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Abstract

Reading Recovery is an intensive, daily, one-to-one intervention for the lowest achieving literacy learners after one year in school. Highly skilled Reading Recovery teachers work in school with the lowest attaining children individually.

Reading Recovery teachers also offer learning support or work as a resource (Special Educational Needs), as well as working alongside class teachers and others in school with responsibility for literacy interventions. This provides wider benefits to the investment in the training and ongoing professional development of a Reading Recovery teacher.

This report presents an overview of Reading Recovery for the academic year 2011–12. It also provides information on where and how Reading Recovery is offered in schools across the Republic of Ireland. Results for children and schools are reported, alongside case studies that evidence the impact on standards and effectiveness.

This report demonstrates the continued success of Reading Recovery in Ireland, enabling over nine out 10 of the lowest attaining young readers to catch up with their classmates.
Reading Recovery and the Irish Primary School Curriculum

Reading Recovery is a short-term early intervention for children who have the lowest achievement in literacy learning in their first years at school.

Children are taught individually by a specially trained teacher for 30 minutes each day for an average of 12-20 weeks.

The goal is for children to develop effective reading and writing strategies in order to work within an average range of classroom performance.

Reading Recovery works alongside the taught curriculum in schools, addressing the complex individual difficulties of children who, for whatever reason, have not responded to classroom teaching.

Some children struggle to respond to phonics teaching or to engage effectively with print until Reading Recovery teachers help them understand how the sound/letter system works in text reading and writing.

Children’s writing arises from their oral language and experience as their teacher helps them to compose their thoughts and words in written form. Children read from a wide range of texts, selected carefully by their teacher to match their current competency in reading.

The Irish curriculum for English language (NCCA, 1999) is underpinned by five key principles:

1. Listening, speaking, reading and writing are integrated in the process of learning language
2. The curriculum is concerned not just with language learning but with learning through language
3. The development of oral language is equally as important as reading and writing in an integrated language process
4. The teaching of reading is part of a rich and varied curriculum, based on a child’s overall experience of language and the world, and involves the use of a range of word identification strategies
5. The process of writing is as important as the product and is viewed as part of the language learning process

The implementation of Reading Recovery™ in Ireland adheres to and supports these principles.

Table 1: Reading Recovery professional infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Recovery teachers at school level</th>
<th>Teacher leaders at local level</th>
<th>National leaders at the Institute of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teach children in Reading Recovery on a daily basis (the other half of the day as either resource (SEN), learning support or class teachers)</td>
<td>• Teach children in Reading Recovery</td>
<td>• Deliver Initial and Continuing Professional Development for teacher leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with class teachers and others in school with responsibility for literacy</td>
<td>• Deliver professional development and support Reading Recovery teachers</td>
<td>• Teach children in Reading Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support colleagues’ understanding of literacy teaching and learning: whole classroom approaches to teaching literacy, including teaching phonics systematically</td>
<td>• Work with teachers in schools to develop effective literacy teaching beyond Reading Recovery, for example work on Guided Reading, and develop lighter touch interventions</td>
<td>• Oversee communications, quality assurance, monitoring etc. at a local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversee communications, quality assurance, monitoring etc. at a local level</td>
<td>• Work in multi-disciplinary teams on a regional basis as part of the Professional Development Service for Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide accreditation, quality assurance, monitoring and reporting at a national level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where is Reading Recovery in Republic of Ireland?

In 2011–12, Reading Recovery was taught in 378 schools, 39 more than in 2010–11.

These schools were supported by 463 teachers, just under a quarter of whom (24%) were in their training year and were therefore still learning how to work with children in Reading Recovery.

The country was served by 10 teacher leaders, all of whom were experienced in the role.

Numbers of schools by county

- Carlow = 3
- Cavan = 16
- Clare = 8
- Cork = 43
- Donegal = 11
- Down = 2
- Dublin = 110
- Galway = 20
- Kerry = 4
- Kildare = 10
- Kilkenny = 5
- Laois = 2
- Leitrim = 2
- Limerick = 20
- Longford = 2
- Louth = 16
- Mayo = 7
- Meath = 12
- Monaghan = 17
- Offaly = 10
- Roscommon = 4
- Sligo = 5
- Tipperary = 15
- Waterford = 7
- Westmeath = 8
- Wexford = 13
- Wicklow = 6
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The continuum of support

Approaches to intervention in the Irish Primary School Curriculum
The learning support guidelines (DES, 2000) place the concept of early intervention as central to school policy on learning support and the provision of supplementary teaching programmes in English.

Referring to research evidence, the guidelines consider the implementation of an intensive early intervention programme in the early primary classes (i.e. Senior Infants to Second Class) as an effective response to meeting the needs of children who experience low achievement and/or learning difficulties.

Reading Recovery is cited as one example of effective intervention. These characteristics all feature in the teaching of children in Reading Recovery.

Characteristics of successful interventions:
• A specific timeframe
• A shared expectation of success
• Small-group teaching or one-to-one teaching
• An intensive frequency of lessons and fast paced instruction
• A strong focus on oral language development
• The development of phonemic awareness and other word identification skills
• Oral and silent reading of texts at appropriate levels of difficulty, and monitoring of comprehension
• The interconnected nature of listening, speaking, reading and writing

A Reading Recovery teacher is a valuable resource in a school. Many also work as learning-support teachers in designated areas of educational disadvantage.

A Reading Recovery teacher plays an important role in developing and implementing whole-school support and intervention programmes.

A Reading Recovery teacher also offers guidance in the School Support process (DES, 2007) and works closely with parents to support the attainment of learning targets in their child’s Individual Profile and Learning Programme.

“After only a short time in Reading Recovery my daughter seemed to blossom and became a much happier, confident child with improved concentration,” Parent.
3,017 children benefitted from Reading Recovery in 2011–12, around 70 more than last year, indicating a continued expansion in Ireland since 2006–7.

In addition, six children were reported as receiving interventions other than Reading Recovery, and two children with exceptional Special Educational Needs were also reported, bringing the total served to 3,025.

In the latest available statistics, one child in six in Ireland (over 205,000) was at risk of poverty (Central Statistics Office, 2010).

This proportion is unlikely to have been significantly reduced in 2012 due to rising unemployment and cuts in incomes and social welfare.

However, Reading Recovery has been effectively targeted to address the needs of children in poverty. 1,989 children were taught in schools which fell into the ‘disadvantaged’ category.

Boys slightly outnumbered girls in the cohort (57% and 43% respectively).

82% of children were from white Irish backgrounds.

Outcomes for different groups of Reading Recovery children

- Achievement for boys and girls was on a par at around 94% of both reaching age-related outcomes after Reading Recovery (93.7% for boys and 94.3% for girls). This is change to last year’s findings, where girls out-performed boys by 2.5%.

- The achievement gap between poor children who received Reading Recovery and their classmates was almost closed with 93% attaining age appropriate levels, alongside 96% of their more advantaged peers on the programme.

- Children for whom English was an additional language and those from ethnic minority groups were highly successful, with 94% and 93% respectively making accelerated progress as a result of their Reading Recovery lessons.

- Vulnerable children also made accelerated progress. Of those who completed their lesson series, 100% of children identified as asylum seekers met age-related expectations. 79% of the ‘looked after’ children, as well as 78% of children living in travellers communities and 76% of other vulnerable children achieved age-related outcomes.

- 454 children were removed from the SEN register following Reading Recovery and 22 were recommended early for formal assessment.

89% of children spoke English as their first language, a slightly smaller percentage than in previous years (91% in 2009–10, and 90.5% last year).

60% of the children who completed Reading Recovery in 2011–12 were in the age six-to-seven age group. Around half of these children had been identified for Reading Recovery in the previous year and had been carried over to complete their series of lessons early in the autumn term.

266 vulnerable children (e.g. children of asylum seekers, refugees or looked after children) were recorded, staying consistently at 9% of the total cohort.

I love reading because it gets me to read lots and it makes me a good reader.
Reading

Reading Recovery teachers work with the lowest attaining five, six and seven year olds in the school. Although these children knew some letters, sounds and words, almost all were unable to apply that knowledge to reading and writing.

Three out of every four children (75%) were reading at Reading Recovery book level two or below on entry to Reading Recovery, essentially non-readers.

In around 18 and a half weeks of one-to-one tuition nearly 19 in every 20 children who completed Reading Recovery (94%) had caught up with their classmates and were working at age appropriate levels of literacy; an excellent achievement, and slightly higher than the previous year’s outcome of 93.5%.

Progress

Children progressed from a reading age of four years and 10 months, book level two (see example), to a reading age of six years and 10 months, book level 18 (see example). They made, on average, a gain of 24 months in four-to-five months, around five times the normal rate of progress.

Children who did not catch up with their classmates (known as referred) still made progress, on average at twice the normal rate, and they moved from being non-readers to accessing reading and writing in their class, but still needing some support.

These children had learned how to use their knowledge of letters and sounds to decode text, and to understand and enjoy stories. They had progressed to a reading age of five years and seven months, book level eight (see example) after a slightly longer lesson series, usually an average of around 22 weeks.
Writing

Writing is an essential element of Reading Recovery. What children learn in reading supports and complements their writing and vice versa.

Children are taught how to compose sentences to write down their own ideas. They are taught explicitly how to use their phonic knowledge to spell regular words.

As children progress they are taught more complex or irregular spelling patterns, and they build a vocabulary of words they can write automatically in order to become fluent writers. They write longer, more complex messages and are able to compose ‘on the run’.

Children like Cáit (see handwriting examples, right) have learned very little about writing before being identified for Reading Recovery. They are typically unable to write the letters and sounds they know, or to use phonics to help their spelling (see ‘At entry to Reading Recovery’). Many cannot even write their own name.

Progress
At the end of their Reading Recovery lessons, after an average of 18 and a half weeks, children had made substantial progress in writing and were now attaining at the appropriate level for their age group.

Cáit was able to use her new understanding of letters and sounds to compose and write messages and stories (see ‘At exit from Reading Recovery’, a task to hear and record sounds in words).

Children who completed their Reading Recovery lessons continued to make impressive progress afterwards, as Cáit’s independent class work demonstrates (see ‘Follow up session’).

As well as being able to control more complex spellings post-programme, children were also able to express more interesting and challenging ideas and to sustain a lengthy composition.
In order to improve pupil outcomes year on year, we need to invest in teachers. It is clear that both initial teacher education and continuing professional development are key to successful pupil outcomes, particularly for those pupils in disadvantage (NRP, 2000; Kennedy, 2010).

The skill of the teacher is vital; a strong theory and pedagogy can fail through ineffective practice (Hall & Harding, 2003). Therefore, investing in teachers is of paramount importance.

International research (Timperely, 2008) clearly indicates that investing in teachers is the most cost effective method of raising pupil attainment.

However, not all professional development activity has a positive impact on pupil attainment. One-off, ‘quick fix’ staff meetings or a day out at a conference centre are known not to impact long-term on either teachers’ learning or on outcomes for children. Making the right sort of investment will make a considerable difference to children’s attainment in the future.

Reading Recovery designs investment in teachers in four interacting aspects;

1. A professional development programme designed to interweave theory and practice
2. Learning through teaching in intensive, daily, one-to-one 30-minute lessons for six year olds experiencing difficulties learning to read
3. A network of professional support and ongoing learning for all teachers and teacher educators involved in Reading Recovery
4. An international body dedicated to continuously monitor results and provide information to maintain integrity

Defining cost effective professional development
Cost-effective professional development needs to be understood not as successfully learning routines, but as the impact that new understandings and practices have on pupil outcomes.

Cost effective professional development interweaves theoretical understanding, raising teacher expectations of all learners and developing quality teacher-pupil interactions.

Enhancing student-teacher interactions
There is research to indicate that the quality of the relationship between the student and the teacher, particularly in support settings, is a significant factor in programme outcomes (Barret & Varma, 1996).

Elaine, a teacher from Dublin, has become aware of her own role in children’s progress. She talks about the impact of the Reading Recovery professional development, she is now “constantly monitoring the children’s progress, making observations, adapting my lessons and planning accordingly. Lessons are tailored to the children’s individual needs to maximise progress”.

For example, an important feature of the successful Reading Recovery approach (Clay, 2005) is the development of the relationship between student and teacher.
Over time Reading Recovery teachers grow and develop their skills, becoming more successful in creating quality teaching interactions and cost-effective as they hone their problem-solving skills through their work with struggling readers, on-going continual professional development and the supportive learning community of Reading Recovery colleagues (Clay, in Watson & Askew, 2009).

Ber, a teacher from Galway, says: “I learned many new skills and strategies and found this course the most helpful and beneficial of all the courses I have done over the years”.

Making the investment; developing theoretical understanding
Reading Recovery professional development is connected to and derived from instructional approaches that work with struggling literacy learners. Sessions deal with building a thorough knowledge of literacy acquisition so that teachers can make effective decisions.

“I found the sessions extremely helpful as they gave me a thorough understanding of the strengths/weaknesses of each individual child. They focused me as a teacher to be very aware of all the elements involved in the reading process and not to take anything for granted!,” added Ber.

Protecting the investment
All experienced Reading Recovery teachers have a continuing professional development programme.

Elaine reflects on the opportunities continuing professional development have given her, for example bringing two class teachers to a live lesson:

“This ensured that the benefits of Reading Recovery could be seen not just through my eyes, and it helps teachers understand the necessity of such a programme in our school where many children are experiencing great difficulties with the English curriculum.

“This is essential to ensure the effectiveness of Reading Recovery for the children with the most complex difficulties.

The professional development programme is also designed to enskill the Reading Recovery teacher to act as a conduit for professional development in literacy for colleagues in their school and to support parents.

This ensures that there is a school wide impact seen for the investment in Reading Recovery and to secure best value for money.”
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Maintaining the gains

A follow up study of six Reading Recovery children in the Republic of Ireland

Reading Recovery sets out to close the attainment gap between pupils at risk of long term literacy difficulties and their classroom peers.

When pupils reach literacy levels appropriate for chronological age and in line with their classroom peers, the Reading Recovery teaching programme is ceased, or ‘discontinued’ in order to identify further pupils.

Short term monitoring indicates that pupils whose programme is successfully ‘discontinued’ go on to make progress commensurate with their chronological age (see table 2).

“Reading Recovery is one of the very few instructional support programs to have demonstrated long term effects on children’s reading abilities” (Allington & Walmesley, 1995: 253).

Continued literacy progress occurs for the large majority of children who receive Reading Recovery and is well documented in England (ECRR, 2012a), but not so well covered in the Irish context.

The study was an attempt to begin to address this. It set out to locate pupils who had received Reading Recovery in 2006–7 in order to explore whether the gains made during Reading Recovery had been sustained throughout the three years following.

The study
This study was undertaken as part of a Masters degree. The scale of the study was small, but offers the opportunity to consider whether similar patterns of gains maintained are observed in the Irish context.

Using a case study approach, the study examined entry and exit scores from Reading Recovery, data from three- and six-month follow-up assessments and outcomes from a range of standardised assessments to examine whether the progress in attainment after Reading Recovery had sustained over time. Principals, class teachers and parents were also interviewed to gather information about the pupils’ reading habits both in and out of school.

This study identified six pupils three years after they had completed their Reading Recovery programmes. Pupils in this study were drawn from highly disadvantaged schools. This was important since a study in Ireland (Eivers, Shiel & Shortt, 2004) concluded that children in schools with designated disadvantaged status performed poorly on nationally standardised tests, with almost 30% of students scoring below the 10th percentile.

The social profile of those included was very diverse. All participants had factors which could affect the extent to which gains were maintained; for example, one child lives in a traveller community and another has been identified with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

Entry to Reading Recovery in 2006–7
All pupils were assessed at book Level 1 on entry to Reading Recovery. Their Observation test scores were close to the means for that year (see table 3, overleaf).

Exit from Reading Recovery
All pupils were successfully discontinued from Reading Recovery following programmes of between 19 and 23 weeks in length (see table 4, overleaf).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment point</th>
<th>Total pupils</th>
<th>Book Level</th>
<th>Writing Vocabulary</th>
<th>BAS Reading Age Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At discontinuing</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 month follow up</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 month follow up</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Follow-up scores on Observation Survey tasks for children with discontinued Reading Recovery programmes: The Republic of Ireland, 2011-12.
Findings
Standardised testing showed that all pupils were attaining in the average to high average band in relation to their peers. Gains in text reading were maintained.

There was a clear relationship between book level on exit and sustaining the gains in reading (see table 5). This is supported by a study in England where book level was found to be an influencing factor for maintaining gains after Reading Recovery (Hurry, 2011).

In the Neale Analysis children are decoding words in context and are able to draw on other information sources using meaning, structure and visual information in a strategic way rather than decoding alone to get to a word.

None of the pupils had needed additional time through the learning support system since their Reading Recovery intervention. This clearly represents a financial saving both to the schools and centrally-funded services.

Implications
Evidence shows that ending Reading Recovery programmes at high book levels (over Level 16) is cost effective in maintaining progress in the longer term (ECRR, 2012b).

None of the pupils had needed additional time through the learning support system since their Reading Recovery intervention. This clearly represents a financial saving both to the schools and centrally-funded services.

Gains are more likely to be sustained when implementation follows international, tried and tested guidelines and standards (ECRR, 2012c and Watson, B. & Askew, 2009), avoiding the need for further, more costly intervention later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Sean (Age 9:9)</th>
<th>Jack (Age 9:11)</th>
<th>Mary (Age 10.2)</th>
<th>Peter (Age 10)</th>
<th>Sharon (Age 9:11)</th>
<th>Michael (Age 10:1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Age (Accuracy)</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Score</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Percentile Rank</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Age (comprehension)</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>11.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Score</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Percentile Rank</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Age (Rate)</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardised Score</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Percentile Rank</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Entry scores for study group and National cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Study group mean</th>
<th>National cohort mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS word reading</td>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>4:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter id (N=54)</td>
<td>37.7 (SD 10.9)</td>
<td>42.9 (SD 10.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts about Print (N=24)</td>
<td>10.2 (SD 3.9)</td>
<td>12.3 (SD 3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Reading (N=23)</td>
<td>3 (SD 3.7)</td>
<td>5.4 (SD 6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Vocabulary</td>
<td>4.2 (SD 2.9)</td>
<td>12 (SD 9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation task (N=37)</td>
<td>14.2 (SD 10.1)</td>
<td>20.8 (SD 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Exit scores for study group and National cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Study group mean</th>
<th>National cohort mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS word reading</td>
<td>6:10</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter id (N=54)</td>
<td>53.5 (SD 0.8)</td>
<td>52.9 (SD 1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts about Print (N=24)</td>
<td>20 (SD 3.2)</td>
<td>20.6 (SD 2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Reading (N=23)</td>
<td>20 (SD 5.1)</td>
<td>22 (SD 1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Vocabulary</td>
<td>37.3 (SD 10.4)</td>
<td>48.6 (SD 17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictation task (N=37)</td>
<td>34.7 (SD 3.4)</td>
<td>35.4 (SD 2.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Neale Analysis scores for all children in the study group
Impact across a whole school

Case study: St. Lelia’s National School, Kileely
Reading Recovery teachers become experts for their schools and districts, sharing their daily responsibilities between teaching Reading Recovery and supporting the school-wide initiative: Lift Off to Literacy.

Mairéad, (a pseudonym) Principal at St Lelia’s, reflects: “Reading in our school was always an issue. No matter how hard we worked and tried to implement programmes to lift attainment, reading levels had remained low for a number of years.

“In 2005, only 35% of children in the school were reading at their chronological age or above. This was a worrying statistic and we knew something had to change.”

In 2006 two teachers enrolled on the Reading Recovery training programme. This signalled the start of the change that Mairéad was seeking.

Educational change is never instantaneous; the teachers first had to learn about Reading Recovery teaching techniques and how to make effective decisions about literacy teaching and learning. When these skills were in place, the teachers were able to capitalise on their specialist knowledge to enrich literacy teaching skills across whole school staff.

Mairéad, wonders: “We often ask ourselves ‘what exactly had changed?’ I believe it’s because from the very beginning we took a whole school approach to the implementation of Reading Recovery. I identified teachers who had the potential to lead the school staff and provide professional development.

“As well as working with the lowest attaining six year olds in the school, they also support groups of children who have specific literacy needs. They use their knowledge of literacy learning to provide targeted support; some children need help with phonics, some with comprehension. Teachers use a range of assessments to make informed choices. Children make progress because they have appropriate teaching.

“My Reading Recovery teachers also work in classrooms alongside class teachers. In this way, all my staff benefit and we have been able to spread new skills and new enthusiasm across the school.

“Teachers trained in Reading Recovery know what to do, why it works, and how to adjust teaching based on assessment for learning. Why? Because their training in Reading Recovery integrates theory and practice.”

By 2008, 50% of children were reading at their chronological age or above. Reading Recovery teachers supported colleagues and initiated change in classroom practice throughout the school.

A dip was seen in 2008, when the focus on Reading Recovery was reduced, but by 2009, with two teachers working in Reading Recovery at the school, 70% of children were reading at their chronological age or above. Outcomes rose again the following year as the school began implementing Literacy Lift-off. Results have been maintained at a high level ever since.

Mairéad, says: “Reading Recovery has not only changed the lives of the children who received the one-to-one intervention but the lives of all the children in our school. It has empowered my staff and built a strong school team. Failure is not an option.”
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