

From: smetzger@mtrace.org
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:09 AM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Topic Areas, Beginning Reading Review, Reference
ID Number: 1852710946

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: smetzger@mtrace.org

Message: While I received the WWC's evidence standards, I continue to be perplexed about it's ratings for Reading Recovery. I have read the four studies that met the "standards." Two of them were conducted by Pinnell, who is introduced the program in the U.S. One of those studies compares the program to itself, with the only variable being the training of classroom teachers! The other study simply reveals that students in Reading Recovery performed better on the Observation Survey (created by Reading Recovery promoters) and Woodcock Johnson than students who received no intervention AT ALL. I just do not understand how the WWC can conclude that the program is effective based on the studies that met its standards. What is the WWC's view on the importance of ruling out bias on the part of the researchers? Please reply using my email shown above.

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Thursday, April 15, 2010 2:17 PM
To: 'smetzger@mtrace.org'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWCPC 2089)
Hello,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). The WWC Quality Review Team is reviewing your email and will prepare a written response. The Quality Review Team responds to concerns raised by study authors, curriculum developers or other relevant parties about WWC reviews published on our website. These quality reviews are undertaken when concerned parties present evidence that a WWC review may be inaccurate. When a quality review is conducted, a researcher who was not involved in the initial review undertakes an independent assessment of the study in question. The researcher also investigates the procedures used and decisions made during the original review of the study. If a quality review concludes that the original review was flawed, a revision will be published. These quality reviews are one of tools used to ensure that the standards established by the Institute of Educational Sciences (IES) are upheld on every review conducted by the What Works Clearinghouse.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

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

From: smetzger@mtrace.org [mailto:smetzger@mtrace.org]
Sent: Wednesday, April 14, 2010 11:09 AM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Topic Areas, Beginning Reading Review, Reference ID Number: 1852710946

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: smetzger@mtrace.org

Message: While I received the WWC's evidence standards, I continue to be perplexed about it's ratings for Reading Recovery. I have read the four studies that met the "standards." Two of them were conducted by Pinnell, who is introduced the program in the U.S. One of those studies compares the program to itself, with the only variable being the training of classroom teachers! The other study simply reveals that students in Reading Recovery performed better on the Observation Survey (created by Reading Recovery promoters) and Woodcock Johnson than students who received no

