

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 6:27 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES WWC Website: Contact Us: Evidence Standards, Reference ID
Number:
835574085

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

From: (b)(6)

Message: I have used the Read Naturally strategy with Title I students
for
thirteen years, and have found that when my paraeducators and I use the
steps
and process exactly as it is explained in the program, I have averaged
between two and three years' growth in oral reading and comprehension
with my
students on state tests. I am a reading specialist and learning
disabilities
specialist (Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo), and recommend the program to
special
education teachers as well as other intervention specialists. I hope your
future reports will be honest and accurate in following the program and
its
process as described, as it is a disservice to teachers and their
students to
dissuade them from having Read Naturally in their repertoire of service
options. No program is effective if one ignores the correct procedure.
Please
review the program again following the recommended format.

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Tuesday, May 22, 2012 3:48 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 3661)

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/>.

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

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2012 6:27 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES WWC Website: Contact Us: Evidence Standards, Reference ID Number: 835574085

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

From: (b)(6)

Message: I have used the Read Naturally strategy with Title I students for thirteen years, and have found that when my paraeducators and I use the steps and process exactly as it is explained in the program, I have averaged between two and three years' growth in oral reading and comprehension with my students on state tests. I am a reading specialist and learning disabilities specialist (Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo), and recommend the program to special education teachers as well as other intervention specialists. I hope your future reports will be honest and accurate in following the program and its process as described, as it is a disservice to teachers and their students to dissuade them from having Read Naturally in their repertoire of service options. No program is effective if one ignores the correct procedure. Please review the program again following the recommended format.

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2013 9:57 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010) (WWCPC 3661)

Hello,

Thank you for your response to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). It is important to note that the WWC assesses evidence on the effectiveness of educational interventions. It does not endorse interventions or maintain a list of programs that are scientifically based. The WWC reviews completed research on interventions. We do not conduct primary research to determine the effectiveness of interventions.

If you know of studies evaluating the effectiveness of the Read Naturally program, please submit them to the WWC so we may consider adding them to the queue for review. You may submit studies in response to this email or via our website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/help/webmail/index.aspx?submitstudy=1>.

There is a resource on our website called the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook that provides detailed information on how the WWC review process, including the process of defining and prioritizing interventions within topic areas (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>). Also, you may want to refer to protocols available on our website at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Publications_Reviews.aspx?f=All%20Publication%20and%20Review%20Types.5:#pubsearch for additional information on reviews conducted by individual topic areas.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

Thank you for your interest,

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: Susan Shallenberger [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 10:22 AM
To: What Works
Subject: Re: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010)

Dear Jill Constantine,

Thank you for looking into this matter for me. I have read your report and I understand that you followed your usual procedures for your studies. But as a serious researcher, and someone who wants to know the truth about programs

that can help children, when so few programs have succeeded, I am still not satisfied with your WWC evaluation.

I have studied so many programs as an educator looking for the right program combination for my students. I would never evaluate a program based on the way "I want to try it out" rather than the way it is designed to be implemented.

Way too often I have mentored young teachers who try to take shortcuts with programs only to end in terrible results. My concern is always that the students with whom they worked were getting short changed. I am one educator who refuses to accept any mediocre level of effort.

Read Naturally is a great program that has helped hundreds of my students gain reading achievement they could not reach without the program. Your evaluation that it is not "what works" based on your inadequate approach to its implementation, is a disservice to all teachers and students who desperately seek meaningful help. If your evaluations lead to teachers not choosing the program, you share in the responsibility for all of the students they will not reach.

Please evaluate the program again, using the procedural steps and consistency that are part of following the program.

Thank you,

Susan Shallenberger
Reading Specialist, Learning Disability Specialist
Consultant, Cal Poly State University

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

From: [What Works](#)

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:31 AM

Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010)

Dear Ms. Shallen,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your message regarding WWC reviews of studies of Read Naturally®.

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: Susan Shallenberger (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 10:22 AM
To: What Works
Subject: Re: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010)

Dear Jill Constantine,

Thank you for looking into this matter for me. I have read your report and I understand that you followed your usual procedures for your studies. But as a serious researcher, and someone who wants to know the truth about programs that can help children, when so few programs have succeeded, I am still not satisfied with your WWC evaluation.

I have studied so many programs as an educator looking for the right program combination for my students. I would never evaluate a program based on the way "I want to try it out" rather than the way it is designed to be implemented. Way too often I have mentored young teachers who try to take shortcuts with programs only to end in terrible results. My concern is always that the students with whom they worked were getting short changed. I am one educator who refuses to accept any mediocre level of effort.

Read Naturally is a great program that has helped hundreds of my students gain reading achievement they could not reach without the program. Your evaluation that it is not "what works" based on your inadequate approach to its implementation, is a disservice to all teachers and students who desperately seek meaningful help. If your evaluations lead to teachers not choosing the program, you share in the responsibility for all of the students they will not reach.

Please evaluate the program again, using the procedural steps and consistency that are part of following the program.

Thank you,

Susan Shallenberger
Reading Specialist, Learning Disability Specialist
Consultant, Cal Poly State University

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

From: [What Works](#)
To: (b)(6)
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 5:31 AM
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010)

Dear Ms. Shallen,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your message regarding WWC reviews of studies of Read Naturally®.

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: What Works
Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 8:32 AM
To: 'susanshallen@comcast.net'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (QR2012010)
Attachments: QR2012010.pdf

Dear Ms. Shallen,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your message regarding WWC reviews of studies of Read Naturally®.

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/>.

What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

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

February 24, 2013

Ms. Susan Shallen

(b)(6)

Reference: QR2012010

Dear Ms. Shallen:

Thank you for your email regarding your experience with Read Naturally® and your concerns with the WWC reviews of studies of Read Naturally®. 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.

Regarding your concern that the steps for Read Naturally® were not implemented fully or correctly in some of the studies that the WWC reviewed, the quality review found that the WWC followed procedures in the manner in which the studies of Read Naturally® are described in WWC publications. As noted in the WWC Handbook, "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..." (http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/reference_resources/wwc_procedures_v2_1_standards_handbook.pdf; 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 studies and may affect the interpretation of findings were properly included in the WWC publications. Specifically, for each of these 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

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. 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 the studies of Read Naturally®, 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.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Jill Constantine
Director, What Works Clearinghouse

cc: (b)(6)