

Jean Stockard

From: Jean Stockard

Sent: 5 Feb 2014 15:57:29 -0700

To: WhatWorks

Cc: Jean Stockard

Subject: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading

Importance: Normal

To Whom It May Concern:

The Research and Evaluation Office of the National Institute for Direct Instruction is in the process of reviewing the WWC report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading that was released in the fall of 2013. I will send you a more complete report of our findings within a few weeks, but one element that appeared in our review was so disturbing that I felt I should let you know immediately so that you could take appropriate corrective actions.

The report states that “The WWC identified 166 studies of Reading Mastery for beginning readers...” Yet, while there were 166 studies listed, eleven of those studies were not of Reading Mastery, but instead were about other programs! In other words, of the 166 studies, seven percent did not even involve the curriculum the report purported to have examined. Five of the listed studies (European Centre for Reading Recovery, 2012; Harvey, 2012; Lewis, 2012; McClendon, 2012; and Redding, 2012) actually involved Reading Recovery, a tutoring program unrelated to Reading Mastery. Five other studies (Cohen & Brady, 2011; Hudler, 2008; Laska, 2009; Schelling, 2010; and Welsh, 2010) involved a variety of approaches, such as “Big Books,” Headsprout, and Earobics. Only one (Flores & Ganz, 2007) used another Direct Instruction program, Corrective Reading. The fact that these studies did not examine Reading Mastery is usually clear from the titles of the works, and is always apparent from the content.

The fact that this mistake was not found prior to publication of your report is shocking and suggests that the quality of the review process was very far from optimal. Thus, I request that you immediately withdraw the November, 2013, report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading from your website. In addition, I ask that you place a notice on the website noting that the withdrawal occurred because of errors in the report.

Please let me know, at your earliest convenience, what action you have taken. As mentioned above I will be sending you a fuller report of errors in the November, 2013, document within a few weeks.

Sincerely,

Jean Stockard, Ph.D.
Director of Research
National Institute for Direct Instruction
Eugene, Oregon
phone: 541-505-5710 or toll-free 877-485-1973

WhatWorks

From: WhatWorks

Sent: 6 Feb 2014 23:49:52 +0000

To: 'jstockard@nifdi.org'

Subject: RE: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading

Dear Dr. Stockard,

Thank you for contacting us. We are in the process of reviewing the concerns you raised in your February 5th email below.

We welcome any additional comments you may send in the next few weeks.

What Works Clearinghouse

-----Original Message-----

From: Jean Stockard [mailto:jstockard@nifdi.org]

Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 4:57 PM

To: WhatWorks

Cc: Jean Stockard

Subject: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading

To Whom It May Concern:

The Research and Evaluation Office of the National Institute for Direct Instruction is in the process of reviewing the WWC report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading that was released in the fall of 2013. I will send you a more complete report of our findings within a few weeks, but one element that appeared in our review was so disturbing that I felt I should let you know immediately so that you could take appropriate corrective actions.

The report states that "The WWC identified 166 studies of Reading Mastery for beginning readers...." Yet, while there were 166 studies listed, eleven of those studies were not of Reading Mastery, but instead were about other programs! In other words, of the 166 studies, seven percent did not even involve the curriculum the report purported to have examined. Five of the listed studies (European Centre for Reading Recovery, 2012; Harvey, 2012; Lewis, 2012; McClendon, 2012; and Redding, 2012) actually involved Reading Recovery, a tutoring program unrelated to Reading Mastery. Five other studies (Cohen & Brady, 2011; Hudler, 2008; Laska, 2009; Schelling, 2010; and Welsh, 2010) involved a variety of approaches, such as "Big Books," Headsprout, and Earobics. Only one (Flores & Ganz, 2007) used another Direct Instruction program, Corrective Reading. The fact that these studies did not examine Reading Mastery is usually clear from the titles of the works, and is always apparent from the content.

The fact that this mistake was not found prior to publication of your report is shocking and suggests that the quality of the review process was very far from optimal. Thus, I request that you immediately withdraw the November, 2013, report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading from your website. In addition, I ask that you place a notice on the website noting that the withdrawal occurred because of errors in the report.

Please let me know, at your earliest convenience, what action you have taken. As mentioned above I will be sending you a fuller report of errors in the November, 2013, document within a few weeks.

Sincerely,

Jean Stockard, Ph.D.
Director of Research
National Institute for Direct Instruction Eugene, Oregon
phone: 541-505-5710 or toll-free 877-485-1973

WhatWorks

From: WhatWorks
Sent: 20 Feb 2014 16:53:37 +0000
To: 'jstockard@nifdi.org'
Subject: RE: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading
Dear Dr. Stockard,

The WWC Quality Review Team is reviewing your email and will prepare a written response as soon as possible.

What Works Clearinghouse

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Thursday, February 06, 2014 5:50 PM
To: 'jstockard@nifdi.org'
Subject: RE: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading

Dear Dr. Stockard,

Thank you for contacting us. We are in the process of reviewing the concerns you raised in your February 5th email below.

We welcome any additional comments you may send in the next few weeks.

What Works Clearinghouse

-----Original Message-----

From: Jean Stockard [<mailto:jstockard@nifdi.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 05, 2014 4:57 PM
To: WhatWorks
Cc: Jean Stockard
Subject: Errors in November 2013 Report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading

To Whom It May Concern:

The Research and Evaluation Office of the National Institute for Direct Instruction is in the process of reviewing the WWC report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading that was released in the fall of 2013. I will send you a more complete report of our findings within a few weeks, but one element that appeared in our review was so disturbing that I felt I should let you know immediately so that you could take appropriate corrective actions.

The report states that "The WWC identified 166 studies of Reading Mastery for beginning readers..." Yet, while there were 166 studies listed, eleven of those studies were not of Reading Mastery, but instead were about other programs! In other words, of the 166 studies, seven percent did not even involve the curriculum the report purported to have examined. Five of the listed studies (European Centre for Reading Recovery, 2012; Harvey, 2012; Lewis, 2012; McClendon, 2012; and Redding, 2012) actually involved Reading Recovery, a tutoring program unrelated to Reading Mastery. Five other studies

(Cohen & Brady, 2011; Hudler, 2008; Laska, 2009; Schelling, 2010; and Welsh, 2010) involved a variety of approaches, such as "Big Books," Headsprout, and Earobics. Only one (Flores & Ganz, 2007) used another Direct Instruction program, Corrective Reading. The fact that these studies did not examine Reading Mastery is usually clear from the titles of the works, and is always apparent from the content.

The fact that this mistake was not found prior to publication of your report is shocking and suggests that the quality of the review process was very far from optimal. Thus, I request that you immediately withdraw the November, 2013, report on Reading Mastery for Beginning Reading from your website. In addition, I ask that you place a notice on the website noting that the withdrawal occurred because of errors in the report.

Please let me know, at your earliest convenience, what action you have taken. As mentioned above I will be sending you a fuller report of errors in the November, 2013, document within a few weeks.

Sincerely,

Jean Stockard, Ph.D.
Director of Research
National Institute for Direct Instruction Eugene, Oregon
phone: 541-505-5710 or toll-free 877-485-1973

What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

A central and trusted source of scientific evidence for what works in education.

March 18, 2014

Dr. Jean Stockard
Director of Research
National Institute for Direct Instruction
P.O. Box 11248
Eugene, OR 97440
jstockard@nifdi.org

Reference: QR2014002

Dear Dr. Stockard:

Thank you for your email regarding the What Works Clearinghouse's *Reading Mastery* intervention report for the Beginning Reading review (Updated November 2013). In response to your email, we conducted an independent quality review to address the concerns you have raised. The WWC quality review team responds to concerns raised about WWC reviews published on our website. When a quality review is conducted, a researcher who was not involved in the initial review undertakes an independent assessment of the studies in question. The researcher also investigates the procedures used and decisions made during the original review of the studies. These quality reviews are one of tools used to ensure that the standards established by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) are upheld on every review conducted by the WWC.

In your e-mail dated February 5, 2014, you stated that "...of the 166 studies of *Reading Mastery* for beginning readers identified by the WWC, eleven of those studies were not of *Reading Mastery*, but instead were about other programs."

The quality review investigated the 11 studies that you indicated were not relevant to *Reading Mastery* and confirmed that they are not appropriate for inclusion in this report. We also investigated the review process and determined that the eleven studies were inadvertently included because of the following errors: (1) five studies were identified through keyword searches that matched our search terms for *Reading Mastery* (e.g., "direct instruction" and "reading mastery"), but the review process did not screen out these irrelevant studies as intended; (2) the inclusion of the five *Reading Recovery* studies resulted from a mistake when the citation list was updated and combined with the June 2013 literature search results; and (3) one study was listed in the previous version of the *Reading Mastery* report. We have revisited our screening procedures to ensure that this type of mistake does not occur in future reports.

We appreciate your close attention to detail, and based on the findings of this quality review, the WWC will revise and rerelease the report with the eleven studies deleted. I hope that this letter has addressed your concerns. If you have other concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the WWC through info@whatworks.ed.gov.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)



Jill Constantine
Director, What Works Clearinghouse

cc: Joy Lesnick, IES

