

From: James Cline (b) (6)  
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 3:37 PM  
To: What Works  
Subject: Miss Information on WWC

Ms James-Burdumy ,

I am a classroom teacher and have taught for over 34 years in the Indianapolis, Indiana area. I am writing you with a real concern about the What Works Clearing House website. While I have shared the website with other educators and encouraged them to use this site for RTI research, I can no longer encourage the use of the site while it misrepresents one of my favorite intervention tools, Read Naturally. I have used this product with real success with my tier II & III students with significant results.

The studies sighted on the website did not follow the steps of Read Naturally and misrepresent the successes of the program and yet the Clearing House continues to keep this false information on the website. This gives your website a black eye and misrepresents the Read Naturally strategies.

I would appreciate a response about this issue.

James Cline

**From:** WhatWorks  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 4:30 PM  
**To:** (b) (6)  
**Subject:** What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 3574)

Hello,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). We have received your email below. WWC staff are reviewing your request and will prepare a response.

#### 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/>.

---

**From:** James Cline [mailto:(b) (6)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 3:37 PM  
**To:** What Works  
**Subject:** Miss Information on WWC

MS James-Burdumy ,

I am a classroom teacher and have taught for over 34 years in the Indianapolis, Indiana area. I am writing you with a real concern about the What Works Clearing House website. While I have shared the website with other educators and encouraged them to use this site for RTI research, I can no longer encourage the use of the site while it misrepresents one of my favorite intervention tools, Read Naturally. I have used this product with real success with my tier II & III students with significant results.

The studies sighted on the website did not follow the steps of Read Naturally and misrepresent the successes of the program and yet the Clearing House continues to keep this false information on the website. This gives your website a black eye and misrepresents the Read Naturally strategies.

I would appreciate a response about this issue.

James Cline

**From:** What Works  
**Sent:** Friday, May 11, 2012 11:47 AM  
**To:** 'James Cline'  
**Subject:** RE: Miss Information on WWC  
**Attachments:** QRT 2012006.pdf

Dear Mr. Cline,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your March 22 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

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/>.

---

**From:** James Cline [mailto: (b) (6)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2012 3:37 PM  
**To:** What Works  
**Subject:** Miss Information on WWC

MS James-Burdumy ,

I am a classroom teacher and have taught for over 34 years in the Indianapolis, Indiana area. I am writing you with a real concern about the What Works Clearing House website. While I have shared the website with other educators and encouraged them to use this site for RTI research, I can no longer encourage the use of the site while it misrepresents one of my favorite intervention tools, Read Naturally. I have used this product with real success with my tier II & III students with significant results.

The studies sighted on the website did not follow the steps of Read Naturally and misrepresent the successes of the program and yet the Clearing House continues to keep this false information on the website. This gives your website a black eye and misrepresents the Read Naturally strategies.

I would appreciate a response about this issue.

James Cline

# What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

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

May 11, 2012

Mr. James Cline

(b)(6)

Reference: QR2012006

Dear Mr. Cline:

Thank you for your email regarding your experience with Read Naturally® and your concerns with the WWC reviews of Read Naturally®. In response to your email, we conducted an independent quality review to address the concerns you've 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 the tools used to ensure that the standards established by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) are upheld on every review conducted by the WWC.

Regarding your concern that the steps of Read Naturally® were not implemented fully or correctly in the studies reviewed by the WWC, the quality review found that the WWC followed protocol in the manner in which WWC publications describe the four studies that the WWC reviewed: Hancock (2002); Denton, Anthony, Parker, and Hasbrouck (2004); Kemp (2006); and Chenault, Thomson, Abbott, and Berninger (2006). As noted in the WWC Handbook (available in the Review Process section of our website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/ReviewProcess.aspx>), "The WWC makes no adjustments or corrections for variations in implementation of the intervention; however, if a study meets standards and is included in an intervention report, descriptions of implementation are provided in the report..." (page 16). This approach is appropriate because there is no standard metric for fidelity to intervention design. Thus, the WWC includes studies with variation in fidelity and does not evaluate implementation fidelity.

The quality review team verified that variations in implementation that are noted in the four studies and that may affect the interpretation of findings were properly included in the WWC publications. Specifically, for each of these for studies, the quality review had the following findings:

1. Hancock (2002). This study is reviewed in a WWC Intervention Report under the Beginning Reading Evidence Review Protocol. The study does not note any deviations in implementation. However, following an inquiry from the CEO of Read Naturally® about implementation in this study, the WWC contacted the author. Hancock's response indicated that the study excluded Read Naturally's pre-reading vocabulary instruction component and the placement system to individualize instruction. The WWC Intervention Report was revised to note these variations in implementation (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=407>, specifically footnote 4

# What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

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

on page 2 and Appendix A1.). The record of correspondence with Hancock did not note any other variations in implementation.

2. Denton, Anthony, Parker, and Hasbrouck (2004). This study is reviewed in a WWC Intervention Report under the English Language Learners Evidence Review Protocol. The quality review found that the study notes that Reading Naturally® was combined with additional activities. The WWC Intervention Report properly identifies this as a “modified version” of Read Naturally and describes the modifications (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=408>, specifically footnote 7 on page 3 and Appendix A1). There were no other variations in implementation noted in the study and there is no record of correspondence with Denton about other variations in implementation.
3. Kemp (2006). This study is reviewed in a WWC Intervention Report under the English Language Learners Evidence Review Protocol. The quality review found that the study does not provide any indication of variation from program design. Specifically, the study states, “...it could be concluded that all teachers implemented the Read Naturally® program as prescribed” (page 40). Furthermore, there is no record of correspondence with the author about variations in implementation. Based on this information, the quality review concluded that there was no evidence that variations in implementation should have been noted in the WWC Intervention Report.
4. Chenault, Thomson, Abbott, and Berninger (2006). This study is reviewed in a WWC Intervention Report under the Students with Learning Disabilities Evidence Review Protocol. In accordance with the study, the WWC Intervention Report notes that the students in the study were identified by researchers as dyslexic and that they were provided only 10 sessions of Read Naturally® (see <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=409>, specifically pages 2-3 and Appendix A1). No other variations in implementation were noted in the study and there is no record of correspondence with the authors about deviations in implementation.

Based on these findings, the quality review team recommends no changes to the descriptions of the Read Naturally® in WWC publications. However, the WWC is in the process of updating the Intervention Report for Read Naturally®, reviewed under the Beginning Reading Evidence Review Protocol. In this update, the WWC will use the current WWC evidence standards to review all studies identified for the previous report and all studies identified since that time. If the WWC needs any further clarification related to these four studies or any other studies, we will contact the author(s).

# What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

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

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](mailto:info@whatworks.ed.gov).

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Jill Constantine  
Director, What Works Clearinghouse

cc (b)(6)