessary. However, the variables listed above highlight why one-to-one instruction may be critical. These variables, along with the diverse background knowledge, delayed language development, and learning needs within a classroom suggest how challenging it may be for a teacher of the deaf to customize learning to meet each child’s unique needs.

It is commonly acknowledged that early literacy intervention is critical. Moreover, the overall literacy progress of deaf learners suggests that early intervention may be even more important in education of the deaf. Results on the Stanford Achievement Test-Hearing Impaired Version have remained similar across decades with the average 18- to 19-year-old deaf reader showing an annual growth rate of .3 grade levels per year with a plateau occurring at third- or fourth-grade level (Paul, 1998). It is important to note that there are many deaf individuals who achieve higher reading levels (Karchmer & Mitchell, 2003); however, given that the average reading level of deaf high school graduates is comparable to that of a hearing 9-year-old in many cases suggests that the need for early literacy intervention is a critical consideration.

Increasingly, researchers have called for careful observation and documentation of literacy processes in young deaf children as well as careful design of literacy practices (Gioia, Johnston, & Cooper, 2001; Kelly, 2003; Nielsen & Luetke-Stahlman, 2002; Schirmer & Williams, 2003). One possible avenue that combines design and documentation is the piloting of an early intervention; for example, working one-to-one with a deaf child offers a unique opportunity to scrutinize the literacy processing of each child who is taught in Reading Recovery. Case studies
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and other types of data collection, research, and evaluation focused on Reading Recovery would provide the documentation that has been called for. Certainly, we have just begun to explore Reading Recovery’s possible potential for deaf children’s literacy learning (Charlesworth, Charlesworth, Raban, & Rickards, 2003a, 2003b; Fullerton, 2008a, 2008b; Fullerton, Brill, & Carter, 2003). As we continue to collect data on these children and as more teachers are trained, we will truly begin to determine the potential that Reading Recovery may hold for deaf children.

Background

As stated earlier, in 1995, the first teachers of the deaf were trained in the United States. These teachers of the deaf in California requested Reading Recovery training because they viewed the training as critical in providing more-intensive instruction to deaf children who are at risk of literacy failure, and also as a way of increasing the teacher’s knowledge of literacy processing. Through grassroots efforts and networking, these teachers used the knowledge they had regarding deaf children and adapted procedures accordingly. The ingenuity of these teachers and the support they provided to each other was critical since the teacher leaders who trained them did not have backgrounds in education of the deaf. The networking was challenging; however, since teachers were in different schools, and after a while, many different areas of the United States. Although the teachers in California were unaware, almost at the same time interest developed in Australia. In 1996, the first Australian teacher of the deaf was trained in Victoria by Ann Charlesworth, a tutor (teacher leader). Seven teachers were subsequently trained with other tutors. When an administrator first contacted Ann requesting training, Ann rose to the challenge even though her background was not in education of the deaf. With much interest and a desire to help, Ann began a journey that culminated in her dissertation research focused on a comparison of 12 deaf and 12 hearing children in Reading Recovery (Charlesworth, et al., 2006a, 2006b).

My work in this area began when I took a position as trainer at The Ohio State University and subsequently discussed my interest and background in education of the deaf with Marie Clay. I began networking and serving as an informal advisor to teachers of the deaf, as well as teacher leaders, in 2000. Teachers of the deaf involved with Reading Recovery across the U.S. came together for the first time in 2003. Two of the teachers, Nancy Brill and Christine Carter, and I organized a presentation and forum at the National Reading Recovery Conference in Columbus, Ohio, giving us an opportunity to network with other educators of the deaf as well as other interested teachers, teacher leaders, administrators, and parents. By this time, there were teachers of the deaf working one-to-one implementing an adaptation of Reading Recovery in California, Kentucky, Michigan, New York, Texas, and South Carolina.

In 2005–2006, the first U.S. deaf teacher of the deaf, Christy Wagner, was trained as a Reading Recovery teacher at the South Carolina School for the Deaf in Spartanburg. In 2007–2008, three teachers of the deaf at two campuses of the Maryland School for the Deaf in Frederick and Columbia were trained together. Two of these teachers are also deaf.

Through my association with these professionals, I have come to recognize the importance this training may have to educators of the deaf and to their students. I have also developed an awareness of the complexity and some of the implementation considerations that must be sorted, particularly in relation to training and in the selection of children. A few of these are addressed in the next section.

Training and Implementation
Considerations and Challenges

There are several misconceptions about training teachers to work with deaf children. Within this section, I address a number of misconceptions, concerns and challenges related to using the intervention with the deaf.

Length of Intervention

One misunderstanding of some teachers of the deaf is that they must complete the child’s series of lessons in 12 to 20 weeks. This is not as clear cut as with hearing children; the decision must be made in consultation with the teacher leader and trainer(s). Literacy Lessons with a deaf child, as Clay has noted, may require a more lengthy series of lessons. Furthermore, at this point, we have limited information to suggest what processing at discontinuing should look like for a deaf child. In addition, other learner characteristics as well as implementation factors need to be considered, including the variables mentioned earlier. Along with literacy processing, the language development of the child, other learning issues, classroom support, and the number of children who need intervention assistance in the school must be considered. For example, in one school
there were six children in first grade, which is not atypical; therefore, the teacher was able to work with most of the children beyond 20 weeks. Again, decisions such as these must include professionals who understand the child, the school context, and Reading Recovery.

Selection of deaf children
Another concern that is frequently discussed is whether first grade is the appropriate grade for Reading Recovery selection as it relates to deaf children. While this is a requirement with hearing children, Clay (2005b) explains that Literacy Lessons may be appropriate for some older learners. In the case of deaf learners, many children come to school with severe language development delays, and a number have other learning issues. Again, it is most appropriate for professionals to consider all these factors as well as need within early grades when making a decision about Reading Recovery entry. In both Australia and the United States, first and second graders have been served to meet the needs of all learners within the early grades as well as to ensure that the Reading Recovery teacher works with at least four students at all times.

Training requirements and possible protocols
Another prevalent misunderstanding is that teachers must first train with hearing children and then begin to work with deaf children. While this may be preferable, it is not always possible. Most of the teachers who initially trained in the U.S. trained first with hearing children. Some trained for a full year with hearing children; others shifted to working with at least two deaf children, if not four, during the second half of the training year. A few trained entirely with deaf children because of travel and logistical concerns (including the teacher’s hearing loss).

There may be some advantages to the protocol of training first with hearing children. Initially working with hearing children may support teachers in having an enhanced understanding of the theoretical framework of Reading Recovery and to observe what might arguably be characterized as “typical” acceleration with hearing children.

While deaf children typically exhibit serious delays in language development, research suggests that language development follows the same progression as for hearing children. Using the procedures as developed without significant adaptation during training. On the other hand, in some contexts, this has the potential to establish fairly unrealistic requirements for many teachers and schools for the deaf who must travel to a different school to work with hearing children—sometimes at considerable distances—thus limiting the number of children they may support during the other portion of the day. In addition, it is likely that requiring teaching first with hearing children would eliminate or diminish the likelihood of training teachers who are deaf themselves. Certainly, during the initial year of training, teachers of the deaf have strong opportunities to observe the progress of hearing children, and through collaboration and discussion with colleagues they develop understandings about hearing children and in turn, make adjustments in applying this knowledge to deaf children. There are certainly more similarities than differences. While deaf children typically exhibit serious delays in language development, research suggests that language development follows the same progression as for hearing children.

Based on the limited research that we have in emergent literacy development in deaf children, preliminary evidence suggests that the literacy progression is also similar (Mayer, 2007; Schirmer & Williams, 2003).

Ultimately, the decision of how best to provide training to teachers of the deaf should be made in relation to the instructional context (e.g., state school for the deaf, public school resource/mainstream, etc.) and in consultation with a teacher leader and trainer(s). It is also important to note that many of my teacher leader colleagues have recommended that, during the year after training, these teachers of the deaf receive more-extensive support than typical to transition and adapt procedures for deaf children.

One key difference for teachers of the deaf is that throughout their training year and ongoing professional development (including contact), they will have fewer opportunities to discuss particular issues and adaptations involved with the one-to-one instruction of deaf children with other Reading Recovery teachers, particularly those who work with the deaf. (This is primarily because the majority of their Reading Recovery peers are working with hearing students.) It is optimal for these teachers of the deaf to have increased opportunities to collaborate with
other teachers of the deaf within their professional cohort, as well as with teachers of hearing children. Unlike the three teachers who trained in Maryland, most are the sole educator of the deaf in a training class. For this reason, I always recommend to administrators and teacher leaders that they train two teachers of the deaf in Reading Recovery whenever possible. When this is not possible, it is important to invite literacy specialists, coaches, or early literacy teachers within the school to observe Reading Recovery lessons to provide additional input about teaching and learning.

Another common concern (particularly among teacher leaders) is how a teacher leader, who typically has limited knowledge of education of the deaf, can assist teachers of the deaf in flexibly adapting procedures for their students. While it is understandable that at first a teacher leader may feel a bit uncertain, teacher leaders who have trained teachers of the deaf have found it to be a valuable and engaging learning experience. They report that it is extremely satisfying to be able to support another population of children who can benefit from Reading Recovery. While I am not minimizing the complexity of making teaching decisions in relation to a deaf child, it is also important to point out that seasoned teacher leaders have vast experience with observing and making decisions about hard-to-teach children. “Hard to teach children do not follow predictable paths of progress” (Clay, 2005a, p. ii); the same is true of deaf children. The tentativeness, knowledge, and collaborative problem-solving spirit that most teacher leaders bring to their role makes it possible for them to work within this context.

I must also counter this uncertainty that a teacher leader might feel with an essential observation: The teacher leaders who have undertaken the responsibility of training these teachers are brave pioneers, or as one teacher leader recently wrote to me, “We often feel like pioneers in uncharted territory” (K. Brown, personal communication, July 3, 2008). Each has attempted to do something that few others have attempted, and they are building their knowledge base of deaf children as they learn, even as they balance this work with their training of other teachers! I have seen them do this with a tremendous sense of dedication, of concern and commitment for all children, and most importantly, with a keen sense of curiosity and wonder coupled with a large dose of flexibility. Most recently, I have observed and interacted with Barb Shelley, a teacher leader training three teachers of the deaf in Maryland (in addition to seven other teachers of hearing children). As a result of these interactions, I am certain the responsibility seems daunting at times, but I have also come to recognize the unique opportunities it provides for both the teacher leader and other teachers.

I learned some time ago, as I discussed rationales for adapting procedures for individual deaf children with Marie Clay, that such thinking influenced stronger reflection on the rationales and theoretical underpinnings related to the teaching and learning of individual hearing children. I have observed this same type of reflection on the part of teacher leaders and teachers during training sessions and school visits. Such discussion has an advantage in strengthening the understanding of all participants. There are other significant and memorable advantages: Watching a teacher teach a deaf child behind the glass is an unforgettable exemplar of the notion of “by different paths to common outcomes” (Clay, 1998). Furthermore, the flexibility that is required in choosing and adjusting procedures for deaf children helps all teachers reflect on the need to design an intervention that meets each child’s unique needs. Finally, these observations of deaf children also strengthen an essential pedagogical perspective in Reading Recovery — that every child can achieve if we find the way to teach them.

**Considerations for Training Classes that Include Teachers of the Deaf:**

**Using an Interpreter**

Clearly, there are many positive reasons to include teachers of the deaf in training classes. There are, however, some important considerations. What seems to most concern the teacher of the deaf as well as the teacher leader is the use of the interpreter during instructional sessions and school visits. Within this section, I discuss several scenarios and describe what, to date, we have found to be most beneficial in organizing training and professional development with the aid of an interpreter.

**Using an interpreter with a hearing teacher of the deaf and a deaf child behind-the-glass and on school visits**

During training sessions or ongoing professional development at least one interpreter is needed when a teacher of the deaf is behind-the-glass. (In this example, the teacher of the deaf happens to be hearing.) When the teacher of the deaf is teaching behind-the-glass, if she is hearing, she may opt to voice (speak) the signs,
or reverse interpret what the child is signing. Anyone who has taught behind-the-glass recognizes the challenge of this scenario. Imagine thinking clearly about teaching decisions behind-the-glass while also interpreting what the child is saying at the same time! Because of this challenge, I recommend that an interpreter assist. The interpreter will be used to voice or reverse interpret what the child, who is signing, is communicating. In most other instructional settings, an interpreter will not be needed. However, during school visits, many teacher leaders have found it helpful to again have an interpreter to voice for the child and to assist with communicating with the child. The Reading Recovery teacher could reverse interpret or voice for the child, but again, given all that the teacher must attend to within the teaching alone, this becomes an added attention requirement. Therefore, this is not recommended for a teacher-in-training who must be freed up to focus on the teaching and decision making as well as the teacher leader’s interactions and feedback rather than interpreting for the child.

A final recommendation, however, is that the teacher be consulted in making this decision. It is important that the teacher have a say in this matter since the interpreter adds one more observer for both the teacher and the child during the school visits.

Using an interpreter with a teacher who is deaf during training or professional development sessions
When the teacher of the deaf is teaching behind-the-glass, it is necessary to have at least two interpreters. Given all the talk that occurs during one Reading Recovery session, the amount of signing/interpreting or reverse interpreting/voicing is quite extensive and intensive. The interpreter communicates to the person who is deaf everything that is said by the teacher leader and colleagues and in turn, communicates what is signed by the teacher who is deaf. The same procedures are followed during school visits.

It has been suggested that some deaf individuals may prefer two interpreters being used at the same time — one beside or behind the teacher and child and one near the teacher leader.

Sorting out how best to structure the situation may seem confusing, but interpreters have received extensive training and have experience in a variety of interpreting contexts.

When we sorted out the best scenario during training classes, we found that this solved one problem, clarifying where the talk was coming from, but added a potential distraction for the child. In addition, it sometimes caused missed information. While the teacher was focused on the interpreter near the teacher and child, she might miss what was being interpreted from the observers on the other side of the glass. For this reason, here in South Carolina, we typically had the interpreter(s) on the side of the glass with the teacher leader and teachers. Again, it seems important to recommend flexibility and to consider both ways based on teacher preference in order to provide the best modes of communication possible.

Using an interpreter during training or professional development sessions when a teacher who is deaf is teaching behind-the-glass
As mentioned earlier, it is important to have at least two interpreters, but it is even more strongly recommended that at least two interpreters be used simultaneously when a teacher and child are both deaf and interacting behind the glass. We found that when only one interpreter was used to voice what the teacher and child were saying, it was confusing — the teachers and teacher leader on the other side of the glass had difficulty differentiating the “speaker.” Two interpreters were used at the same time, one voicing or reverse interpreting the signed communication of the teacher, another reverse interpreting for the child.

Using an interpreter during training or professional development sessions when one teacher who is deaf is teaching behind-the-glass and other Reading Recovery teachers (observers) are deaf
This past year, when three teachers of the deaf trained in one class in Maryland and two of those teachers were deaf, we found that sometimes three interpreters were needed — two interpreters to represent the teaching and learning going on as described above, and one to interpret what was being said by the teacher leader and teachers for the other teacher who is deaf.

As we sorted out these different scenarios, particularly the last one, I feared that these changes to the typical teaching and learning sessions would be difficult. But after observing behind-the-glass sessions, I realized that in the case of training class sessions, all the teachers were experiencing behind-the-glass for the
first time and they had no previous expectations. For these in-training participants, having the teachers of the deaf and interpreters became a natural part of their class structure. In fact, individuals have reported that it provided an added dimension of learning to their training. After some reflection, I have come to realize that Reading Recovery professionals are trained to be flexible, so responding to these unique training situations is just another indicator of flexibility as well as problem solving.

It is important to acknowledge the expertise of the interpreters. Sorting out how best to structure the situation may seem confusing to a teacher leader (and trainer!), but interpreters have the necessary expertise; they have received extensive training and have experience in a variety of interpreting contexts. As long as the interpreters are certified as skilled interpreters, it is likely they will be able to make recommendations in how best to use their skills and how many interpreters will be needed given a particular context.

These descriptions may also cause some administrators and teacher leaders to worry about logistics and cost. First, what should be understood is that this situation is not atypical in any instructional or business setting involving a hearing-impaired or deaf individual. In fact, it is common for two interpreters to accompany a deaf person. Reading Recovery sessions are no different; it is optimal and necessary in most cases to have two interpreters given the rigorous and lengthy discourse context. For example, consider the technical, literacy-related terms that are a part of Reading Recovery. Interpreting in this context is challenging because of the vocabulary; it is also challenging when a session is going well, the amount of talk is abundant, and after a short time one interpreter becomes less efficient in representing the communication. So in most cases, a minimum of two interpreters is needed.

In these two examples of training contexts, the cost of interpreter services was covered by the university or the state school for the deaf as a part of required services to deaf individuals. In South Carolina, for example, credit for the training class was offered through Clemson University, and I worked with the university’s office of interpreting services to ensure that interpreters were provided.

**Establishing Networks to Ensure Collaborative Learning and Problem Solving**

Another important consideration was mentioned earlier: If a teacher of the deaf is the only person in her training class working with deaf children, she does not have peers who are sharing the same instructional concerns or having to adapt procedures in the same way. For example, teachers training in Reading Recovery learn the procedures related to Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words early, and it is discussed frequently. For severely to profoundly deaf children, the Elkonin boxes for hearing and recording sounds (phonemic analysis) are not typically a viable procedure (Fullerton et al., 2003); yet at the same time, it is important that consideration be given to letter boxes (advanced learning, spelling using boxes for letters) which offer an important visual and sequential learning tool for deaf learners. Though not an insurmountable concern, this provides one example of the importance of teacher leaders who are training teachers of the deaf, as well as the teachers themselves, to locate other educators of the deaf and resources that can support them during training. Otherwise, teachers (and teacher leaders) may be more likely to decide that a particular procedure is not relevant and can be omitted without strong consideration for how the procedure might be adapted or what might replace it. In other words, questioning what should be done in relation to a particular procedure, even when it may seem at first that it does not pertain to deaf children, is critical. It is also important to acknowledge, however, that to date we have limited research and documentation of Reading Recovery with deaf children (Charlesworth et al., 2006a, 2006b; Fullerton, 2008a, 2008b; Fullerton et al., 2003).

Therefore, we cannot say with certainty what procedures work best in most cases.

Again, this is another reason why teacher leaders and teachers who are working with deaf children are truly pioneers. Their efforts, often through trialing different procedures and adaptations, increasingly bring us closer to some notions of what works best for deaf learners in Reading Recovery. Since teachers of the deaf—working collaboratively with teacher leaders—are often sorting through procedures and trialing to determine what works best during the initial training year, an important consideration is that teacher leaders plan to spend more time with these teachers of the deaf during their second year so that they might continue to collaboratively explore the best ways to individually design and deliver instruction for young deaf learners.
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Just as teachers of hearing children regularly network at ongoing professional development and state, regional, and national Reading Recovery conferences, ways for teachers of the deaf to network and come together to support one another’s learning is also another necessary dimension. In many cases, there is one teacher of the deaf doing Reading Recovery in an entire state. Currently, we are working on an institute to bring these teachers together during the summer for in-depth study, but we need additional ways to offer professional support and legitimize the efforts of these teachers and their institutions.

Another way that we are working toward establishing a network of teachers of the deaf is to begin to collect data on deaf children in a more formal manner. Since we still have uncertainties in relation to discontinuing and needed length of program, many teachers and teacher leaders have opted not to enter and combine their data with that of hearing children. Again, this has been a decision made by teacher leaders and trainers.

Given that teachers have been working with deaf children for over a decade, it seems appropriate and important to begin to collect and separate the data so that we can more clearly discern the impact of the intervention with deaf children. It would seem that ongoing data collection might also have an important role in implementation and advocacy, as it has with hearing children. Through NDEC, we have formulated plans to begin data collection in fall 2008. Interested teacher leaders and teachers of the deaf should contact me so that we can ensure that each child’s data will be a part of this research and evaluation endeavor. If data entry has not occurred previously, you will receive assistance in beginning this process. This endeavor will be the first step in allowing us to determine the impact of Reading Recovery for deaf children in a more-comprehensive manner. As with any innovation, but perhaps more so in relation to special populations, it is important to collect data over time to inform instructional changes that might occur.

Finally, the work that has been done in the past has provided the necessary foundations for further development of Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons for deaf children. Several university trainers have supported these efforts, particularly those in California. The teachers have kept this movement going, and the teacher leaders have made it possible for them to do so. Some of these professionals have moved on to other endeavors, while others are just beginning or continuing. What follows is a way of recognizing these explorers for the history books.

United States Teacher Leaders and Teachers of the Deaf

Nancy Brill, teacher California
Kathleen Brown, teacher leader California
Melissa Brown, teacher California
Terri Brown, teacher South Carolina
Debbi Byrne Cain, teacher California
Susan Carmichael, teacher leader Kentucky
Christine Carter, teacher Michigan
Margaret Clark, teacher leader Colorado
Judy Embry, teacher leader (now trainer) Kentucky
Maureen Guarneri, teacher New York
Lindy Harmon, teacher leader Kentucky
Gayle Hurt, teacher leader California
Lou Jacobs, teacher leader South Carolina
Neely Kelly, teacher leader Kentucky
Jennifer Leith, teacher Michigan
Mary Ann Marks, teacher leader California
Sharon Margol, teacher Texas
Viki Munn, teacher leader Texas
Karri Ohlhausen, teacher Maryland
Mickey Palmer, teacher Michigan
Sandy Pennington, teacher leader Maryland
Elizabeth Reed, teacher California
Jan Rohman, teacher New Mexico
Elizabeth Romero, teacher Michigan
Darlene Schoolmaster, teacher leader Maryland
Barbara Shelley, teacher leader South Carolina
Christy Wagner, teacher Kentucky
Margaret Warner, teacher leader

Note: If you have been or are currently working in Reading Recovery for the deaf and are not mentioned here, please contact me at susanf@clemson.edu so we can maintain a complete list of professionals.
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