

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR ELEMENTARY BEGINNING READING PROGRAM RATINGS

	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)	Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE)
Extent of Review	51 studies of 24 programs	63 studies of 26 programs
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades K-3 (outcomes may be measured in later grades) Programs, products, practices, and policies intended to increase skills in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alphabetics Fluency Comprehension General reading achievement (i.e., summary scores) English language (not English language learners) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades K-1 (outcomes may be measured in later grades) Initial, non-remedial reading programs intended to enhance beginning reading achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curricula (core texts and curricula) Instructional technology (supplemental or embedded) Instructional process programs (strategies such as cooperative learning or phonological awareness training) Combinations of curricula and process (e.g., Success for All, Direct Instruction)
Criteria for Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published between 1983 and 2006 Must have been conducted in the United States Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs Includes outcome measures aligned to the content of the intervention (e.g., phonics skills measures for phonics instruction) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standardized achievement tests Researcher- or teacher-developed assessments Class grades (measured after implementation of the program) Grade promotion (indirect measure only) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published between 1970 and 2009 May have been conducted outside the United States, but report must be available in English Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs Includes quantitative outcome measures of reading performance, such as standardized assessments (measures of reading objectives inherent only to the experimental group, and not control groups, are excluded) Excludes outcome measures of pre-reading skills (e.g., phonological awareness), oral vocabulary, language arts, and spelling Minimum study duration of 12 weeks Minimum treatment group size of 15 students and 2 teachers
+	<i>Positive Effects:</i> Two or more studies showing statistically significant positive effects. No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important negative effects	<i>Strong Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> One large randomized study and additional studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of +0.20
+	<i>Potentially Positive Effects:</i> At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect	<i>Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> Two large matched studies, or smaller studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of at least +0.20
~L	Not specified	<i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> <i>Strong Evidence of Modest Effects:</i> Meet the criteria for “Moderate” but weighted mean effect size is +0.10 to +0.19
~M	<i>Mixed Effects:</i> Evidence of inconsistent effects	<i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> <i>Weak Evidence with Notable Effect:</i> Weighted mean effect size at least +0.20 based on one or more qualifying studies insufficient in number or sample size to meet the criteria for “Moderate”
~I	<i>No Discernible Effects:</i> No studies show a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either positive or negative	<i>Insufficient Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> Qualifying studies do not meet the criteria for “Limited”
-	<i>Potentially Negative Effects:</i> At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect	Not Specified

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR ELEMENTARY BEGINNING READING PROGRAM RATINGS

	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)	Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE)
–	<u>Negative Effects:</u> Two or more studies showing statistically significant negative effects. No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important positive effects	Not Specified
U	<u>NA:</u> Outcome measure not included in studies reviewed	Not Specified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Does Not Meet Eligibility Screens:</u> Studies are outside the scope of the review</p> <p><u>Does Not Meet Evidence Screens:</u> Studies do not meet criteria for inclusion</p>	<u>No Qualifying Studies:</u> Studies are outside the scope of the review or do not meet inclusion standards

Sources

Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Chambers, B., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). *Effective beginning reading programs*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education.

Available at: http://www.bestevidence.org/reading/begin_read/begin_read.htm

What Works Clearinghouse (2007). *WWC evidence review protocol for beginning reading interventions*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=27&tocid=1>

What Works Clearinghouse (2007). *WWC topic report: Beginning reading*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/beginning_reading/topic/

What Works Clearinghouse (2008). *What Works Clearinghouse procedures and standards handbook (Version 2.0)*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR ELEMENTARY LITERACY: GENERAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM RATINGS

	Best Evidence Encyclopedia
Extent of Review	63 studies of 26 programs
Scope of Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 2-5 (outcomes may be measured in later grades) • Non-remedial reading programs intended to enhance reading achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Curricula (core texts and curricula) ○ Computer-Aided Instruction (programs that use technology to enhance reading achievement) ○ Instructional Process Programs (strategies such as cooperative learning, classroom management and motivational approaches, and cross-age tutoring)
Criteria for Inclusion of Research Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published between 1970 and 2009 • Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs • Includes quantitative outcome measures of reading performance, such as standardized assessments (measures of reading objectives inherent only to the experimental group, and not control groups, are excluded) • Excludes outcome measures of pre-reading skills (e.g., phonological awareness), oral vocabulary, language arts, and spelling • Minimum study duration of 12 weeks • Minimum treatment group size of 15 students and 2 teachers
+	Strong Evidence of Effectiveness: One large randomized study and additional studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of +0.20
+	Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness: Two large matched studies, or smaller studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of at least +0.20
~L	Limited Evidence of Effectiveness: Strong Evidence of Modest Effects: Meet the criteria for “Moderate” but weighted mean effect size is +0.10 to +0.19
~ 	Limited Evidence of Effectiveness: Weak Evidence with Notable Effect: Weighted mean effect size at least +0.20 based on one or more qualifying studies insufficient in number or sample size to meet the criteria for “Moderate”
~ 	Insufficient Evidence of Effectiveness: Qualifying studies do not meet the criteria for “Limited”
☒	No Qualifying Studies: No studies meet inclusion standards

Source:

Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). *Beyond the basics: Effective reading programs for the upper elementary grades*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education.

Available at: http://www.bestevidence.org/reading/upper_elem/upper_elem_read.htm

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR SECONDARY LITERACY: GENERAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM RATINGS

	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)	Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE)
Extent of Review	51 studies of 24 programs	63 studies of 26 programs
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 4-12 Programs, products, practices, and policies intended to increase skills in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alphabetics Fluency Comprehension General literacy achievement (i.e., summary scores) English language (not English language learners) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades K-1 (outcomes may be measured in later grades) Initial, non-remedial reading programs intended to enhance beginning reading achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curricula (core texts and curricula) Instructional technology (supplemental or embedded) Instructional process programs (strategies such as cooperative learning or phonological awareness training) Combinations of curricula and process (e.g., Success for All, Direct Instruction)
Criteria for Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published between 1983 and 2006 Must have been conducted in the United States Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs Includes outcome measures aligned to the content of the intervention (e.g., comprehension skills measures for comprehension instruction) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standardized achievement tests Researcher- or teacher-developed assessments Class grades (measured after implementation of the program) Grade promotion (indirect measure only) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published between 1970 and 2009 May have been conducted outside the United States, but report must be available in English Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs Includes quantitative outcome measures of reading/literacy performance, such as standardized assessments (measures of literacy objectives inherent only to the experimental group, and not control groups, are excluded) Excludes outcome measures of pre-reading skills (e.g., phonological awareness), oral vocabulary, language arts, and spelling Minimum study duration of 12 weeks Minimum treatment group size of 15 students and 2 teachers
+	<i>Positive Effects:</i> Two or more studies showing statistically significant positive effects. No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important negative effects	<i>Strong Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> One large randomized study and additional studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of +0.20
+	<i>Potentially Positive Effects:</i> At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect	<i>Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> Two large matched studies, or smaller studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of at least +0.20
~L	Not specified	<i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness: Strong Evidence of Modest Effects:</i> Meet the criteria for "Moderate" but weighted mean effect size is +0.10 to +0.19
~M	Mixed Effects: Evidence of inconsistent effects	<i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness: Weak Evidence with Notable Effect:</i> Weighted mean effect size at least +0.20 based on one or more qualifying studies insufficient in number or sample size to meet the criteria for "Moderate"
~I	No Discernible Effects: No studies show a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either positive or negative	Not Specified
-	Potentially Negative Effects: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect	<i>Insufficient Evidence of Effectiveness:</i> Qualifying studies do not meet the criteria for "Limited"

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR SECONDARY LITERACY: GENERAL INSTRUCTION PROGRAM RATINGS

	What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)	Best Evidence Encyclopedia (BEE)
	significant or substantively important negative effect	
-	<i>Negative Effects:</i> Two or more studies showing statistically significant negative effects. No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important positive effects	Not Specified
U	<i>NA:</i> Outcome measure not included in studies reviewed	Not Specified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Does Not Meet Eligibility Screens:</i> Studies are outside the scope of the review <i>Does Not Meet Evidence Screens:</i> Studies do not meet criteria for inclusion	<i>No Qualifying Studies:</i> Studies are outside the scope of the review or do not meet inclusion standards

Sources

Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective reading programs for middle and high schools: A best evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3), 290-322.

Available at: http://www.bestevidence.org/reading/mhs/mhs_read.htm

What Works Clearinghouse (2008). *What Works Clearinghouse procedures and standards handbook (Version 2.0)*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>

What Works Clearinghouse (2009). *WWC evidence review protocol for adolescent literacy interventions (grades 4-12): Version 1.0*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=29>

What Works Clearinghouse (2009). *WWC intervention report: SuccessMaker®*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Available at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/adolescent_literacy/successmaker/index.asp

STANDARDS OF EVIDENCE FOR ELEMENTARY LITERACY: STRUGGLING READERS PROGRAM RATINGS

Best Evidence Encyclopedia	
Extent of Review	96 studies of 47 programs
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 2-5 (outcomes may be measured in later grades) • Specific, potentially replicable programs for children who are having difficulties learning to read in grades K-5 (defined as children with reading disabilities, children in the lowest 33% of their classes in reading performance, any children receiving tutoring or intensive services to remediate or prevent serious reading problems) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One-to-one tutoring by teachers ○ One-to-one tutoring by paraprofessionals and/or volunteers ○ Small group tutorials ○ Classroom instructional process approaches (e.g., cooperative learning, direct instruction, approaches focused on classroom methods rather than pull-out services) ○ Classroom instructional process with tutoring (Success for All) ○ Instructional technology (computer-assisted instruction and other uses of technology)
Criteria for Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published between 1970 and 2009 • May have been conducted outside the United States, but report must be available in English • Empirical, quantitative studies employing random assignment or matched comparison group designs • Includes quantitative outcome measures of reading performance, such as standardized assessments (measures of reading objectives inherent only to the experimental group, and not control groups, are excluded) • Excludes outcome measures of pre-reading skills (e.g., phonological awareness), oral vocabulary, language arts, and spelling • Minimum study duration of 12 weeks • Minimum treatment group size of 15 students and 2 teachers • Interventions beginning in kindergarten included only if students were followed through 1st grade or later
+	<i>Strong Evidence of Effectiveness</i> : One large randomized study and additional studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of +0.20
+	<i>Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness</i> : Two large matched studies, or smaller studies with a combined sample size of 500; weighted mean effect size of at least +0.20
~L	<i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness</i> : <i>Strong Evidence of Modest Effects</i> : Meet the criteria for “Moderate” but weighted mean effect size is +0.10 to +0.19 <i>Limited Evidence of Effectiveness</i> : <i>Weak Evidence with Notable Effect</i> : Weighted mean effect size at least +0.20 based on one or more qualifying studies insufficient in number or sample size to meet the criteria for “Moderate”
~ 	<i>Insufficient Evidence of Effectiveness</i> : Qualifying studies do not meet the criteria for “Limited”
⊗	<i>No Qualifying Studies</i> : No studies meet inclusion standards

Source:

Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2009). *Effective programs for struggling readers: A best evidence synthesis*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education.

Available at: http://www.bestevidence.org/reading/strug/strug_read.htm