

6-1-1991

Why Is An Inservice Programme For Reading Recovery Teachers Necessary?

Marie M. Clay
University of Auckland, New Zealand

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons

 Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Clay, M. M. (1991). Why Is An Inservice Programme For Reading Recovery Teachers Necessary?. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 31 (5). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol31/iss5/2

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Education and Literacy Studies at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



Why Is An Inservice Programme For Reading Recovery Teachers Necessary?

Marie M. Clay

Raising the question which has dominated her early studies on emergent literacy, "...how can an education system provide a second chance for young children who have not responded to the literacy program in their first year of instruction at school?" Clay paints a richly detailed picture which answers many of the oft-asked questions at Reading Recovery informational sessions.

She arranges her palette into four bright colors: the teaching of children, the training of teachers, the training of teacher leaders, and the implementation and coordination of the long-term prevention strategy. As a primer coat enables paint to adhere to canvas, inservice education undercoats each element of Reading Recovery critical to providing children with their second chance. Throughout her article, she illustrates a sound program requiring a collaborative relationship of teachers, teacher leaders and teacher trainers, concluding with the suggestion that the Reading Recovery process might best begin by having a [University] "trainer of teacher leaders in a setting with both a university course and an on-going program operating in the schools, and having a senior administrator ...familiar with the preventive thrust of this early intervention program."

The Reading Recovery program was developed in New Zealand to answer the question *how can an education system provide a second chance for young children who have not responded to the literacy programme in their first year of instruction at school?* (It is *not* a program for teaching beginning reading to 80-90% of school children.) There are four aspects to the program: 1) the teaching of children, 2) the training of teachers, 3) the training of teacher leaders, and 4) implementing the program in an education system and coordinating the long-term prevention strategy. Teachers help children from the lower end of the achievement distribution to participate at or near an average level in their classrooms. Research has demonstrated that the procedures work with children who differ markedly in their prior experience and in their ways of responding (Clay, 1982, 1987, 1990, 1991).

A critical factor in this program is the training of teachers to do what seems impossible — that is, to take the tail off a normal distribution of achievement and put it into the middle of the distribution. The possibility of mounting a highly successful program working only from a published description of the procedures seems unlikely. In our experience when teachers merely read about the procedures, the new ideas merge with their old practices. In training teachers we have had to work very hard to change old ways of teaching. So one important factor in the delivery of a quality Reading Recovery program is the training of the teachers.

Overview

Reading Recovery teachers in New Zealand are classroom teachers who are released to teach children with literacy learning problems for part of the day and who attend a year long inservice course. The expectation is that they will develop their understanding of the reading process, become competent in selecting specific Reading Recovery teaching procedures to meet the needs of a child at a particular time, accelerate the progress of six year old children having difficulty in learning to read at the average level of performance in their classes, and be able to evaluate their own teaching efforts critically.

Participation of schools

Suggested requirements for a school which was considering opting into this programme in New Zealand were: 1) full support from the principal, 2) a two and a half hour minimum time allocation for daily individual teaching, 3) regular attendance at the inservice sessions held every two weeks (every week in the United States, where the school year is shorter), 4) Reading Recovery teacher's time not to be used for other school programs, 5) provision of an area for individual teaching, and 6) provision of story books for the children's programme.

Two models of delivering Reading Recovery were tried and reported in research: full-time and part-time. Each had its strengths and its difficulties. Teachers working part-time had only two or three hours a day for individual tutoring and taught a class for the rest of the time. They could only teach the most needy children, and other members of their staff helped them with testing and assessment. They had to be given extra time to attend the inservice sessions held every two weeks in a forty-two week year. For these sessions, teachers were divided into small tutorial groups of twelve teachers with one tutor.

The full-time teachers did not have the problems of switching from one job to another. They did, however, feel the loss of reinforcement from not teaching a class of children who were progressing normally, and they found the concentrated individual teaching very demanding. Probably twenty hours of individual teaching should be thought of as a maximum. This means that more than one full-time Reading Recovery position is required in a large school or in a district where children are ill-equipped for reading when they enter first grade.

An important advantage of the part-time model when the Reading Recovery teacher also teaches a normally progressing class is that her keen awareness of normal progress gives her an appropriate sense of the directions and levels of performance to aim for with her Reading Recovery children. This is not the case if she spends her time only with children who have difficulty reading and writing.

Selection of the teachers

The New Zealand program was planned so that it would be implemented by experienced teachers who were informed about reading instruction in the first years of school but who were not specialists. It was suggested that the teachers who volunteer for training should:

- be permanent members of the staff
- be able to commit themselves for at least two years to the program
- be able to work with their peers (i.e., the teachers of the children selected)
- demonstrate good relations with staff members
- be prepared to teach before members of the inservice course.

In addition, some experience with the administration of running records and other aspects of the Diagnostic Survey (Clay, 1985) was considered desirable. Because mobility, and thus job and role changes, are a feature of the professional life of New Zealand teachers we thought that teachers would probably not spend more than three to four years in teaching individual children in this way, but that the teacher's work as an educator in any role would benefit from understandings gained on this course. In practice teachers have stayed with Reading Recovery longer than I predicted and those who have become principals and advisors have taken new insights into children's learning into their new roles.

The experience of training a large number of Reading Recovery teachers over recent years provides strong support for the need to select good classroom teachers who are knowledgeable about teaching five and six year olds in our school system. As Reading Recovery teachers are required to work with children who are having marked difficulty in learning to read (i.e., children who are very poor readers and often non-readers) the experience of teaching successful readers is an essential perspective for the teacher to have. This experience means that they know the behaviours that must be developed and can make accurate predictions about when children can leave the program to ensure that they will continue to gain in skill as a result of a normal classroom program.

Introducing schools to the program

The introduction was guided by several assumptions related to the delivery of a quality intervention. Firstly, school populations are very different and any new program must allow for different solutions in different settings. Secondly, consultation was the key word in our planning. We did not want to prescribe how schools should organize for the program.

We were convinced that the Reading Recovery teacher would not work effectively in isolation, but should be part of a team aiming to raise the lower levels of reading achievement for the school. So an initial meeting was held at the beginning of the school year for all the principals, teachers in charge of first and second year classes, and the Reading Recovery teachers recommended for training in each of the participating schools. Schools which did not think this team approach was important were not permitted by the district administrator to join the scheme.

At the initial meeting that administrator explained the arrangements that allowed for the year-long training course. Teacher leaders for the course gave an historical synopsis of the development of the Reading Recovery program and explained the scope of the teacher's work and the ground rules for participation. These were that children be taught individually, daily, for a minimum of thirty minutes each, and in a suitable teaching space; that the Reading Recovery teacher was not, under any circumstances, to be taken from her work for other school tasks such as relief teaching; and that the teacher would need to bring a child to her inservice sessions two or three times in the year.

At the initial meeting a school could confirm its wish to opt into the program. The Reading Recovery teacher leader outlined the program for the inservice course comprising assessment training, individual teaching in schools, selection of the children, the demonstrations of teaching, the peer discussion of that teaching and the teacher leader visits to schools to see the program on site, and also described how teachers remain in contact with the program after the training year.

Training in assessment

Teachers were first trained to be sensitive observers of reading behaviour. They learned to take running records of text reading and to administer the tests in the Diagnostic Survey. They observed and recorded exactly what the children were doing, and made these observations more explicit by writing a diagnostic summary report. This careful analysis of precisely what a child can do guides the teacher in designing a program for that particular child. Teachers brought these test results to sessions for discussion of perplexing points or alternative interpretations, and they submitted a diagnostic summary of two cases for detailed appraisal by the teacher leader.

Before they began teaching children individually, teachers wrote predictions of what changes they would expect to see in the children's reading behaviours at various stages of their program as they improved. Teachers were given two tasks: to complete a statement such as, *At the end of the individual teaching program the child will be able to...* and, following this analysis of the child's expected achievements, to answer the question, *Are there any priorities among these?* This helped them to specify the program goals for each child and begin to grapple with some of the conceptual issues, although at a rather superficial level.

Selection of children

Children selected for possible admission to the program *were the lowest scorers on text reading in that particular school, not excluding any child in regular six year old classrooms for any reason.* The lowest scorers in school O might be better than some of the higher scorers in school E. A teacher in each school was trying to raise the performance of the low progress readers *in that school.* Consequently, the teachers had to learn to make their own decisions about whom to admit to the program. The teachers tested or ranked all children at age 6.0, after one year at school, who were considered not to be making good progress. Information was sought from classroom teachers and supervising teachers also. Admission to the program was not dependent on a specialist's diagnostic testing. The children identified by teachers as the poorest readers in their classes after one year at school were given the Diagnostic

Survey as a basis for planning the individually designed programs of instruction. The results were also used for making final selection decisions on the basis of a profile of scores.

In the field trials of the program we explored how the program could settle into schools of various types and sizes. The numbers of children who entered the program in a school year differed from school to school because of the different sizes of the schools and because of the variations in the needs of the children. The working week of the teacher set limits on the number of children who could be included in her program. Part-time teachers selected four children, full-time teachers began with six and increased this to ten within a short period. The responsiveness of each child to individual tuition determined how long the child remained in tuition. Factors which tended to lengthen time in the program were language problems, family mobility, unsettled family circumstances, sickness or absence, general retardation and unusual learning problems. The children who were admitted to individual teaching had learned very little about reading and writing, and, after more than twelve months at school, were confused about these activities. Sometimes in the smaller schools the children admitted to the program were making progress with learning to read and write but had low scores in particular areas; for example, on one or more of the diagnostic tests.

Selection of the children produces problems to be discussed and solved as the program moves from one culture to another. In the United States, for example, issues that have been discussed are the preparatory programs of kindergarten, transition classes, retention policies, specialist services, bilingual education and attendance problems. However, because teacher judgement is least subject to error when selecting extreme cases, and in order for the program to address reading problems effectively in an education system, the principle of selecting the most extreme cases (i.e., the lowest achievers) should, in my opinion, be adhered to.

Valuing the teacher's experience

We wished to minimize the feelings of insecurity that teachers might initially feel about changing their teaching

patterns and thinking differently about reading instruction. Teachers were invited to teach. They were reminded that they were experienced teachers and were urged to draw on their own experience when working with the children. It was considered economical to move both children and teachers gradually from their existing competencies rather than to demand at the outset new behaviours that might cause confusion and disrupt established and efficient responses.

New concepts and activities were demonstrated and discussed and these gradually became part of the teachers' procedures. As the course continued, it became obvious from the teachers' discussions that their views of the child's task and of their own roles were changing. Teachers had their own theories about the task and the characteristics of their pupils. By the end of the year after the inservice course, they had acquired new theories about how they and their pupils performed and how they should perform. They were now able to question, challenge, discuss, work out courses of action, and explain their decisions in ways that they could all understand because these new theories were shared and explicit.

Beginning the teaching programme

Teacher Leaders then had to support teachers through a brief but difficult period. For two weeks teachers were to devise activities using only what the child could already do. The idea was to develop fluency on things that were easy for the child. By the second week, teachers were keen to introduce new material. However, they were held to the time limit to give them some experience of the value of consolidating what children already knew. The children were allowed time to become fluent with the familiar, to habituate their responses so that they no longer needed attention, and to enjoy *the creative and exploratory payoffs of 'roaming around the known.'* A teacher's tendency to drag her student into new territory, into harder work, was being challenged. The value of reading quantities of easy material began to be obvious. These are some of the important principles of Reading Recovery instruction which were established in these two weeks. The diagnostic summary report gave the teacher an analysis of the behaviour that should relate directly to her teaching program, and she arranged to see

children once a day for thirty minutes on a flexible timetable so that children would not always miss the same activity in their classrooms.

Records

Teachers were required to keep these program records:

- **Lesson plans.** The individual teaching sessions were planned to last for half-an-hour. Teachers kept a summary for each lesson with the child, detailing the teaching sequences and providing a record of the changes or persistent difficulties *in the child's responses*. Teachers gain in skill throughout the year, developing the ability to record details more effectively while the lesson is taking place, having less and less to add to the summary after the session.

- **Running records.** A running record of the new text introduced on the previous day is taken during every session. After the teaching sessions some time is required to calculate the accuracy rate and analyze the running record, and to transfer relevant details to the lesson plan record.

- **Book graph.** Once a week the book graph is plotted from the accuracy level information obtained from that day's running record.

- **Writing vocabulary chart.** Once a week any new words written independently by the child during the writing section of the lesson are added to the cumulative chart under the appropriate week.

- **Selection of books.** Selecting new books for the next lesson for each child is a daily task for the Reading Recovery teacher, prior to the session. Reading Recovery teachers are provided with a list of books leveled by many teachers on the basis of their experiences with children's reading of them.

The time required for Reading Recovery preparation can be likened to time required for planning and evaluation of classroom teaching; however, it must be noted that detailed preplanning of teaching sessions is *not* required. Teachers are trained to respond, within a general framework of possible procedures, to what the child is doing and therefore to make decisions "on the run." Appropriate decision-making is a critical aspect of Reading Recovery teaching. Too much detailed advance planning will actually interfere with responding to

individual needs. Analysis of each child's text reading, writing and Lesson Record provide the basis for deciding on the most appropriate action and making the most powerful decisions for acceleration in the following lesson.

Materials

A vast range of material is not required for Reading Recovery teaching. Schools are asked to arrange for the provision of a magnetic chalkboard, an ample supply of magnetic letters, large blank exercise books, felt pens, and many easy story books providing a gradient of difficulty. A variety of suitable books are already in Reading Recovery schools, but usually, because of the limited skills of children in this program, *many* texts are needed on the same level of difficulty, and so additional titles are purchased and teacher-made books extend the range available. If Reading Recovery teachers participate in "leveling" the books available, and new books as they come to hand, they can quickly select a book for a particular child at a particular stage of the child's progress. This choosing of texts is an important part of a Reading Recovery teacher's training.

Discussion of lessons behind the one-way glass

At inservice sessions throughout the year two teachers give lessons behind the one-way glass, and these lessons are discussed by their peers. These were critical aspects of the training course. We assumed that teachers would come gradually to understand the full implications of programming individually for children with difficulties who needed to learn at accelerated rates if they were to reach normal levels of performance. The inservice course made extensive use of a one-way window between two rooms. Children were taught in one room; in the other, teachers observed and discussed a teaching demonstration while it was in progress. The one-way viewing facility was essential in the inservice training, allowing for discussion of what the child was doing and why the teacher might have responded as she did. Delayed discussion would not have been as effective. Videotaped replays lost the excitement of the on-task question and commentary. The content of a lesson and the focus of each activity is selected very carefully to match the competencies, and meet the learning needs, of an individual child. A teacher who was demonstrating made

decisions one after the other while the observers attended to these decisions and discussed the options as they arose.

During early training sessions, a teacher leader or experienced teacher demonstrated teaching while another teacher leader modeled how the discussion should proceed behind the one-way screen. Demonstrations by teacher leaders were kept to a minimum and the first demonstrations by the teachers themselves began in the third or fourth session. Children were brought to the inservice site, and a typical lesson was conducted for the teacher's peers. This provided several opportunities: the teacher's techniques were evaluated, gently, by her peers; the watching teachers had a chance to observe, from the outside, the tutorial situation which they worked in daily; and the situation induced an objectivity among teachers in evaluating their own work. None enjoyed giving a demonstration lesson but almost all commented on its value. They described their ordeal as "a very nerve-wracking experience," which they dreaded, but a profitable one because "one was reinforced for some things and was shown ways of improving." They felt the sessions made them more aware, as teachers, of their own choices and assumptions, and more self-critical. The discussion among the observers as the child and teacher worked was described by the teachers as "invaluable."

Under such close scrutiny, the teacher was under strong pressure to make sound judgements which had massive pay-offs in terms of learning gains for the child. If the children were to return to an effective functioning level near to the average for their class, they had to make accelerated progress; yet they were the very children who should not be pressured. Teachers were asked to take every necessary step forward that was warranted for a particular child. They were to waste no time on instruction that was inappropriate for any one child. Short-cuts were fine; detours away from text reading were highly suspect, were questioned, and a good rationale was expected for making detours from text. The teacher's peers were quick to criticize any indulgent wandering into unnecessary activities once they appreciated the importance of acceleration.

The emphasis in the inservice sessions shifted, in the latter part of the year, to the Reading Recovery children who were proving the most difficult to teach. Teachers taught during their demonstrations in ways which were deliberately chosen to expose the child's peculiar problem to the group, and, in discussion, the resources of the group were directed to exploring the problem and searching for a solution. After two demonstrations, each of which lasted for half-an-hour, the teachers spent a further hour discussing their work. Issues were raised by the teacher leader or by the teachers. New Zealand teachers' comments on these inservice sessions were:

A major percentage of learning takes place here. The inservice sessions extend and consolidate one's understanding of reading processes and recovery procedures.

They kept me thinking about ways to improve my teaching and gave me a good opportunity to discover whether I was approaching the problems in the best way.

Your demonstration of how to increase writing vocabulary suddenly made it all go clear.

Seeing X take a lesson was far more valuable than a video because it was alive and not static.

The one-way window was invaluable and could never have been taken over by videotapes. Being able to see someone working and being able to discuss and question as they went along was really good.

I learned so much by just observing the children at work. Each one is so different and how they operate on print can vary so much.

The most difficult pupils are very interesting to watch.

The last term when we saw people working with very difficult children was extremely helpful.

One of the early demonstrations should be with a child who knows almost nothing. Where do you start? What do you do? How do you build on nothing?

Reading Recovery teachers have no one else at their school to discuss problems with and need to meet other Reading Recovery teachers to air problems and find possible solutions.

At all times, the inservice sessions aimed to enrich the teachers' understanding of their children and to sharpen their use of special teaching procedures in order to maximize their effectiveness. Some of the discussion centered on the difficult problem of finding appropriate resources, especially easy reading books. Throughout the year, teachers were introduced gradually to the new teaching procedures and concepts. The book describing these procedures (Clay, 1985) did not provide a simple set of instructions that could be read and then implemented, but was a reference source and a basis for the discussion and clarification of concepts and rationales behind the procedures. Such rationales provide the basis for the teacher's decisions about how next to work with a child. Some activities were introduced to teachers before others (to reduce the load of newness). First to be introduced were the text and book reading, text writing with cut-up stories, and letter identification. A concept of teaching children to make use of reading strategies was introduced. Within a month procedures for helping children hear the sound sequences in words were introduced.

As the program continued, the teachers became more adept at discussing the children, the teaching they observed, their own programs, and the directions and explanations in the written account of the procedures. Other aspects of reading that were discussed included ideas about the reading process, syntax, semantics, visual analysis, over-learning and habituating responses, word learning, memory, integration and cross-relating of cues, and independence. Topics raised by the teachers in these discussions suggested that their attention to the reading process was shifting from teaching for items of knowledge (letters known, words remembered) and from getting the child to habituate a skill or memorize a new element, to

developing in the child the confidence and willingness to use a variety of strategies. An important feature of teaching was movement away from having the poor reader dependent on the teacher and towards teaching in such a way that the children had many opportunities to teach themselves.

Teacher leader visits to schools

The teacher leader paid on-site visits to programs running in the schools. These had three purposes: to communicate with the school about the running of the project; to talk over new techniques recently introduced with the teacher and answer any queries; and to observe the Reading Recovery teacher at work, or to work with a particular child at the teacher's request.

Discontinuing teaching

When the teachers judged from the children's work that they were able to work with an appropriate average band group in their classroom, they recommended the children discontinue special teaching sessions. It was not uncommon for a fast learner to be ready to leave the program within three months. Reading Recovery teachers were now faced with a new set of decisions, for which they had been prepared. Initial discussion dealt with what a teacher would look for in a child prior to discontinuing, and what information she would ask for from the child's classroom teacher. The dangers of dependency on the Reading Recovery teacher were emphasized as threatening a child's survival in group work back in the classroom.

Teachers were asked to make recommendations that a child discontinue sessions on the basis of the setting a child would be working in (the teacher, other children, book levels and groups available for placement, classroom teacher's style and demands, etc.); the observed behaviours of the child that would make him or her likely to cope; and the evidence from the child's accumulated running records of book reading. Retesting the child was carried out in order to cross-check the decisions to discontinue, not to initiate them. Decisions to discontinue were always checked by the teacher leader. Occasionally a child was not ready to discontinue the sessions. In most cases, however, the teachers had carried the children for longer and to

higher levels than may have been necessary. They were conservative in their recommendations for discontinuing.

Continuing support for teachers

Delivery of a quality program requires contact with teachers beyond the initial training phase. This has been welcomed by the teachers we have trained. Teaching procedures were carefully designed to help children with specific problems make fast progress. Because of this, there was little room for changing the procedures. Innovation was welcomed, but top priority was always given to accelerating the child's progress, and, in practice, teachers' suggested variations in procedures were often ineffective because a crucial skill was no longer included. Inservice training usually encourages teachers to innovate, to apply new ideas in creative ways. In this program, strict adherence to most procedures seemed necessary. In the year following the first training course, we watched some of our teachers veer away from appropriate practices in their demonstrations when they were no longer attending regular meetings.

To foster a critical approach to non-productive variations and an open mind on productive changes to the program, it was agreed that some continuing support for teachers might be useful. Teachers met four to six times a year to learn what new things each had discovered, to demonstrate to their colleagues and to discuss their programs. Demonstrations and probing questions tend to prevent practice drifting away from the most accelerating procedure. Over time the teacher evolved new support mechanisms, such as visits from a colleague invited to observe and critique the teaching of a particular child or cluster visits of a group of teachers with questions to share.

Training the leaders who train the teachers

Reading Recovery teacher leaders were specially trained as key people in establishing a Reading Recovery program. They have a very complex role that requires a wide range of skills in diverse areas. It is essential that they have a thorough and academic understanding of the theoretical concepts upon which the programme is based, a sensitive awareness of the organizational, professional and child development issues associated with the innovations in the program, and extensive

practical experience of the everyday workings of the first two years of school. They have to act as advocates for whatever cannot be compromised in the interests of an education system getting effective results from the program. Strengths considered in the selection of trainee teacher leaders were effectiveness as teachers of young children, a thorough knowledge of the theoretical basis of the Reading Recovery program, the ability to work supportively with teachers, and the ability to undertake academic study. The course moved through several patterns of organization to meet the changing needs of the trainees throughout the year. It was an intensive course demanding flexibility.

University courses. The teacher leaders undertook relevant university studies and in particular a course on theoretical issues and recent research into the reading process and reading acquisition. This was considered essential to sound decision-making in the devising and improving of reading programs. They also completed a focal course on Issues Related to Reading Difficulties, studying the many competing and controversial ideas in the field with particular attention to ideas about prevention, early intervention, individual tutoring and clinical programs, and ways of evaluating such programs.

Practical coursework. Teacher leaders had to develop a thorough knowledge of the whole operation of the Reading Recovery program in an education system, and of the development and history of the project. This included a critical appraisal of its strengths and problem spots, and of the competing explanations for its success. Teacher leaders had to teach Reading Recovery children and work through the experiences of being a member of a group learning to do this. It was essential that they participate in the operation of Reading Recovery over the whole year, so that they could become aware of the shifts in teachers' understanding, their questioning and their in-service needs as they became more familiar with the program.

By mid-way through the year the training emphasis shifted for the trainees to observing how a teacher leader worked with teachers. They were given opportunities to develop a role as teacher leader of teachers guiding their observations in

inservice sessions, developing questioning skills, leading teachers to articulate in words what the child was doing and why they thought the teacher responded as she did. A trainer of teacher leaders provided input to increase these skills and feedback on trainee performance, giving them opportunities for self-evaluation of their own performance. The opportunity for trainee teacher leaders to work with inservice courses throughout a whole year enabled them to observe the way program emphasis shifted through several changes as the teachers gained in competence and the pupils improved and were discontinued.

They also had the opportunity to learn sensitively in these settings and become skillful in helping teachers to grow and develop. Small groups of trainees worked with each of the inservice course groups in turn. They met with their trainer to plan for these sessions. Their responsibilities increased as the year progressed and their skills developed. Trainee teacher leaders participated in the continuing contact sessions twice a term with teachers who had been trained in the previous year. These sessions provided for observation of the development of teachers' skills after the inservice year. Trainee teacher leaders visited teachers working in their schools, talked over new techniques recently introduced, answered queries, observed the teacher at work in her school setting, and worked with a child if a teacher requested a demonstration or needed help. The first visits were made with the regular teacher leader; subsequently trainees made visits on an individual basis.

Organizing an inservice course. Organization and administration of the inservice course from the introductory talk through the year's operation was studied in detail. Because variations might occur among districts, trainees moving to districts outside Auckland met with the coordinating administrator for the new district to begin planning for the start of the program in the following year. Each year after teacher leader training a national inservice course (in the United States this is a Teacher Leader Institute) was held for a week just before mid-year bringing the network together in a residential setting to share their experiences, hear of new developments, and use the experience of colleagues and their trainer to solve some of the

problems they had encountered. An important factor in the successful implementation of the program on a national basis was the continuing contact maintained with the fledgling teacher leaders throughout their first year of operation by their trainer, who made many phone calls, kept regular contact by mail and made numerous on-site visits to all parts of the country to coordinate the program.

Teacher leader training is a necessary first step

For a small education system of 30 to 100 schools, one teacher leader trained at some national or central training course could run the program. However, to establish Reading Recovery in a larger education system it would be necessary to have a training course for the teacher leaders. (Once an education system has enough well-trained teacher leaders the quality program can be maintained.) In this case the system might begin by having a trainer of teacher leaders in a setting with both a university course and an on-going program operating in the schools, and having a senior administrator become thoroughly familiar with the preventive thrust of this early intervention program.

References

- Clay, M.M. (1982). Reading Recovery: A follow-up study. *Observing young readers*, (pp.173-191). Exeter NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M.M. (1985). *The early detection of reading difficulties: A diagnostic survey with recovery procedures*. Auckland: Heinemann.
- Clay, M.M. (1987). Implementing Reading Recovery: Systemic adaptations to an educational innovation. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 22, 35-58.
- Clay, M.M. (1990). The Reading Recovery programme, 1984-88: Coverage, outcomes and Education Board district figures. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 25, 61-70.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Auckland: Octopus Press.

Marie M. Clay, originator of Reading Recovery, is professor emeritus at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, and president-elect of the International Reading Association.

The article by Dr. Clay which appears here is an updated version of an article which appeared originally in Gnosis, a magazine of the Inner London Remedial Teaching Service, London, in 1984.