

From: Karla Ramy [mailto:kramy@readnaturally.com] On Behalf Of
info@readnaturally.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2007 11:51 AM
To: Mark Dynarski
Subject: Read Naturally - Tom Ihnot

Mark,

In her email of August 28, 2007 Becki Herman directed me to contact you
about What Works
Clearinghouse (WWC) issues.

I would appreciate it if you could evaluate whether the Hancock review in
WWC beginning reading
section should be removed.

Carrie Hancock made it clear that she used Read Naturally passages but
not the Read Naturally
strategy and that her purpose was not to evaluate Read Naturally.

The following set of emails demonstrates the author's desire to stop WWC
from using her
dissertation as a review of Read Naturally.

Becki,

See email below from Carrie Hancock that verifies that she was not
evaluating the Read Naturally strategy. Please let me know how this
information impacts the WWC review of the Hancock study.

Thanks,
Tom Ihnot

Read Naturally, Inc.
750 S. Plaza Dr. #100
St. Paul, MN 55120
www.readnaturally.com
www.oneminutereader.com
651-452-4085
800-788-4085
651-452-9204 - fax

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

From: drcarriehancock@cox.net [mailto:drcarriehancock@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2007 10:15 PM
To: info@readnaturally.com
Subject: dissertation clarification

Tom,

Per our phone conversation this morning, I wanted to clarify a couple of

issues regarding my 2002 dissertation titled, "Accelerating Reading Trajectories: The Effects of Dynamic Research-Based Instruction". While I used Read Naturally materials, I did not fully implement the Read Naturally strategy and my study was not intended to evaluate the Read Naturally strategy. Rather, the purpose was to determine the impact of ongoing supplemental fluency practice on 2nd grade students' rates of learning to read.

Thank you,

Carrie Hancock Ph.D.

From: Herman, Rebecca [mailto:RHerman@air.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2007 8:01 AM
To: info@readnaturally.com
Cc: Duncan, Teresa (Garcia); Kidron, Yael; Constantine, Jill; Sanchez, Susan
Subject: RE: from Tom Ihnot

Mr. Ihnot,

Thank you for forwarding the email from Dr. Hancock about her study. I have shared that email and discussed your concerns with Jill Constantine, the PI for the WWC Beginning Reading Review, as well as with the U.S. Department of Education. As I mentioned to you in our phone calls earlier this week, the WWC does not look at WHY a study author chose to test an intervention. If a study author looks at the effects of an intervention, we would consider that study eligible for review (pending review of other design issues). Further, as we have also discussed earlier, the WWC does not consider implementation except in the case of removing studies that have zero implementation (e.g., there were no elements whatsoever of the intervention used in the study) In this case, although the study author may not have implemented the intervention as you had originally intended, it is clearly not a case of zero implementation. Although we have heard and considered your concerns, the Department, the Beginning Reading team, and the WWC core team agree that this study should remain in the review.
Becki Herman
WWC Project Director

In addition the following link details some of the major ways Hancock did not implement the Read Naturally strategy.

