



# Case Studies in Effective Advocacy

# 2007

<b>Elements of Effective Advocacy</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Kentucky</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Michigan</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Ohio</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Texas</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>12</b>

## Elements of Effective Advocacy

As you review the case studies in this document, several common or related strategies emerge as tools for effective advocacy.

### *Collaboration*

- Involve multiple stakeholders including parents, principals, teachers, university faculty, Reading Recovery professionals and others.
- Include everyone—advocacy is not just one person’s responsibility.
- Use consultants/professional advocates as needed and feasible.

### *Commitment*

- Have an advocacy plan and be prepared to monitor and adjust your approach.
- Be proactive in garnering support so if there’s a crisis, you’re not starting from scratch.
- Be ‘nimble’ and prepared to respond to issues and opportunities on short notice.
- Build on your success. Early results may open the door to other goals.
- Be prepared for a long-term commitment to advocacy.

### *Community*

- Cultivate widespread legislative support, on both sides of the aisle, especially among key decision makers. A legislative champion can be crucial.
- Get to know and appreciate legislative staff.
- Make in-district/local contact—don’t rely on visits to the State or U.S. Capitol to do the job alone.
- Recognize your supporters at events, with plaques or awards, and/or through involvement in *their* issues.

### *Credibility*

- Use data, research, reports, examples, and publications to support your case (from your school, district, UTC, NDEC, or RRCNA for example).
- Invite stakeholders and decision makers to observe Reading Recovery in person. Seeing is believing!

# CASE STUDY #1 Kentucky

UTC: University of Kentucky

## Summary

Successful grassroots effort secured state funding for early literacy instruction and intervention in 1998, \$11 million in additional funding in 2005, then another \$12.5 million in 2007.

## Description

Under the leadership of Dr. Judy Embry, Reading Recovery trainer at the University of Kentucky, the 20 teacher leaders in Kentucky organized to promote increased state funding for early literacy instruction and Reading Recovery.

Targeting state legislators, school superintendents, elementary school principals and teachers, university professors, and parent teacher organizations, the group stressed Reading Recovery's effectiveness and importance of fully implementing Reading Recovery throughout Kentucky.

Kentucky advocates praise State Senator Dan Kelly for his dedicated persistence in sharing the Reading Recovery success story with local, state, and federal officials at every opportunity. His dedication has now spanned two governors' administrations, having ensured that Governor Fletcher and former Governor Patton attended Reading Recovery lessons with him.

Senator Kelly is credited with enlisting bipartisan support for the Read to Achieve (RTA) legislation passed in 2005. RTA bridges the 1998 legislation which provided early literacy funding through Early Reading Intervention Grants (ERIG).

To document Reading Recovery's effectiveness and the need to increase funding for early literacy instruction, advocates used National Data Evaluation Center reports; University of Kentucky research data; RRCNA publications, website, and staff; and consultants and resources from the Center for Collaborative Literacy Development.

At the first statewide Reading Recovery conference in July 2006, the Kelly Literacy Leadership Award

was established and presented to Senator Kelly for his dedication in championing early literacy in Kentucky.

## Results

In 2005, \$11 million in state funding was allocated for early literacy intervention for struggling readers when Kentucky Governor Ernie Fletcher signed the RTA legislation. In 2007, an additional \$12.5 million in state funding was allocated for the RTA program, bringing the total to \$23.5 million.

The RTA legislation created a fund to provide renewable 2-year grants to give teachers the tools and training to implement Reading Recovery or other early intervention programs; ERIG/RTA funds currently help approximately 334 schools in 108 districts.

The legislation also called for the creation of the Early Diagnosis & Intervention Grant Steering Committee which is charged with recommending how RTA funds are distributed, as well as interfacing with state department of education officials and members of the state board of education.

Currently there are 261 schools in Kentucky with Reading Recovery. There is new early intervention funding in 2007 totaling \$23.5 million.

## Current/Ongoing Advocacy Plans

Reading Recovery advocates in Kentucky have adopted a strategic plan that identifies and prioritizes their advocacy work.

Following the plan, advocates coordinated support for Senator Kelly's efforts by providing a model site at Hearn Elementary School in Frankfort, the state's capital. Using this model site equipped with a one-way glass, Senator Kelly and advocates invited state legislators and education department officials, university staff, district administrators, elementary school principals, and teachers to observe Hearn's Early Literacy Program which includes Reading Recovery and small-group instruction. Other advocacy opportunities include

- Teacher Leader Institute/North American Leadership Academy—Kentucky advocates visited U.S. Representatives John Yarmuth,

Geoff Davis, Ed Whitfield, Hal Rogers, and U.S. Senators Jim Bunning and Mitch McConnell during the 2007 North American Leadership Academy & Teacher Leader Institute.

- Reading Recovery teacher leader Lindy Harmon nominated Gene Wilhoit for the Teacher Leader Award for his outstanding contribution to Kentucky literacy. Wilhoit was formerly the Kentucky Department of Education Commissioner and now is the executive director of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

In 2007, State Representatives Larry Belcher (Bullitt County) and Tim Firkins (Jefferson County) observed Reading Recovery lessons. U.S. Representative John Yarmuth observed a Reading Recovery lesson through invitation of Reading Recovery teacher Carolyn VonSick at Kenwood Elementary in Louisville, KY.

Reading Recovery advocates are actively involved in ensuring the intent of the legislation is evidenced in its implementation, and that the state legislature increases RTA funding annually to help serve all Kentucky school children in need of literacy intervention.

#### **For further information**

Reading Recovery Center  
University of Kentucky  
College of Education  
859.257.7859  
[www.readingrecoverycenter.org](http://www.readingrecoverycenter.org)

## **CASE STUDY #2** **Massachusetts**

UTC: Lesley University

### **Summary**

Advocates established and maintain a statewide council to secure funding and to advocate for Reading Recovery.

### **Description**

David Moriarty and 11 other administrators informally met as the Reading Recovery Task Force beginning in 1993. In the early years they met to discuss state implementation of Reading Recovery, how to expand it in the state, etc., with support from the UTC at Lesley. They were able to find a sponsor in the legislature who listened very carefully to their idea of a grant to fund Reading Recovery. The legislator had his aides thoroughly research Reading Recovery. The legislator was so impressed by the findings that he sponsored the bill. He told Dr. Moriarty that absolutely no one gets a bill through the legislature the first time because legislators need to learn more about it before they will fund it—but it did go through.

A state strategic planning meeting took place with Marie Clay in 2001 that led to a more-structured advocacy board called the Reading Recovery Council of Massachusetts (RRCMA). When setting up a state advocacy board, make sure that there is a clear understanding of the relationship of the board with the UTC which oversees the implementation of Reading Recovery in the state. Consider the type of support the UTC can give to the board in terms of administrative support/legislative work. Give thought to the structure of the board and how all of the relationships will work effectively.

In the fall of 2001, the governor had to make drastic cuts to the budget. In doing so, he completely eliminated the line item that funds Reading Recovery. Through grassroots advocacy efforts involving Reading Recovery teachers, teacher leaders, parents, classroom teachers, and administrators, we were able to get the funding back to its original level.

We were able in the 2005–06 school year to get line item language that allowed “not less than \$300,000” to be used for partial Reading Recovery teacher salaries. Every district that applied for one partial teacher salary was awarded the money.

In 2006–07, we advocated to get the line item language written so that it stipulated that all of the line item money was to be used for Reading

Recovery. Also, we were able to increase the amount of money for partial teacher salaries to not less than \$500,000.

We have had very strong, knowledgeable RRCMA presidents and board members who have guided the group over the years with great success due to their dedication to Reading Recovery and their knowledge of literacy. One of our board members is on the International Reading Association Governmental Relations Committee. While this is not a partnership as an organization, we are able to benefit from her knowledge of federal issues surrounding literacy education. We also have the president of the Massachusetts Reading Association on our board. Again, it is not a partnership but they are connections to state organizations.

To have an impact, we have conducted meetings, letter-writing, phone calls, lesson demonstrations, testimony, lobbying, etc. Much of the work involves Reading Recovery teachers, teacher leaders, and RRCMA board members calling or writing letters to their legislators. Several times a year, the RRCMA president, the UTC's researcher, as well as our advocate meet with key legislators. We provide a one page, back-to-back document, called the Research Highlights, to legislators. This document is a summary of the research numbers for the state for the previous school year. Having a researcher at legislator meetings who can speak in detail about the research results is also very helpful.

When we need a large grassroots campaign, we involve classroom teachers and administrators of Reading Recovery schools. In addition, we have Reading Recovery teachers who meet with their legislators at their district offices. We have had many interactions with key legislators over the years.

RRCMA is also fortunate to have resources to engage a legislative advocate to work with the Massachusetts legislature on our behalf. He has played a key role in ensuring that we know what is happening with the line item that funds Reading Recovery, who we should contact or meet with, and how the state budget process works. He lets us know every step of the way where the budget

process is as it makes its way from the governor's office to the House, to the Senate and to the Conference Committee if needed.

## Results

The first year, the legislature designated \$500,000 for early literacy intervention. The funding levels have, for the most part, increased every year or every other year since 1996. We have a state grant that is called the Massachusetts Early Literacy Intervention grant. For 06–07, we were able to get language in the line item to specify that all of the grant money be dedicated to Reading Recovery and that not less than \$500,000 of the grant money be used for partial Reading Recovery teacher salaries.

We have broad support for Reading Recovery within the legislature. This has been one of the key reasons that we have been able to sustain funding in Massachusetts—even during very difficult financial years for the state. Over the years, we have had several legislators who have gone above and beyond for Reading Recovery. We usually recognize these individuals at our conference or at luncheons. We give them a plaque with a picture from a Reading Recovery student from their district. We also try to have a Reading Recovery student present them with the award. In June 2006, State Representative Patricia Haddad received the Teacher Leader Award at the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Institute for her exemplary work on behalf of Reading Recovery in the state.

## Current/Ongoing Advocacy Plans

RRCMA's action plan is really dependent upon the initial stage—the governor's budget. Depending upon what the governor does with the line item in the budget, we proceed with a plan that is suggested by our advocate. However, state legislators are always targeted for advocacy because our line item needs to be renewed annually. We are planning a second strategic planning meeting for fall 2007 that will help outline our goals for the coming years, as well as how we can expand Reading Recovery in the state.

### For further information

Center for Reading Recovery and  
Literacy Collaborative  
Lesley University  
617.349.8165  
[http://www.lesley.edu/crr/rr\\_intro.html](http://www.lesley.edu/crr/rr_intro.html)

## CASE STUDY #3 Michigan

UTC: Oakland University

### Summary

The U.S. House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education scheduled a field hearing in Flint, MI, for the spring district work period in April 2007. With very short notice, Reading Recovery professionals responded to this opportunity by attending the hearing, talking with members and staff of the U.S. House of Representatives, and submitting public testimony for the record.

### Description

Dr. Mary K. Lose, director, Reading Recovery Center of Michigan; Mary Howell, Reading Recovery teacher leader, Genesee Intermediate School District; and Carol Shanahan, Reading Recovery teacher from the Genesee Reading Recovery site, attended the congressional field hearing on “Local Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act” on April 30, 2007, in Flint. Presiding over the field hearing was Michigan Congressman Dale Kildee, chair, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education.

The purpose of our attendance at the hearing was to advocate for funding of early literacy interventions to truly ‘leave no child behind.’ Members of our delegation met with Chairman Kildee to emphasize the importance of early intervention for struggling learners, to recommend assessments that examine children’s growth over time, and to advocate for greater equity for children through the provision of successful interventions such as

Reading Recovery that are based on scientific research.

Materials submitted included:

- Executive Summary of the 2006 Reading Recovery Center of Michigan at Oakland University, authored by Dr. Lose
- Summary of the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Report on Reading Recovery and Oakland University announcement of Reading Recovery’s inclusion in the WWC. The announcement included information about Reading Recovery in Michigan and a quote by Dr. Mary Otto, dean of the School of Education and Human Services at Oakland
- Testimony for the Written Record, submitted by Dr. Lose
- Testimony for the Written Record, submitted by Mary Howell
- A report of Reading Recovery in the 5th Congressional District of Michigan prepared by the National Data Evaluation Center

The event was well-covered by the press—featured in Michigan newspapers and covered by several local television stations. In addition to our delegation of three, members attending the hearing included parents, community members, teachers, and representatives of school districts and the local chapter of the National Education Association. Letters thanking Chairman Kildee for his support of education and early intervention were sent as a followup to our attendance at the meeting.

### Results

Our participation at the NCLB Congressional Field Hearing accomplished the following:

- It built on prior advocacy work (including an award that was presented to Rep. Kildee on behalf of the Reading Recovery Council of Michigan and the 2005 Leadership Academy visit (see *The Journal of Reading Recovery* spring 2005 for details).
- It involved all three levels of Reading Recovery (the university training center, the teacher leader, and a teacher all attended).

- It provided tangible results: a personal conversation with Rep. Kildee and his counsel, Lloyd Horwich, plus public comments submitted for the written record.

In addition, our attendance at the hearing is a good example of being ‘nimble,’ that is, we made the most of an unexpected opportunity that cropped up on short notice. It also shows how national, state, and local advocacy efforts amplify and support each other to make a difference for Reading Recovery.

### Current/Ongoing Advocacy Plans

Plans are to continue our advocacy efforts at the local, state and national levels, starting with participation in the 2007 TLI and NALA.

#### For further information

Reading Recovery Center  
Oakland University  
School of Education  
248-370-3057

<http://www2.oakland.edu/oakland/ouportal/index.asp?item=1635&site=53>

## CASE STUDY #4 Ohio

UTC: The Ohio State University

### Summary

Advocacy partially prevailed over a crisis in state funding and allowed advocates to weather gubernatorial changes and changes in the legislature.

### Description

For over 20 years, Reading Recovery in Ohio has been supported through a designated line item in the state budget, but for the past 4 years we have experienced substantial cutbacks as the state experienced a sluggish economy. Additionally, the state superintendent, who wanted to preserve funds for other initiatives, excluded Reading Recovery in the education department’s proposed budget. Reading Recovery teachers, teacher leaders, trainers, as well as parents of students and school administrators

have worked hard the past 4 years, rebuilding state support in the Ohio General Assembly.

Under the leadership of Daphne Driscoll, former Ohio governing board president and teacher leader, our organization built a new level of advocacy needed as our ties with the Ohio Department of Education began to dissolve under new leadership. Republican State Representative Kevin DeWine had become our “embedded advocate,” adding us into the budget and securing funding in the past two budget cycles. Even with term limits added to the mix, we were able to build a strong base of support and had lasted through very tough times.

By fall of 2006, Ohio advocates reorganized as the Ohio Reading Recovery Council (ORRC), which included a Legislative Advocacy Committee. Members of the current Legislative Advocacy Committee are Gay Su Pinnell, Pat Scharer, Randy Overbeck, Sharon Gilbert, Susan Vincent, Elnorah Watson, Valerie Wilson, Phyllis Amicon, Amy Shilt, Stacy Moormeier, and Phoebe Ingraham, chair.

Other changes included a new governor (of a different party than for the prior 16 years) and a new General Assembly, the composition of which was changed as a result of biennial elections and term limits (which restrict the number of consecutive years a member can serve).

In response, the ORRC planned and conducted a broad advocacy initiative. It became known as our “Splash” campaign, as we wanted to create a splash of information that would be noticed throughout the legislature and the administration. Four years of tight budgets were beginning to show long-term damage to implementation across the state. Our goal was to lift funding levels from \$900,000 to \$2,000,000 per year, in order to regain the support for funding of teacher leader salaries as well as the training of new Reading Recovery teachers in school districts.

### Highlights

First, a postcard campaign was planned to welcome the new governor. Large postcards were designed by two teacher leaders, printed, and distributed. Each Reading Recovery teacher, teacher

leader, trainer, and site coordinator was responsible for seeing that at least one postcard was mailed to welcome Governor Ted Strickland to office. We targeted the mailing to arrive the week before the National Reading Recovery & K–6 Classroom Literacy Conference. Postcards were written by parents, classroom teachers, school administrators, and former students, all organized by individual Reading Recovery personnel. We wanted our new governor to understand that one-to-one instruction adds up and is supported by many diverse individuals throughout the state.

At the same time, we approached Representative DeWine and enlisted his support in a new way. He wrote a welcome letter to each member of the House of Representatives the week after the election. He then expressed his strong support for Reading Recovery and suggested they make the time to learn more about this early literacy intervention. Each teacher leader then followed up with letters to the representatives in their sites, inviting them to see a lesson and/or class session. These were targeted to arrive before the 127th Legislature began in January, so that members could observe a class in their districts. This created quite a buzz! Many of the members reported back to Representative DeWine after hearing from us, and we reported all contacts to him.

Our efforts continued with more-formal advocacy efforts:

- In April, testimony was provided in the Primary and Secondary Education Subcommittee of the House Finance Committee by Leslie McBane, teacher leader and chair of the Ohio Reading Recovery Council; Sherry Kinzel, former Reading Recovery teacher and literacy collaborative trainer at The Ohio State University; and Dr. Randy Overbeck, assistant superintendent of Xenia Community Schools.
- Dr. Emily Rodgers, trainer at the Ohio State University; Leslie McBane, Connie Martin, and Phoebe Ingraham, teacher leaders; and Tony Reese, site coordinator; held meetings in May with State Senators Joy Padgett,

chair of the Senate Education Committee, and John Carey, chair of the Senate Finance Committee.

- Teacher leader Jenny Samoly and Dr. Overbeck of Xenia provided testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in June.
- John Stanford, the governor's education policy executive assistant, attended the May meeting of the ORRC. During this session, Stanford listened as each member of the council spoke briefly about the strengths of the intervention and expressed concerns about funding. Stanford took careful notes and asked many thoughtful questions about Reading Recovery, its history in Ohio education, as well as more general questions of comprehensive early literacy instruction. Before leaving, Stanford watched a short video of a Reading Recovery student reading early in the year, and later, toward the end of his series of lessons.
- Many Reading Recovery advocates worked behind the scenes, making phone calls and writing state legislators urging their support for continued state funding. Several legislators visited schools to view either a Reading Recovery lesson or a professional development session.

## Results

While our efforts to increase state funding were not as successful as we had hoped, Ohio Reading Recovery advocates have much to celebrate. We continue to have designated funding through a line item within the budget of the Ohio Department of Education in order to sustain the work of trainers and teacher leaders throughout the state.

Our strongest advocate, Representative Kevin DeWine, followed through on his promise to watch over our line item. In the final conference committee before the final budget was passed by the House and Senate and sent to the governor, Representative DeWine deleted the words “up to” ensuring that all funding allotted us would, in fact, be provided.

For the first time, we were placed into the budget by the governor. Newly elected Governor Strickland continued to show strong support for our work in the final hours before signing the budget, as our line item was one of only 38 items he addressed. After deleting questionable language within the line item for Reading Recovery, he wrote:

The veto of this item is necessary to ensure the cost effective implementation of this proven research-based reading intervention program. Therefore, the veto is in the public's interest.

As term limits change the makeup of the current legislature, newly elected members of the House and Senate have been introduced to our work and have seen and heard evidence of the success our students' experience. We have already begun to build for the future.

Throughout our efforts to prevail, additional supporters became involved and learned how strongly their voice matters as individuals and in expanding the group as a whole. Increasing our numbers adds additional points of view that will undoubtedly provide new perspectives to our work. It has been our experience that as supporters discover the power of their advocacy, the group is enriched through the ever-increasing ideas and energy that each new advocate brings to this effort.

### **Current/Ongoing Advocacy Plans**

Under the terms of the Ohio Reading Recovery Council, the chair of the Legislative Advocacy and Finance Committee will change in this off-budget year. The current chair feels this is excellent timing, as there is so much support to build upon at this time.

Efforts to work more closely within the Ohio Department of Education continue. We hope to return to the position of working within the department, rather than beside it.

Contact with John Stanford will continue, as we encourage the governor's office to promote our position within Ohio's comprehensive literacy plan.

Legislative advocacy will continue as we further develop the support from newly elected members of the House and Senate. Possible expansion of Reading Recovery sites so that all districts have access to professional development opportunities and coaching will be investigated as followup to a request made by a recently elected legislator in a more-rural portion of the state.

Most importantly, we will continue to develop strong supporters on "both sides of the aisle." The governor and several newly elected legislators showed strong support for Reading Recovery. Increasing their understanding of our work and developing additional ties between these legislators and key constituents will be most important. Representative DeWine was recently elected deputy chairman of the Ohio Republican Party, an office that was specifically created to groom the successor to the retiring chairperson who has held the office since 1988. This will be a new area of political involvement that we'll explore. As always, the budget does not end our work, but begins it in new ways.

#### **For further information**

Reading Recovery Program  
The Ohio State University  
614.688.3646  
<http://ehe.osu.edu/edtl/outreach/readrec-at-osu.htm>

## **CASE STUDY #5 Texas**

UTC: Texas Woman's University

### **Summary**

At Fort Bend ISD, Sugar Land, TX, the Reading Recovery team recognized the importance of establishing a strong connection with the special education team in our district. Reading Recovery professionals, including a site coordinator, teacher leaders and others created a multi-faceted approach to identify mutual interests to ensure that our students are successful readers and writers.

## Description

There were a number of reasons why we felt that our collaboration was essential:

1. Reading Recovery is the first net intervention for struggling first graders as part of our district's K–8 literacy plan. At times there is a “rush to judgment” prompting campus teams to refer to special education before providing students the opportunity to participate in Reading Recovery.
2. One of the positive outcomes of Reading Recovery is identification of students who may need longer-term interventions. In such cases, it is not uncommon for such students to be referred to special education. Unfortunately, we found that diagnostic teams were not always using the rich data from Reading Recovery to inform their decision making and design of individualized education programs (IEPs).
3. Some special education teachers told us that they wanted more training on teaching reading and that they wanted to be a stronger presence in the implementation of our district's literacy plan.
4. And finally, the response to intervention (RTI) legislation provided a very opportune moment to connect with special education. We believe that Reading Recovery fits beautifully into the RTI tiered model, and we felt it was important that we reach out to our colleagues to work with them in strategizing our district's RTI Plan.

The teacher leaders and site coordinator scheduled a series of meetings with the leadership of the special education department to discuss our mutual interests in ensuring that our students are successful readers and writers. Through these meetings we talked about specific ways we could collaborate in this effort and defined the positive outcomes we hoped to achieve. Our Reading Recovery team offered a number of supportive services that made this process attractive to the special education team. After each meeting we took notes, followed

up with “next steps” in our plan, and continuously monitored our progress. Our plan of action has been multi-faceted:

- Cathy Duvall and Mary Jackson met with over 300 elementary and middle-school special education teachers to provide an overview of our district's K–8 literacy plan and to solicit their participation in the implementation of the plan.
- Teacher leaders trained over 90 elementary special education teachers in the administration of and use of running records.
- A teacher leader met with all elementary counselors to discuss the interface between Reading Recovery/*Descubriendo la Lectura* services and referrals being made on first grade struggling students. The discussion included utilizing Reading Recovery/*Descubriendo la Lectura* records as another source of data prior to the Campus Student Support Team making a referral for a child to be tested for special education.
- Our leadership team (Reading Recovery/special education) mapped out a plan where in Year 1 (2004–05) we would train a special education teacher as a Reading Recovery teacher. This person's assignment is to teach Reading Recovery for a half day (four students) and teach special education the other half of her day. Our expectation is that the teacher will stay in this assignment for 3 years and then rotate back into a full-time special education teaching assignment. In Year 2, the goal was to train two more special education teachers who would take on the same responsibilities as that of our Year 1 teacher. Year 3, our goal was to add two or three more teachers, and so on. By rotating more teachers through the cycle, we will grow the expertise of the special education staff throughout the district.

We were prepared for a long-term commitment in terms of a collaborative effort, knowing that our partners would have other priorities and that we may need to monitor and adjust.

## Results

We have trained three special education teachers at this point. Over 90 elementary special education teachers have been trained in administering running records. Twelve facilitators have participated in a yearlong training session with an outside early literacy consultant. Reading Recovery has a prominent place in our district's RTI plan. Counselors and diagnosticians are using data from Reading Recovery to inform their decision-makers regarding recommendations for longer term services for former Reading Recovery students. Special education teachers are participants on our campus-based school literacy teams. In addition,

- a number of special education teachers and special education coordinators attended the Early Literacy Conference sponsored by Texas Woman's University in conjunction with their Reading Recovery/Descubriendo la Lectura Conference, and
- special education staff members now participate in the school literacy team meetings at each of our Reading Recovery/Descubriendo la Lectura schools.

## Current/Ongoing Advocacy Plans

We are working as an integral part of the district team which is formalizing our RTI Plan of Action for the district. Reading Recovery plays prominently in that plan as a Tier 3 intervention for first grade.

### For further information

Special Programs Department

Fort Bend ISD

281.634.1715

[http://www.fortbend.k12.tx.us/  
specialprograms/](http://www.fortbend.k12.tx.us/specialprograms/)

## Acknowledgements

The Reading Recovery Council of North America would like to thank the authors and presenters for the Case Studies in Effective Advocacy 2007.

Kelly Adams, project manager  
Lesley University, MA

Cynthia Bogle, teacher leader  
Fort Bend ISD, TX

Cathy Duvall, teacher leader  
Fort Bend ISD, TX

Judy Embry, trainer  
Kentucky State University, KY

Sharon Gilbert, teacher leader  
Marion City Schools, OH

Rachel Gonzales, teacher leader  
Fort Bend ISD, TX

Jeff Hawkins, site coordinator  
Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative,  
Hazard, KY

Mary Howell, teacher leader  
Genesee Intermediate School District, MI

Phoebe Ingraham, teacher leader  
Wright State University, OH

Mary Jackson, site coordinator  
Fort Bend ISD, TX

Mary Lose, Reading Recovery Center director  
Oakland University, MI

Leslie McBane, teacher leader  
Warren City Schools, OH

David Moriarty, RRCNA president 2006–07  
Massachusetts

Vickie Slone, teacher leader  
Kentucky Valley Educational Cooperative,  
Hazard, KY



Reading Recovery® Council  
of North America

614-310-READ  
[www.readingrecovery.org](http://www.readingrecovery.org)