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In March of 2020, a global pandemic prompted sudden school closures, both nationally and internationally. The unprecedented events of COVID-19 brought forth unique challenges to teachers everywhere, including those in the Reading Recovery® community.

The Ohio State University (OSU) trainer team (Drs. Jamie Lipp, Lisa Pinkerton, and James Schnug) became increasingly aware that their teacher leaders were in need of support as they attempted to navigate this uncharted territory. After several remote brainstorming sessions with OSU-affiliated teacher leaders, Dr. Schnug raised the idea that the issues and roadblocks OSU teacher leaders were facing extended beyond the OSU site. He initiated the process to join forces and collaborate across the three largest (in terms of the number of teacher leaders and affiliated sites) university training centers (UTCs) to allow for increased input, problem solving, and solution-based activity to occur.

During the summer of 2020, teacher leaders from OSU, National Louis University, and Saint Mary’s College joined forces remotely to tackle the most common and pressing issues concerning Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons™ teaching in remote, hybrid, and socially distanced formats.

Although brought together through unfortunate circumstances, the power and promise of increased collaboration opportunities among teacher leaders became increasingly apparent. In this narrative, we will discuss the benefits of teacher leader collaboration in support of ongoing teacher learning, tell the story of recent cross-UTC collaboration, and consider the future possibilities of expanded collaboration opportunities moving forward.

Collaboration as Integral to Teaching and Learning in Reading Recovery

Collaborative communities, also known as professional learning communities (PLCs), consist of a group of educators who participate in collective inquiry and problem solving, while allowing space for innovation. Three important elements for successful PLCs are a focus on learning, collaborative culture, and results-oriented thinking (DuFour et al., 2006). A PLC may comprise educators within a single school building or beyond, the same content area or cross-curricular groupings. Ideally, PLCs “would be a place where teachers inquired together into how to improve their practice in areas of importance to them, and then implemented what they learned to make it happen” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 127).

PLCs are beneficial in four ways. They have the potential to (a) improve student achievement, (b) improve relationships among team members, (c) promote reflective practice, and (d) expand each member’s repertoire of tools. The ability to improve practice, which in turn has the potential to improve student achievement, is a leading positive
result of collaboration (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Smith et al., 2020). The power behind PLCs lies in the development of professional capital. Hargreaves and Fullan define professional capital as “having and building a system that will be truly great” (p. xvi). Professional capital is promoted by the highest-performing economies and educational systems worldwide. High-quality teaching and learning is a trademark of professional capital, such that “the group is far more powerful than the individual” (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012, p. 3).

Reading Recovery is, essentially, an international PLC that is designed to maximize the power of professional capital. Wilson and Daviss (1994, as cited in Watson & Askew, 2009) explain that, “International Reading Recovery Trainers, alongside the professional community of teachers, Tutors/Teacher Leaders, administrators, other educators, and policy makers worldwide, offer a unique synergy that results from combining research, development, mentoring and redesign” (p. 304). Clay designed the system framework of Reading Recovery to essentially create what we now call PLCs in three tiers: university trainers, teacher leaders, and teachers.

Central to the work of individuals within each part of the system is the study of the literacy processing theory (e.g., Clay, 1991, 2014, 2015, 2016). Clay’s theory posits learning as a complex process of constructing meaning which forms the basis of the hypothesis that “teachers must participate in constructing their own understandings” (Lyons et al., 1993, p. 12). This is true for all Reading Recovery professionals (trainers, teacher leaders, and teachers) in the Reading Recovery network. In the following sections, we first discuss the previous ways in which teacher leaders have collaborated with one another, and then we describe the new ways in which teacher leaders had the opportunity to collaborate outside of their usual networks during the summer of 2020.

Prior Opportunities for Teacher Leader Collaboration
Reading Recovery teacher leaders participate in an initial year-long training at a certified UTC. Although the number of teacher leaders in a training class and their geographic location varies, the participant makeup of the class remains constant across an entire school year. Classmates from different states often develop strong social and emotional bonds due to their shared experience of an intense year of learning and reflection, which often acts as a springboard for future cooperative work as they support each other in their teacher leader roles.

Beyond the training year, teacher leaders have opportunities for continued collaborative inquiry and learning through the following:

- annual Teacher Leader Institute
- national and regional conferences
- ongoing professional learning at individual UTCs
- participation in state or local committees and organizations
- publication opportunities

Most of the collaboration we have identified supported extending understanding of Clay’s literacy theory and practice, problem solving when something is not going well in teaching or student learning, considering advocacy opportunities, or extending the reach of Reading Recovery teachers’ expertise to support and influence teachers and students in other settings. Participation in these opportunities opened doors for teacher leader collaboration in order to enhance theory and practice together. While numerous opportunities for collaboration exist within the network, many of these occur in small-scale situations involving only a small portion of the teacher leader population, highlighting the need to explore further the power of widespread collaboration efforts. The following section describes how the pandemic provided an opportunity for teacher leaders to participate in a more widespread collaboration across the UTCs.

Cross UTC Collaboration:
Process, Product, Power

Many previous opportunities for collaboration occurred on a small level, typically among teacher leaders within a single UTC. However, seemingly overnight, COVID-19 presented time-sensitive challenges that required swift problem-solving efforts. The global pandemic thrust educators into novel situations and created emotional uncertainty that affected every part of their lives and the lives of their students and families. The impact also reached the Reading Recovery/Literacy Lessons community. (Literacy Lessons is an intervention designed to reach young children—generally Grades 1–4—in special education or ESL settings who are struggling with beginning reading and writing but are not eligible for
Reading Recovery. This was no longer just about extending content knowledge. It was evident that our existing knowledge was insufficient to address the challenge of teaching children from a distance, whether remotely or 6 feet apart.

Thus, the idea of joining forces across multiple UTCs emerged. This new larger group of 55 teacher leaders across three UTCs was able to rely on more minds and ideas to begin climbing the immense hill placed in front of them. The initial meetings elicited eight priority areas, specifically: (a) teaching Reading Recovery lessons while socially distanced, (b) teaching Reading Recovery lessons remotely, (c) administering the Observation Survey remotely, (d) developing necessary resources, (e) providing social and emotional support for students, (f) collecting, analyzing, and applying data, (g) teaching Literacy Lessons, and (h) administering the Record of Oral Language. Teacher leaders volunteered their time and self-selected into a workgroup of interest to them.

During the summer months of 2020, each workgroup met multiple times via Zoom to talk through and identify overall objectives and to complete the group’s tasks. Groups varied in size, from three to thirteen teacher leader members, and each group included at least one teacher leader from each UTC within the collaboration. To promote efficient, organized work, each group had a facilitator who established meeting dates and times, took notes, and disseminated information to teacher leaders across the larger group.

As the three UTCs were united in this focused problem-solving process, conversation, creativity, and possible solutions increased. Workgroup members were highly invested as they faced the need to find solutions to the problems caused by the pandemic and the abrupt change from the usual, and comfortable, mode of teaching. Teacher leaders needed to think flexibly and tentatively, exploring various possibilities to continue the important work of Reading Recovery and Literacy Lessons. Cooperative learning, combined with specific but varied strengths of individual teacher leaders, facilitated achieving group goals in a timely manner.

The Reading Recovery community continued to work together to serve the students most in need throughout the pandemic while fully attempting to maintain the integrity of the Standards and Guidelines for both Reading Recovery and Literacy Lessons.

It is important to acknowledge that changes in tools, resources, and teaching interactions could compromise the standardization of lessons and assessments. Close observation is a central tenet of Reading Recovery and was often challenged through alternate methods of instruction such as remote teaching and teaching while remaining socially distanced. However, the Reading Recovery community continued to work together to serve the students most in need throughout the pandemic while fully attempting to maintain the integrity of the Standards and Guidelines for both Reading Recovery and Literacy Lessons. The remainder of this article describes the goals, experiences, and outcomes for seven of the eight priority areas identified above. We also try to capture and discuss the power of those unique collaboration opportunities in hopes that such collaborative work can continue and be prioritized in the future.

**Teaching Reading Recovery lessons while socially distanced**

Since new guidelines halted the physical gathering of students and educators, the Reading Recovery community recognized the need to problem solve how best to continue lessons in accordance with these restrictions. This workgroup’s (11 teacher leader members) objective was to consider: How are we going to work one-to-one with students while incorporating the social distancing guidelines? The governing sources that influenced the work were the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines, individual district protocols, and recommendations provided by the North American Trainers Group (NATG) 2020–2021 Pandemic Task Force Report (Briggs et al., 2020). Group members knew that variations in the implementation of social distancing would exist from district to district based on the virus’ impact in each community. Because teacher leader members in this group spanned the national grid, a myriad of context-specific considerations was taken into account.

The workgroup explored and documented possibilities for personal protective equipment including...
masks, face shields, gloves, and a clear plexiglass divider between the teacher and student. This group also considered how to maintain clean and nonshared materials, from individualized materials to be handled by only one student, to disinfecting the space between student lessons, to projecting books electronically on a wall in a classroom to allow a student to use one-to-one correspondence without touching the book itself. The group had thoughtful discussions about measuring, monitoring, and recording student success during uncertain times.

**Teaching Reading Recovery lessons remotely**

As the summer drew to a close, many school districts across the country had announced their intentions to begin the school year with 100% remote instruction. Other districts indicated that they would be providing students with a blended model of instruction using a combination of in-person and remote learning days. Both of these instructional models required a way to deliver Reading Recovery lessons remotely. Some teachers had already experienced remote lessons amidst the initial shut down (March to June), during which they learned a great deal about the challenges and successes of working remotely with Reading Recovery children. This group’s goal was to build upon this emerging knowledge about remote lessons and provide teachers with more guidance and options in order to implement remote Reading Recovery lessons as closely to Standards and Guidelines of Reading Recovery in the United States (2017/2018) as possible.

This workgroup (13 teacher leader members) carefully considered how to address specific teaching challenges in a remote setting, such as promoting independence in reading and writing, learning to look at print, and especially one-to-one matching. Since student devices, internet platforms, and available instructional tools (at home and at school) would vary considerably across the country, the group created a list of recommended tools and materials (e.g., document cameras; digital alphabet books; at-home kits for children containing writing journals, magnetic letters, Elkonin boxes; etc.). They suggested possible online applications like Jamboard to deliver the lesson components of letter/word work and the cut-up sentence. The group also explored digital access to leveled texts and the use of leveled book collections with document cameras.

The workgroup brought all ideas together into a document that examined each component of the lesson and shared implementation suggestions, platform-specific ideas, and resources that would support effective delivery of each. This resource has been used in a variety of ways since its dissemination among members of the three UTCs: as a part of continuing professional development sessions preparing for remote lessons, to investigate the recommended materials, and to practice the use of the various resources. As the school year began, teacher leaders provided teachers with more frequent, informal opportunities (e.g., short online check-ins outside of scheduled professional development time) to reflect upon what was working well with this remote format, to share new ideas, and to problem solve new challenges that arose.

**Administering the Observation Survey remotely**

Determining how to assess and monitor students’ literacy growth and knowledge in an online format was a challenge that many teachers faced. This workgroup (9 teacher leader members) considered how to respond to the question: How will we be able to assess students in the fall to learn more about each child’s literacy...
strengths and needs? This workgroup grew out of teachers’ initial efforts in the spring and responded to the urgent need for a complete set of digital tools to use when completing the tasks within Clay’s (2019) *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement*.

For those who would be teaching Reading Recovery remotely, it was essential that they had access to the Observation Survey tasks to assist with student selection and to analyze data to prepare for instruction. The group worked together to create a digital version of each Observation Survey task, a guidance document for its use as well as technology tips based on the various platforms available to different districts. The group also created a letter that could be shared with parents to explain the purpose of the assessment.

When developing the slideshow of the Observation Survey tasks, there were many discussions surrounding how to maintain the integrity and purpose of the assessment while balancing that with the logistics of ease of delivery and minimizing confusion. One example of such in-depth conversations happened with the Letter Identification task. To put all 54 letters on one slide was not realistic; students would not be able to see the letters clearly if they had a device with a small screen and teachers would not know where the child was looking or which letter(s) they were identifying. However, creating 54 separate slides—one for each letter—was too bulky. The compromise was to isolate one line of letters from the assessment at a time (6–7 letters) for the child to identify so the letters were still embedded within print, but yet it was manageable for both the student and the teacher.

To date, the Concepts About Print task proves the most challenging to administer remotely given the call-and-response format of the assessment. However, problem-solving teachers have found unique ways to complete the task successfully, including annotating the document during a screen share or using the Jamboard or Pear Deck applications to allow students to mark up the slides on their end. The documents created by the group provided a skeleton and framework on which many teachers have built.

**Developing necessary resources**

In order to support Reading Recovery lessons that would be delivered remotely, this workgroup (3 teacher leader members) investigated and compiled a broad list of specific resources that teachers could use. The group identified many different platforms and apps that could support online learning and described how they could be used with either live teaching or as a recorded video (e.g., Google, Zoom, Screencastify, Pear Deck, Seesaw, etc.). The group also found various resources that would assist teachers with writing and word learning, including digital magnetic letter tiles, sight words, and digital whiteboards like Jamboard. In addition to resources for writing instruction, the group researched digital book collections that could be used via screen sharing during lessons and listed the applicable subscription options and costs. The final document also suggested a variety of physical materials (e.g., document camera, iPad/cell phone stands) that could be helpful as teachers shared books from their own collections. Finally, the workgroup listed possible inexpensive books and materials that could be purchased for students’ at-home use (e.g., Keep Books [www.keepbooks.osu.edu], book sets through various publishers, etc.). This list could serve as a starting point to save time as teachers were beginning to wrap their heads around the unique teaching that would be part of the 2020–2021 school year. As the school year began,
not only were these resources helpful for Reading Recovery teachers, but they also proved important for other intervention and classroom teachers for continued reading and writing instruction online.

Providing social and emotional support for students

Thoughtful educators know that the most meaningful plans must factor in the social and emotional needs of those involved (teachers, students, and, in remote learning, families as well). This workgroup (5 teacher leader members) determined that although it was certain that social and emotional needs would be great during the pandemic, the range of needs that may occur would be difficult to define. For that reason, the group decided to create a resource document that teachers could consult and use to address the varied and unique needs they might encounter.

Each member researched personal resources and tools that, in their past experience, had been helpful. When the group met again, they developed a plan for organizing this information in a user-friendly way. The social-emotional needs of teachers were the impetus for this due to the fact that the group wanted to be mindful of their needs as well. The result of these meetings was a two-part document that teachers could reference as needed. The first part of the document included guidance and recommendations for building relationships and fostering engagement. The second part was a list of topics, possible resources, key ideas, and related page numbers that could support the particular social and emotional needs that might occur. This document could be shared with teacher leaders and, in turn, shared with individual sites as needs arose.

This work provided ideas for setting up the foundation for engagement and relationships with parents and students. From experience and specific feedback, the workgroup learned that working remotely and intentionally building relationships with families created many positive results. If families were not completely overwhelmed, they had been steady in communicating and working in partnership with teachers. This truly impacted the social-emotional well-being of teachers, students, and families.

Collecting, analyzing, and applying data

Data tell a story. If it is up to Reading Recovery professionals and teacher leaders to give voice to that story, what story might our 2019–2020 data tell? The task of this workgroup (7 teacher leader members) centered around identifying the various types of data that show how Reading Recovery can help systems weather the disruptions caused by the pandemic. The group explored typical uses for the site report to tell the story of each site. This led teacher leaders to consider how site reports would be different from one another and the opportunities this might afford all stakeholders impacted by Reading Recovery. Conversations pushed this group beyond just data to confront the reality that systems would be facing in welcoming back students who may need additional support in literacy learning. Reading Recovery certainly had the potential to support systems, teachers, and students to provide just-in-time learning.

Through these conversations, the workgroup created a table identifying specific tools to support data analysis: site report, I Love Data Fridays (www.idecweb.us), additional data collection ideas, testimonials and surveys, acceleration, equity, and social-emotional tools. This table included language and explanations about how these tools might help teacher leaders.
support sites more effectively as well as talking points that might be useful when working with external stakeholders. This workgroup was able to move beyond simply analyzing data from the interrupted school year to leveraging data by sharing Reading Recovery’s impact over time and how that might support systems in this unique time when acceleration and social-emotional connections are needed.

**Teaching Literacy Lessons**

The collaboration that occurred within the Literacy Lessons workgroup (4 teacher leader members) started with a discussion of the current state of districts’ slightly varied Literacy Lessons implementation. This opportunity for conversation provided a unique view of how Literacy Lessons is implemented across our nation. This workgroup determined the why behind renewed, collaborative efforts. An opportunity was evident: Reading Recovery has an opportunity to blaze a renewed Literacy Lessons path. COVID-19, coupled with this collaborative process, provided an opportunity to understand where Literacy Lessons has been and to consider reimagining and reinvigorating it. This felt like a turning point.

Literacy Lessons in the United States has been developing for years. This process of bringing teacher leaders together uncovered an urgency to re-imagine Literacy Lessons on behalf of the children whose Reading Recovery journey was interrupted during the 2019–20 school year as well as for children who are up and coming, early acquisition literacy learners in the early elementary grades. The workgroup’s goals remained flexible yet responsive, resulting in a suggested system approach to address the rising number of needs across the grades with Literacy Lessons as a possible solution.

This workgroup created a document containing a collection of resources: discussion questions (to foster system conversations by district or site), student selection ideas, and rationale for lesson modifications (with specific connections to Standards and Guidelines of Literacy Lessons in the United States (2013/2015). The group also offered suggestions for professional development for both continuing teachers and teachers in training.

**Dissemination of the work among the three UTCs**

As the summer drew to a close, each workgroup uploaded their information and resources into an electronic folder. Trainers then compiled and distributed a complete set of electronic resources to teacher leaders affiliated with each of the three UTCs. Teacher leaders now had full access to all resources, which could then be passed along to the teachers within their site. This all happened before the school year began so that teacher leaders and teachers could use the materials and resources from the first day of the new school year. The workgroups were a way to align systems of delivery and equip Reading Recovery and Literacy Lessons teachers with tools and materials that could be used to maximize instructional time and continue to

* Literacy Lessons is an intervention designed to reach young children (generally Grades1–4) in special education or ESL settings who are struggling with beginning reading and writing but are not eligible for Reading Recovery. Intervention specialists in these two settings are trained to use Reading Recovery instructional procedures to design individual lessons for their students with the goal of accelerating their literacy learning. (Reading Recovery Council of North America, n.d.) For more information about Literacy Lessons training, please see the Standards and Guidelines of Literacy Lessons in the United States (2013/2015) or contact a UTC near you.
close students’ literacy achievement gaps. The workgroups aimed to provide a foundation and starting place to lessen anxiety, workload, and pressure.

**Using What was Learned to Advance Future Collaboration Efforts**

Of those who participated in these workgroups, 42 of the 55 teacher leaders (76%) completed a survey about their perceptions of this work (see Table 1). For almost all statements, teacher leaders responded with the two most favorable perceptions. Teacher leaders felt that their contributions were valued by colleagues and that the outcomes were worth the personal time and effort expended. An overwhelming majority (95.2%) indicated that they would be willing to collaborate like this in the future with teacher leaders outside of their UTC. This seems particularly important, noting that more than 70% of respondents had not previously worked with teacher leaders outside of their UTC.

An open-ended survey question asked how this workgroup experience was different from the other ways in which they had worked with teacher leader colleagues. Three themes emerged from the responses to that question. First, these groups had a very clear and specific focus, as they came together to problem-solve specific issues related to supporting Reading Recovery implementation during a pandemic. Second, teacher leaders indicated that this collaboration allowed for alternative perspectives to be shared and considered throughout the process. Teacher leaders felt that their diverse contributions were valued and important. Finally, teacher leaders indicated that this work afforded them opportunities to build both professional and personal relationships with colleagues and expand their network of expertise beyond their own UTC.

The teacher leader feedback about these workgroups echo those described by Schwartz (2006) that “the Reading Recovery community of practice is centered around the activities of literacy learning and instruction. The product of our community is knowledge and the process of production is shared inquiry” (p. 55). Teacher leaders inquired together about literacy learning and instruction during unusual circumstances and produced new knowledge to combat the challenges, demonstrating the power of this professional learning community. Anonymous teacher leader feedback further highlighted the impact and benefits of the collaboration process.

“It is so helpful to collaborate, share concerns, and problem solve together. This work was important and urgent to all of us! It was wonderful to talk with others across the country, so we knew that we weren’t in this alone.”

“Everyone’s contributions were valued. This was different than meeting people at a conference, working together to problem-solve something at a table and then walking away. We had to come together multiple times. Relationships were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Participants’ Perceptions of Their Workgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I contributed to my workgroup’s discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workgroup colleagues valued my contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues’ discussions contributed to my thinking on the workgroup’s focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My time expended on this workgroup was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My effort expended on this workgroup was worthwhile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workgroup received the support it needed to complete its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workgroup’s final recommendations will benefit (or have benefited) fellow teacher leaders and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to collaborate like this in the future with teacher leaders outside my university training center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: A score of 5 designated the most positive perception. Scores are reported as a percentage of respondents.
The planning we did during summer 2020 was instrumental in enabling teachers and teacher leaders to deliver quality Reading Recovery lessons, regardless of setting, that are as close as possible to the lessons to which we are accustomed. After observing dozens of remote and socially distanced Reading Recovery lessons, we are inspired by this newfound ability to reach and teach our most vulnerable students during this most difficult and challenging time in our lives. Teacher leaders felt that relationships with families through remote learning have improved as has parents’ understanding of how to support their children at home. We have seen and heard children become active problem solvers, read with fluency and expression, write poignant and meaningful messages, and become more strategic readers and writers despite the pandemic.

**Conclusion**

It is evident that we (teacher leaders) are truly stronger together. This was an important opportunity to connect, collaborate, problem solve, and share outside of our smaller regions. Together, we engaged in conversations aimed at problem solving our implementation challenges and issues. Together, we explored and planned for potential pitfalls. Together, we broadened our concepts of what is possible.

Together, we engaged in conversations aimed at problem solving our implementation challenges and issues. Together, we explored and planned for potential pitfalls. Together, we broadened our concepts of what is possible.

What is the take-away from this collaborative work? Lyons et al. (1993) discuss **novelty detection** as “providing emotional overtones and motivation for learning” (p. 31). The novelty of this situation energized and motivated teacher leaders to be highly engaged, as did the driving force to help Reading Recovery teachers prepare to teach remotely in a way that would support the students, the families, and the learning. The job of the workgroups was ultimately to help energize, encourage, and empower Reading Recovery teachers to teach in new environments and with new requirements so that they, in turn, could energize, encourage, and empower their students to learn in new situations. The Reading Recovery teacher leader professional learning community faced this task with resolve, tentativeness, mutual respect, encouragement, and confidence. As the year of remote or hybrid learning continued, the original resources from the summer work continued to grow and change as a result of the daily teaching encounters of Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leaders with students and colleagues.

There have always been opportunities for teacher leaders to initiate collaboration with other teacher leaders, so what made this experience different? In this instance, trainers facilitated the workgroups by providing access to other teacher leaders, narrowing focus topics (rising from teacher leader conversations), inviting teacher leaders to choose a workgroup, providing a framework with adequate time and autonomy to create their own plan of action, administering a follow up evaluation survey, and providing time for sharing and celebration. This resulted in high quality work, a large quantity of learning, and a newly expanded network. We are hopeful that this joining of teacher leader minds and efforts will continue in the future and on a larger scale. The question is: Does this level of collaboration need to rely on trainer initiation, or can teacher leaders expand their own networks and opportunities to work collaboratively?

Reading Recovery encourages networks of teachers, schools, tutors/teacher leaders and trainers to critique and support each other’s problem solving. “The search for solutions has no end” (Clay, 2016, p. 214). It is our hope that continued and enhanced collaboration among teacher leaders and across UTCs is also never-ending in nature.
### Completed Products
- Digital version of the Observation Survey
- Considerations for Literacy Lessons
- Digital resource for social-emotional aspects of remote learning
- Tools for supporting data and advocacy
- Provision of options and guidance to support remote Reading Recovery lessons
- Resource to share CDC guidelines/ideas for socially distanced Reading Recovery lessons
- List of specific resources to support students and teachers in lessons

### Process Outcomes
- Formation of new professional bonds
- Enlargement of professional network
- Sharing of alternatives to common issues
- Enhancement of ideas and perspectives on common topics
- Contributions to the success of Reading Recovery outcomes
- Realization that topics and ideas are bigger than one person or one site
- Focus on reflective practices
- Expansion of tools and expertise
- Momentum of group carries others through difficult times
- Constructive learning with a larger group
- Engagement in collective inquiry
- Opportunity to articulate and investigate the reasoning behind respective positions
- Energized approach to work

### New Possibilities
- Initiating new topics for broader collaboration by individuals, sites, teacher leaders, and trainers
- Revisiting common topics in Reading Recovery across sites and states
- Increasing participation across sites, states, national, and international lines in IDEC Data Friday sessions
- Highlighting teacher leaders on the Reading Recovery Facebook page, Twitter, blogs, etc.
- Increasing the number of co-written articles for *The Journal of Reading Recovery*
- Increasing teacher leader blog contributions as author or co-author for Reading Recovery Council of North America
- Increasing participation through RRCNA committee work
- Increasing participation in national teacher leader work (e.g., book leveling)

### Interfering Factors
- Time: commitment and scheduling
- Routinized ways of doing things
- Lack of awareness of what is possible
- Lack of structure, catalyst, or leadership to initiate these kinds of collaborations
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