

Reviews of Collections of Programs, Curricula, Practices, Policies, and Tools: Evaluated According to Evidence

Compiled by Judy Smith-Davis, Ph.D

For more information, see: <http://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/resources/reviews>

This collection originated as part of the Results for Kids: Resources library of The IDEA Partnership, which transferred early contents to NIRN in 2009.

Reading, Language Arts, and Literacy

Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents: A Guidance Document (pertains to content instruction)

Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2007).
J. K. Torgesen, D. D. Houston, L. M. Rissman, S. M. Decker, G. Roberts, S. Vaughn, J. Wexler,
D. J. Francis, M. O. Rivera, & N. Lesaux.

This document has three major parts. **PART ONE: Improving Academic Literacy Instruction for Students in Grades 4-12** -- Based on current research in adolescent literacy, this part discusses recommendations to improve literacy instruction in the content areas (e.g., science, social studies, history, literature), instructional recommendations for English language learners, and critical elements of instruction for special reading classes with struggling readers. . . . **PART TWO: Advice from Experts About Improving Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents** -- Eight experts with extensive experience conducting research on adolescent literacy were asked to respond to four questions about methods for improving adolescent literacy from the perspective of school-level and state-level policy recommendations. They were asked to address both literacy instruction in the content areas and recommendations for struggling readers; they were also asked to recommend additional readings related to these questions. An annotated bibliography of their responses is included. **PART THREE: Examples of State Activities in Support of Improved Adolescent Literacy Instruction** -- This part describes specific activities four states have adopted to improve adolescent literacy, placing the targeted activities in the broader context of each state's efforts to support improved reading instruction. Contact information for each state is included."

[Full text – Academic Literacy Instruction for Adolescents](#)

[A video overview is also available on this page]

[Also see – Adolescent Literacy Resources: Annotated Bibliography](#)

Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs: Chart and Program Review Guide

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Learning Point Associates, Naperville, Illinois. (2005).
C. Shanahan.

"In this paper, the author describes characteristics of programs developed for adolescents who are struggling with literacy. The paper includes both a chart the author developed to compare and contrast those characteristics (Appendix A) and a review guide to help schools make principled decisions when

choosing programs for use with their students (Appendix B)." . . . Each identified program has a chart showing: (a) publisher/author; (b) foci/goals; (c) targeted population; (d) theoretical premise and embedded assumptions; (e) main components; (f) required training to implement; (g) program length; (h) date created or published; (i) assessment components; (j) research basis; and (k) effectiveness data. Many of the programs are supplemental, although some are core programs developed for struggling students or programs that call for structural changes in the school program.

[Full text -- Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs](#)

[On the same page, see "A Closer Look at the Five Essential Components of Effective Reading Programs: A Review of Scientifically Based Reading Research for Teachers"]

Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners: A Discussion of Recent Research and Practice Literature in Relation to Nationwide Standards on Writing

The Education Alliance at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. (2005)

C. Panofsky, M. Pacheco, S. Smith, J. Santos, C. Fogelman, M. Harrington, & E. Kenney.

"English language learners in U.S. middle and high schools face significant challenges from state writing assessments, and data suggest that they do not fare well. This report looks at writing standards for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and identifies six major topics and themes in the standards. The report (a) reviews research and practice literature focused on adolescents and second language learning and writing; (b) examines key issues in writing instruction for adolescent ELLs; (c) connects the existing knowledge base to the standards; and (d) recommends further research to improve the ability of ELLs to meet writing standards."

[Full text -- Approaches to Writing Instruction](#)

Assisting Students Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades -- IES Practice Guide

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2009).

R. Gersten (Panel Chair), D. Compton, C. M. Connor, J. Dimino, L. Santoro, S. Linan-Thompson, & W. D. Tilly.

"This guide offers five specific recommendations to help educators identify struggling readers and implement evidence-based strategies to promote their reading achievement. Teachers and reading specialists can utilize these strategies to implement RtI and multi-tier intervention methods and frameworks at the classroom or school level. Recommendations cover how to screen students for reading problems, design a multi-tier intervention program, adjust instruction to help struggling readers, and monitor student progress. . . . The recommendations reflect not only the panel's expertise and experience but the findings of rigorous studies of interventions to promote reading achievement. Each recommendation received a rating that describes the strength of the research evidence that has shown its effectiveness."

[Full text -- Assisting Students Struggling with Reading](#)

[Also see -- Doing What Works: RTI in Primary Grade Reading](#)

Beyond the Basics: Effective Reading Programs for the Upper Elementary Grades

Best Evidence Encyclopedia, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland (2009).
R. E. Slavin, C. Lake, A. Cheung, & S. Davis.

"This article systematically reviews research on the achievement outcomes of three types of classroom approaches to improving the reading achievement of students in grades 2-5: (a) reading curricula, (b) computer-assisted instruction (CAI), and (c) instructional process programs. Study inclusion criteria included use of randomized or matched control groups, study duration of at least 12 weeks, and use of valid achievement measures that were independent of the experimental treatments. A total of 80 studies met these criteria. The review concludes that programs designed to change daily teaching practices have substantially greater research support than those that focus on curriculum or technology alone. In particular, positive achievement effects were found for cooperative learning programs and for structured, phonetic curricula combined with instructional process approaches. The effective approaches provided extensive professional development intended to significantly affect teaching practices. In contrast, studies of reading textbooks and of computer-assisted instruction found small effects on reading outcomes." Program ratings are included at this site.

[Upper Elementary Reading -- Summary, Key Findings, Program Ratings](#)
[Click on "Full Report" for the full text of *Beyond the Basics*]

CELLreviews (early literacy)

Center for Early Literacy Learning (CELL), Orelena Hawks Puckett Institute, Asheville, North Carolina. (Continuing Collection).

"The goal of the Center for Early Literacy Learning is to promote the adoption and sustained use of evidence-based early literacy learning practices. This site has resources for early childhood intervention practitioners, parents, and other caregivers of children, birth to five years of age, with identified disabilities, developmental delays, and those at-risk for poor outcomes. . . . CELLreviews are practice-based research synthesis of early literacy studies."

[Full texts -- CELLreviews](#)

Closing the Reading Gap: Findings from a Random Trial of Four Reading Interventions for Striving Readers. Volume II of the National Assessment of Title I, Final Report

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2007).
Under a contract with the Corporation for the Advancement of Policy Evaluation, Princeton, New Jersey.
J. Torgesen, A. Schirm, L. Castner, S. Vartivarian, W. Mansfield, D. Myers, F. Stancavage,
D. Durno, R. Jovorsky, & C. Haan.

"Volume II presents a report on follow-up findings from *Closing the Reading Gap*, an evaluation of the impact of supplemental remedial reading programs on achievement of 3rd and 5th grade students. (The authors) initiated an evaluation of either parts or all of four widely used programs for elementary school students with reading problems. The programs are (a) Corrective Reading, (b) Failure Free Reading, (c) Spell Read Phonological Auditory Training (P.A.T.), and (d) Wilson Reading, all of which are expected to be more intensive and skillfully delivered than the programs typically provided in public schools. The programs incorporate explicit and systematic instruction in the basic reading skills in which struggling

readers are frequently deficient. . . . Conducted just outside Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit, the evaluation has explored the extent to which the four reading programs can affect both the word-level reading skills (phonemic decoding, fluency, accuracy) and reading comprehension of students in grades three and five who were identified as struggling readers by their teachers and by low test scores. Ultimately, it provides educators with rigorous evidence of what could happen in terms of reading improvement if intensive, small-group reading programs like the ones in this study were introduced in many schools."

[Full text – National Assessment of Title I: Final Report](#)

[Full text of Volume II – Closing the Reading Gap \(the source of the above information\)](#)

[Summary of Key Findings -- National Assessment of Title I Final Report](#)

[See the Summary of Key Findings for an overview of reading outcomes (Impact Studies, pages 21-31).]

Developing Early Literacy -- Report of the National Early Literacy Panel: A Scientific Synthesis of Early Literacy Development and Implications for Intervention

National Institute for Literacy, Washington DC, in consultation with the Partnership for Reading and National Center for Family Literacy. (2008).

T. Shanahan (Chair), A. Cunningham, K. C. Escamilla, J. Fischel, S. Landry, C. J. Lonigan, V. J. Molfese, C. Schatschneider, & D. Strickland.

"The National Early Literacy Panel (NELP) was established for the express purpose of summarizing scientific evidence on early literacy development and on home and family influences on that development. . . . Toward that end, the panel posed the following questions: (a) What are the skills and abilities of young children (birth through five years or kindergarten) that predict later reading, writing, or spelling outcomes? (b) Which programs, interventions, or other instructional approaches or procedures have contributed to or inhibited gains in children's skills and abilities that are linked to later outcomes in reading, writing, or spelling? (c) What environments and settings have contributed to or inhibited gains in children's skills and abilities that are linked to later outcomes in reading, writing, or spelling?; and (d) What child characteristics have contributed to or inhibited gains in children's skills and abilities that are linked to later outcomes in reading, writing or spelling? . . . Search procedures yielded more than 8,000 potential articles that were screened to determine their relevance to the research questions and their consistency with all selection criteria established by the panel. This led to the identification of approximately 500 research articles that were used in meta-analysis conducted by the panel. The meta-analysis summarizes both correlational data showing the relationships between children's early abilities and skills and later literacy development and experimental data that showed the impact of instructional interventions on children's learning."

[Full text -- Developing Early Literacy](#)

Effective Beginning Reading Programs

Best Evidence Encyclopedia, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland (2009).

R. E. Slavin, C. Lake, B. Cheung, & S. Davis.

"This article systematically reviews research on the achievement outcomes of four types of approaches to improving the beginning reading success of children in kindergarten and first grade: (a) reading curricula, (b) instructional technology, (c) instructional process programs, and (d) combinations of

curricula and instructional process. Study inclusion criteria included use of randomized or matched control groups, a study duration of at least 12 weeks, valid achievement measures independent of the experimental treatments, and a final assessment at the end of grade 1 or later. A total of 63 studies met these criteria. The review concludes that instructional process programs designed to change daily teaching practices have substantially greater research support than programs that focus on curriculum or technology alone. In particular, positive achievement effects were found for Success for All, PALS, phonological awareness training, and other programs focused on professional development." Program ratings are included at this site – strong evidence, moderate evidence, and limited evidence.

[Beginning Reading -- Summary, Key Findings, and Program Ratings](#)

[Click at the right for the full report]

Effective Instruction for Adolescent Struggling Readers, Second Edition

Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2010).

"This suite of resources developed by the Center on Instruction has two purposes. First, it is designed to guide the delivery of instruction for adolescent struggling readers, particularly secondary interventions in the general education context. Second, it seeks to deepen technical assistance providers' knowledge of reading-related issues for adolescents with reading difficulties and learning disabilities and enrich providers' work with SEAs and LEAs. Detailing selected research-based instructional practices associated with positive effects for adolescent struggling readers, the suite comprises (a) a meta-analysis, (b) a practice brief, (c) a professional development module, and (d) training of trainers materials."

[To access all components – Effective Instruction for Adolescent Struggling Readers](#)

Effective Programs for Struggling Readers: A Best Evidence Synthesis

Best Evidence Encyclopedia, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland (2009).

R. E. Slavin & C. Lake.

"This review summarizes evidence on six types of programs designed to improve the reading achievement of children having difficulty in learning to read: (a) one-to-one tutoring by teachers; (b) one-to-one tutoring by paraprofessionals and volunteers; (c) small group tutorials; (d) classroom instructional process approaches; (e) classroom instructional process programs with tutoring; and (f) instructional technology. . . . The reviews selected for inclusion in the Best Evidence Encyclopedia are meta-analyses or other quantitative syntheses that apply consistent, scientific standards to bodies of evidence that both meet high standards of methodological quality and evaluate realistic implementations of programs currently available to educators." Program ratings are included: (a) strong evidence of effectiveness; (b) moderate evidence; and (c) limited evidence.

[Programs for Struggling Readers: Summary, Key Findings, and Program Ratings](#)

[Click on "Full Report" for the entire paper]

Effective Reading Interventions for Kids With Learning Disabilities

LD Online. (2009). K. Stanberry & L. Swanson.

"Over the past 30 years, a great deal of research has been done to identify the most effective reading interventions for students with learning disabilities who struggle with word recognition and/or reading comprehension skills. Between 1996 and 1998, a group of researchers led by H. Lee Swanson, Ph.D., Professor of Educational Psychology at the University of California at Riverside, set out to synthesize (via

meta-analysis) the results of 92 such research studies (all of them scientifically-based). Through that analysis, Dr. Swanson identified the specific teaching methods and instruction components that proved most effective for increasing word recognition and reading comprehension skills in children and teens with LD." This article summarizes and explains Dr. Swanson's research findings. It also offers "practical tips for using the research findings to 'size up' a particular reading program."

[Full text -- Effective Reading Interventions](#)

Effective Reading Programs for Middle and High Schools: A Best Evidence Synthesis

Best Evidence Encyclopedia, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland (2009).

R. E. Slavin, A. Cheung, C. Groff, & C. Lake.

"This article systematically reviews research on the achievement outcomes of four types of approaches to improving the reading of middle and high school students: (a) reading curricula, (b) mixed-method models (methods that combine large and small-group instruction with computer activities), (c) computer-assisted instruction, and (d) instructional-process programs (methods that focus on providing teachers with extensive professional development to implement specific instructional methods). Criteria for inclusion in the study were use of randomized or matched control groups, a study duration of at least 12 weeks, and valid achievement measures that were independent of the experimental treatments. A total of 33 studies met these criteria. The review concludes that programs designed to change daily teaching practices have substantially greater research support than those focused on curriculum or technology alone. Positive achievement effects were found for instructional-process programs, especially for those involving cooperative learning, and for mixed-method programs. The effective approaches provided extensive professional development and significantly affected teaching practices. In contrast, no studies of reading curricula met the inclusion criteria, and the effects of supplementary computer-assisted instruction were small." Program ratings are included at this site – strong evidence, moderate evidence, and limited evidence.

[Middle/High School Reading: Summary, Key Findings, Program Ratings](#)

[Click on "Full Report" for the entire paper]

Effectiveness of Selected Supplemental Reading Comprehension Interventions: Findings from Two Student Cohorts

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2010).

Under a contract with Mathematica Policy Research Inc, Princeton, New Jersey.

S. James-Burdumy, J. Deke, J. Lugo-Gil, N. Carey, A. Hershey, R. Gersten, R. Newman-Gonchar, J. Dimino, K. Hammond, & B. Faddis.

The Institute of Education Sciences "has undertaken a rigorous evaluation of curricula designed to improve reading comprehension. . . . The study was conducted based on a rigorous experimental design for assessing the effects of four reading comprehension curricula on reading comprehension in selected districts across the country, where schools were randomly assigned to use one of the four treatment curricula in their fifth-grade classrooms or to a control group. The four reading curricula included in the study are (a) Project CRISS, developed by CRISS; (b) ReadAbout, developed by Scholastic; (c) Read for Real, developed by Chapman University and Zaner-Bloser; and (d) Reading for Knowledge, developed by the Success for All Foundation. . . . The study's first report -- based on the first-year of data collected in 2006-2007 for the first cohort of fifth-grade students was released in 2009. . . . This report focuses on the impact of the intervention on Cohort 2 fifth graders after one school year of implementation and the

impact of the interventions on Cohort 1 sixth graders one year after the end of the intervention implementation. . . . Findings do not support the hypothesis that these four supplemental reading comprehension curricula improve students' reading comprehension -- except when ReadAbout teachers have had one prior year of experience using the ReadAbout curriculum."

[Full text -- Supplemental Reading Comprehension Interventions: Findings from Two Cohorts](#)

[Full text -- The first phase of the study \(Impacts on a First Cohort of Fifth-Grade Students\)](#)

Effects of Educational Technology Applications on Reading Outcomes of Struggling Readers: A Best Evidence Synthesis

Best Evidence Encyclopedia, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. (2012).

A. Cheung & R. E. Slavin.

"This review examines the effectiveness of educational technology applications in improving the reading achievement of struggling readers in elementary schools. The review applies consistent inclusion standards to focus on studies that met high methodological standards. A total of 20 studies based on about 7,000 students in grades K–6 were included in the final analysis. Four major categories of education technology are reviewed: (a) small-group integrated applications, such as the Lindamood Phoneme Sequence Program and Read, Write, and Type; (b) comprehensive models, including READ 180 and Read About; (c) supplemental CAI programs, such as Destination Reading, Plato Focus, Waterford, and WICAT; and the FastForWord program."

[Full text – Effects of Educational Technology Applications](#)

[Click at the right]

[Also see – The Effectiveness of Educational Technology Applications for Enhancing Reading Achievement in K-12 Classrooms: A Meta-Analysis](#)

Evidence-Based Decisionmaking: Assessing Reading Across the Curriculum Interventions

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2007).

Under contract with the Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast at the SERVE Center, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

K. Lewis, W. McColskey, K. Anderson, T. Bowling, K. Dufford-Melendex, & L. Wynn.

Interventions described in this report "were selected for analysis in a three-phase process. The first phase involved gathering information from southeast region state education agencies and documents on their initiatives in adolescent literacy. . . . The second phase was a search for professional development or teacher-support interventions designed to help content-area teachers increase their attention to reading. . . . The third phase involved a search for evaluation reports and studies on seven identified interventions so that the extent of the evidence base on effectiveness could be described." The interventions discussed in the report are: (a) ReadAbout; (b) Reading in the Content Areas; (c) Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI); (d) Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies (CRISS); (e) Reading Apprenticeship (f) Literacy First; and (g) Strategic Instruction Model—Content Literacy Continuum (SIM-CLC).

[Full text – Evidence-Based Decisionmaking](#)

Extensive Reading Interventions in Grades K-3: From Research to Practice

Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2007).

N. Scammacca, S. Vaughn, G. Roberts, J. Warzek, & J. K. Torgesen.

This report "summarizes relevant high-quality research studies and synthesizes their findings on the effects of extensive reading interventions (comprising at least 100 instructional sessions) and related implications for practice for students with reading problems or learning disabilities in an RTI setting. . . . Studies for this synthesis were located by searching electronic databases, perusing reference lists of prior syntheses on related topics, and researching citations to assure a comprehensive pool of eligible studies. Interventions were included in this synthesis if they met a set of criteria (that are shown on page 5 in the manuscript). . . . A total of 12 studies reported in 13 publications were found that meet the criteria. They were implemented in ways that shared many similar procedures. . . . For each study, (this paper) provides a brief synopsis of the research design, methodology, nature of the intervention, and results." Effect sizes, calculated as a measure of the effectiveness of the interventions, are reported in Table 3, page 66.

[Full text -- Extensive Reading Interventions](#)

Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices -- IES Practice Guide

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2008).

M. L. Kamil (Panel Chair), G. D. Borman, J. Dole, C. C. Kral, T. Salinger, & J. Torgesen.

"The goal of this practice guide is to present specific and coherent evidence-based recommendations that educators can use to improve literacy levels among adolescents in upper elementary, middle, and high schools. . . . A unique feature of practice guides is the explicit and clear delineation of the quality -- as well as the quantity -- of evidence that supports each claim." A level of evidence is shown for each recommendation.

[Full text -- Improving Adolescent Literacy](#)

[Also see -- Doing What Works: Adolescent Literacy](#)

Improving Reading Comprehension in Kindergarten Through 3rd Grade: IES Practice Guide

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2010).

T. Shanahan (Panel Chair), K. Callison, C. Carriere, N. K. Duke, P. D. Pearson, C. Schatschneider & J. Torgesen.

"This guide recommends five specific steps that teachers, reading coaches, and principals can take to successfully improve reading comprehension for young readers. . . . The level of evidence assigned to each recommendation in this practice guide represents the panel's judgment of the quality of the existing research to support a claim that when these practices were implemented in past research, positive effects were observed on student outcomes.

[Full text -- Improving Reading Comprehension in K-3](#)

[Also see -- Doing What Works: Improving K-3 Reading Comprehension](#)

Interventions for Adolescent Struggling Readers: A Meta-Analysis with Implications for Practice

Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2007).
N. Scammacca, G. Roberts, S. Vaughn, M. Edmonds, J. Wexler, C. K. Reutebuch, & J. K. Torgesen.

"Studies for the meta-analysis were located by searching electronic databases, by perusing reference lists of prior syntheses on related topics, and by researching citations to assure a comprehensive pool of eligible studies. To be included in the meta-analysis, studies had to have: (a) been published between 1980 and 2006; (b) included only students who were English-speaking struggling readers in grades 4-12 (or disaggregated data provided for this group of participants if other types of students participated in the study; only data for these students were included in the meta-analysis); (c) consisted of an intervention focused on word study, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension strategies, or multiple components of reading instruction; (d) used a multiple-group experimental or quasi-experimental design (treatment-comparison or comparison of multiple treatments); (e) reported data for at least one dependent measure that assessed reading or reading-related variables; and (f) reported sufficient data to allow for the computation of an effect size and a measure of standard error. . . . Results of this meta-analysis provide guidance for intervening with adolescent struggling readers, outlining major implications for practice. The report focuses on interventions designed to improve students' use of reading comprehension strategies. It also considers the impact of interventions that target improved reading vocabulary, accurate decoding of unfamiliar words in text, and increased reading fluency."

[Full text -- Interventions for Adolescent Struggling Readers](#)

Key Characteristics of Effective Adolescent Literacy Programs: Research Brief

Minority Student Achievement Network (MASN), Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison. (2010). R. Lander.

"This research brief draws on relevant literature and rigorous research to describe a set of key characteristics found to be effective in designing adolescent literacy programs, with a focus on improving reading abilities for struggling readers. It aims to frame a mindset to use when designing, selecting and implementing adolescent literacy programs. Specifically, it describes a vision of embedding the social and cultural nature of both adolescents and of literacy into well-coordinated, balanced programs that are inspirational and effective. The purpose is not to evaluate or recommend specific programs, but rather to set forth criteria from which district leaders can make decisions about how to judge, select, and reflect upon programs for their schools and districts."

[Full text – Key Characteristics of Effective Adolescent Literacy Programs](#)

Literacy Publications and Resources

What Works Clearinghouse, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
(Continuing Collection).

"The What Works Clearinghouse offers a range of reports that evaluate literacy interventions and instructional strategies for beginning readers in grades K-3 and adolescents in grades 4-12. These interventions and strategies are intended to increase skills in (a) alphabets, (b) early reading/writing, (c) print knowledge, (d) reading achievement, (e) reading fluency, (f) reading comprehension, and (g) writing assessment. The What Works Clearinghouse assesses the rigor of research evidence on the effectiveness of interventions (programs, products, practices, and policies), giving educators the tools to

make informed decisions.” Contents cover Intervention Reports, Single Study Reviews, Practice Guides, Reference Resources, and Multimedia.

[Full texts – Literacy Publications and Resources](#)

New Research on Oral Language, Text Difficulty and Writing: Literacy Research Update -- WebEx

Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2011).
B. Foorman.

“The Center on Instruction hosted a webinar January 20, 2011, in which Dr. Barbara Foorman of the Florida Center for Reading Research provided an overview of recent research in oral language, text difficulty, and writing, and the implications that the findings from the research have for improving reading outcomes. She also discussed the relationship of these topics to the Common Core Standards for English/Language Arts. The archived webinar is available. Also available for download is the PowerPoint presentation used during the webinar, with extensive speaker notes, which can be used as a professional development tool.”

[To access the WebEx and materials – Literacy Research Update](#)

Reading Comprehension Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities, 1995-2006: A Meta-Analysis (structured abstract)

Remedial and Special Education. (2010). S. Berkeley, T. E. Scruggs, & M. A. Mastropieri.
Structured abstract by the National Dissemination Center for Children with Disabilities.

“This meta-analysis of research conducted between 1995 and 2006 synthesizes findings of 40 studies for improving the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities. Nearly 2,000 students participated in the interventions, which were classified as fundamental reading instruction, text enhancements, and questioning/strategy instruction (including those that incorporated peer-mediated instruction and self-regulation). Mean weighted effect sizes were calculated for criterion-referenced measures (0.69 for treatment effects, 0.69 for maintenance effects, and 0.75 for generalization effects) and for norm-referenced tests (0.52 for treatment effects). These outcomes were somewhat lower than, but generally consistent with, the results of previous meta-analyses, which showed that reading comprehension interventions are generally very effective. Higher outcomes were noted for interventions that were implemented by researchers than those implemented by teachers. Implications for practice and further research are discussed.”

[Full text – Reading Comprehension Instruction](#)

Research-Based Practices for Creating Access to the General Curriculum in Reading and Literacy for Students with Significant Intellectual Disabilities

Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington DC. (2009).
K. Erickson, G. Hanser, P. Hatch, & E. Sanders.

"The purpose of this monograph is to conduct a systematic review of the literature as it relates to literacy instruction for students with significant intellectual disabilities. The review describes the multiple components of comprehensive instruction (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, as well as writing and emergent literacy) and identifies research-based practices that address and support learning in each of these areas for students with significant

intellectual disabilities, including students with physical and/or sensory impairments. Specific attention is given to the use of assistive and instructional technologies to support literacy learning for students with significant intellectual disabilities. . . . The research had to (a) be published in peer-reviewed journals, dissertations, books, or book chapters between 2003 and 2009; (b) be based on a quantitative or qualitative design; (c) report on student outcomes related to one or more components of literacy; and (d) include at least one student between the ages of 3 and 21 with a significant intellectual disability." Findings from the National Reading Panel Report and the National Early Literacy Panel Report are also covered.

[Full text -- Research-Based Practices for Creating Access -- Reading and Literacy](#)

Supporting Struggling Writers Using Technology: Evidence-Based Instruction and Decision-Making

Special Education Assistive Technology (SEAT) Center, Illinois State University. (2007).

G. R. Peterson-Karlan & H. P. Parette.

Distributed by the Center for Technology in Education (CITEd).

"This report uses research-based findings to examine the effectiveness of technology in supporting writing by students with learning disabilities (LD) and academic disabilities. . . . Multiple searches were completed using the ERIC-OVID and PsycINFO electronic databases. . . . In addition, a hand search was conducted of 15 journals known to publish articles on the topic. . . . The resulting database contained more than 200 articles, including discussion articles, meta-analyses, research articles, and national reports. Only articles reporting research were used in the analysis of technology effectiveness. . . . (Although) more research is needed to establish a complete evidence base for many of the more promising tools, the evidence available most strongly supports the following practices: (a) planning and organization technologies, including outlining tools and draft templates, especially those that are genre specific and also have embedded content prompts and procedural facilitation cues; (b) transcription technologies, including both word processing (keyboarding) and word prediction; and (c) spell checkers, especially with text-to-speech output, as an editing technology."

[Full text -- Supporting Struggling Writers Using Technology](#)

[Click under Research Papers]

Synopsis of "Improving Comprehension of Expository Text in Students with Learning Disabilities: A Research Synthesis"

From the *Journal of Learning Disabilities* (2007). M. Gajra, A. K. Jitendra, S. Sood, & G. Sacks.

Summarized by the Center on Instruction, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2008).

This synopsis "discusses the results of a synthesis of 29 studies that addressed instructional approaches for enhancing reading comprehension and their implications for helping students with LD improve their reading comprehension in content-area instruction. The authors describe two main types of interventions: content enhancement and cognitive strategy instruction, both found to be highly effective in this population. This resource can facilitate the strengthening of reading and English/Language Arts instruction for implementation of the College & Career Ready Standards (including Common Core State Standards) and support broader school improvement efforts, including the implementation of School Improvement Grants (SIG), by facilitating the acceleration of reading instruction for adolescent struggling readers and students with disabilities."

[Full text of the Synopsis](#)

[For-purchase article from the Journal of Learning Disabilities](#)

Synopsis of “Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools”

S. Graham & D. Perin are authors of the original 2007 paper prepared for the Alliance for Excellent Education, Washington DC.

Summarized by the Center on Instruction, RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. (2008).

The authors of *Writing Next* compiled “a quantitative synthesis of the existing research on writing instruction, using the rigorous methodology of meta-analysis. Their results provide a foundation for selecting and implementing effective instructional methods. This synopsis of Graham and Perin’s meta-analysis summarizes their findings and describes implications for practice with a particular eye toward interventions that have been shown to be effective with low-achieving students or those with learning disabilities. . . . The synopsis identifies 11 instructional strategies, listed in decreasing order of effect size. Although writing has received less attention than reading, it is a critical aspect of literacy and one in which effective instructional techniques and intervention models are needed.”

[Full text of the synopsis and access to a related WebEx and PPT](#)

Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction

National Reading Panel. (2000). D. N. Langenberg, Chair.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services.

"This report is organized into sections to provide an overview of the major findings and determinations achieved by the National Reading Panel in the areas of (a) alphabets (phonemic awareness instruction and phonics instruction), (b) fluency; (c) comprehension (vocabulary instruction, text comprehension instruction, teacher preparation and comprehension strategies); (d) teacher education and reading instruction; and (e) computer technology and reading instruction. . . . The Panel developed and adopted a set of rigorous research methodological standards. (See the methodology adopted by the Panel and printed as an addendum to this Report.) These standards guided the screening of the research literature relevant to each topic area addressed by the Panel. This screening process identified a final set of experimental or quasi-experimental research studies that were then subjected to detailed analysis. The evidence-based methodological standards adopted by the Panel are essentially those normally used in research studies of the efficacy of interventions in psychological and medical research."

[Full text -- Teaching Children to Read](#)

Teaching Elementary School Students to Be Effective Writers: IES Practice Guide

Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2012).

S. Graham (Panel Chair), A. Bollinger, C. B. Olson, C. D’Aoust, C. MacArthur, D. McCutchen, & N. Olinghouse.

“This guide, developed by a panel of experts, presents four recommendations that educators can use to increase writing achievement for elementary students and help them succeed in school and society. These recommendations are based on the best available research evidence, as well as the combined experience and expertise of the panel members. This guide is intended for use by teachers, literacy coaches, and other educators. . . . Principals, districts, and curriculum developers may also find the guide useful.”

[Full text – Teaching Elementary Students to Be Effective Writers](#)

Teaching Reading Well: A Synthesis of the International Reading Association’s Research on Teacher Preparation (for reading instruction)

International Reading Association (IRA), Newark, Delaware. (2007).

“IRA completed a major programmatic study of the preparation of classroom teachers in reading through its National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction (IRA, 2003). The Commission specified the features that were common to eight excellent programs identified through a competitive application process (2001). IRA’s Teacher Education Task Force followed that research with a comprehensive review of the empirical literature in the area of teacher education in reading. The findings of these research efforts are synthesized in this document. Teacher educators from across the country can use the knowledge and insights generated from these investigations to spur reflection and to improve their teacher preparation programs in reading.”

[Full text – Teaching Reading Well](#)

The Effect of Family Literacy Interventions on Children’s Acquisition of Reading From Kindergarten to Grade 3: A Meta-Analytic Review

National Center for Family Literacy and the Partnership for Reading,
National Institute for Literacy. (2006).

In this review, "parent involvement in literacy acquisition was narrowly defined to include parent-child activities that focus on reading. Moreover, the 14 studies that were analyzed were those that included an intervention where researchers tested whether parent involvement enhanced children's literacy. Standard meta-analytic procedures were used to analyze the study outcomes. . . . The three types of parent involvement represented in the review differed in their effectiveness. Having parents teach specific literacy skills to their children was two times more effective than having parents listen to their children read and six times more effective than encouraging parents to read to their children. In the present review, providing supportive feedback to parents during the intervention did not alter effectiveness. Also, the duration of the intervention did not moderate its effectiveness. . . . Parent involvement had a positive impact from kindergarten to grade 3. In addition, the interventions were as effective for children experiencing reading difficulties as they were for normally-developing children. Finally, the socioeconomic level of the participating families did not affect the positive impact of the interventions.”

[Full text --The Effect of Family Literacy Interventions](#)

The Enhanced Reading Opportunities Study: Final Report -- The Impact of Supplemental Literacy Courses for Struggling Ninth-Grade Readers

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. (2010).

M. Somers, W. Corrin, S. Sepanik, T. Salinger, J. Levin, & C. Zmach with E. Wong.

“The U.S. Department of Education initiated the Enhanced Reading Opportunities (ERO) study — a demonstration and rigorous evaluation of supplemental literacy programs targeted to ninth- grade students whose reading skills are at least two years below grade level. As part of this demonstration, 34 high schools from 10 school districts implemented one of two reading interventions: (a) Reading Apprenticeship Academic Literacy (RAAL), designed by WestEd, and (b) Xtreme Reading, designed by the University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning. . . . This report — which is the final of three reports for this evaluation — examines the impact of the ERO programs on the more general outcomes that the programs hope to affect — students’ academic performance in high school (grade point average, credit accumulation, and state test scores) as well as students’ behavioral outcomes (attendance and disciplinary infractions). These academic and behavioral outcomes are examined during the year in which they were enrolled in the ERO programs (ninth grade), as well as the following school year (tenth grade for most students). Overall, the findings from these reports show that over the course of ninth grade, the ERO programs improved students’ reading comprehension skills and helped them perform better academically in their high school course work. However, these benefits did not persist in the following school year, when students were no longer receiving the supports provided by the ERO programs.” The two earlier ERO reports are also available.

[Full text and executive summary -- ERO Final Report, 2010](#)

[Second ERO report -- Findings from the Second Year of Implementation, 2008](#)

[First ERO report -- Early Impact and Implementation Findings, 2008](#)

What is the Development of Literacy the Development of?

Understanding Language, Stanford University School of Education, Stanford, California. (2012).

G. A. Hull & E. B. Moje.

“Research on literacy teaching and learning has often focused on the identification and support of cognitive processes and strategies in the reading of printed texts. Another line of literacy research has centered on understanding how contexts, learning environments, social interactions, cultural practices, and cultural tools inform and shape reading and writing — which are also conceived ever more broadly to include a range of technical platforms, modalities, and symbol systems. . . . (The authors) juxtapose relevant findings from socio-cultural research on literacy to the Common Core agenda, hoping to support the successful curricular and pedagogical implementation of the standards for all students, including ELLs, and simultaneously to broaden the conception of literacy, learning, and associated pedagogies that will constitute that implementation. In a nutshell, (they) suggest how literacy, rather than only being about the development of particular kinds of print-based skills, can helpfully be conceived as participation in a range of valued meaning-making practices, and that these practices are themselves nested within particular activity structures that index desired purposes, roles, and identities.”

[Full text – What is the Development of Literacy the Development Of?](#)

[A video is also available on this page]

Writing to Read: A Meta-Analysis of the Impact of Writing and Writing Instruction on Reading

Harvard Educational Review. (2011). S. Graham & M. Hebert.

“One potential means for improving students' reading is writing. In this meta-analysis of true and quasi-experiments, Graham and Herbert present evidence (a) that writing about material they have read improves students' comprehension of it; (b) that teaching students how to write improves their reading comprehension, reading fluency, and word reading; and (c) that increasing how much students write enhances their reading comprehension. These findings provide empirical support for long-standing beliefs about the power of writing to facilitate reading.”

[Abstract – Writing to Read](#)

[Full text for purchase]

[See the complete report on “Writing to Read” from the Carnegie Corporation of New York \(the basis for the above article\)](#)



This information is an attempt to gather wide-ranging information in one place, to convey what others have accomplished, and to make valuable resources readily accessible. Information is presented in the language of the developer, publisher, distributor, or author to the maximum possible extent. The National Implementation Research Network has no ownership of contents described in this library. Nor does NIRN make claims about any models, curricula, strategies, tools, products, or papers that are annotated. Links to evidence are provided, so that you can decide whether the evidence is convincing and the material is relevant to your context. Some collected reviews are developed and distributed by a U.S. Government agency. Otherwise, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of any U.S. Government agency, and no endorsement should be inferred.
