



TO: Dr. J. Brian Sarvis, Superintendent
FROM: Robin Sawaske, Associate Superintendent *RS*
Cynthia White, Director of Curriculum and Categorical Programs
DATE: November 6, 2009
RE: READ 180 Update

The Board has requested frequent updates on the status of the implementation of READ 180.

Training

We have had four follow up training days.

Saturday, September 26 – READ 180 L-Book training, Instructional Assistant & Americorps training

Wednesday & Thursday, September 30-October 1 – Intensive training for teachers who did not attend the summer SB 472 training

Saturday, October 10 – How to use READ 180 Data Reports

Saturday, October 24 – System 44 training

District Professional Learning Community

Janet Gordon, Literacy Coach and Abby Vasquez, Curriculum Teacher on Special Assignment, hold monthly PLC meetings. The meetings address curriculum, data, strategy, and issues such as common grading practices.

Technology Challenges

We have had a number of issues with the software and technology. Attached is a report issued to us detailing the technical support provided to Santa Barbara School Districts between October 5th -16th from Scholastic (see attached).

Research

The What Works Clearinghouse issued a review of READ 180 the week of October 19th, 2009. The review met the Clearinghouse’s evidence standards, with reservations. It is important to note that READ 180, National Version was reviewed. SBSD adopted the California version of READ 180 which includes the L-Book, designed to support English Learner literacy, and System 44, which covers beginning reading strategies such as phonemic awareness, phonics and early comprehension strategies. These two critical components of the READ 180 suite of programs are new so they are not part of the studies cited in the review (see attached).

Adams Elementary School	Harding Elementary School	Peabody Charter School	Goleta Valley Junior High School	Dos Pueblos High School
Cesar Chavez Charter School	McKinley Elementary School	Roosevelt Elementary School	La Colina Junior High School	La Cuesta Continuation High School
Cleveland Elementary School	Monroe Elementary School	Santa Barbara Charter School	La Cumbre Junior High School	San Marcos High School
Franklin Elementary School	Open Alternative School	Santa Barbara Community Academy	Santa Barbara Junior High School	Santa Barbara High School
		Washington Elementary School		



**SBSD Technical Support Summary
Leland Collins
October 23, 2009**

General Information:

Two weeks were spent in Santa Barbara School District in order to trouble shoot the problems reported on the technology front. SBSB & Scholastic technicians (Karol & Davis) worked together with READ 180 and System 44.

The following issues were reported by teachers:

1. Recording problems in System 44 (several school sites)
-Fixed by patch.
2. Unable to get out of Success Zone in System 44 (several school sites)
-Fixed by patch.
3. Segment skipping in READ 180
-Scheduled to be a server side fix deployed in 2-3 weeks. Workstations will not need touched.
4. Performance / speed issues (San Marcos HS, Dos Pueblos HS, SBJHS, Cleveland)
-Corrected by network upgrades at all sites but Cleveland.
5. Trouble interfacing with other software programs including Carmen San Diego
-Karol King will be sending me screenshots of the specific error. From early research it actually looks like Carmen and Kid Pix are using much older QuickTime modules. Both of these applications are not officially supported on Mac OSX 10.5, which is what they are running on. Scholastic applications do utilize the latest version of QuickTime, so the conflict seems to reside there. We will need more time with this.
6. Problems with reports/printing data (all sites)
-Print preview is not working with some of the reports and teachers have to save the report to the desktop and then open it. This will be fixed in a server patch scheduled to be released in December or January.
7. Mac's cannot have parental control enabled. If they do System 44 will not work properly.
-This is a known issue with part of the needed application not showing up as a program to allow in parental control. We are working on creating a script to fix this.

Scholastic applied and tested a patch with strong student traffic. As a result, a vast majority of Scholastic related issues have been resolved. Additional patches will be applied at the hosted server level to resolve some reports/printing issues (December 2009) Recording issues were reduced to faulty headphones, connectivity, viruses, etc. Speed/performance issues have been resolved via internal district remedies. Several networks were upgraded by SBSB. READ 180 & System 44 are now stable & functioning at **ALL** sites.

Specific School status report:

Adams: Had an issue with the System 44 media being an older version. After applying the patch we observed student on the applications and caught this. All computers have now been corrected.

Cleveland: New patch applied, and tested. There are issues with viruses and spyware on the computers. The computers are running much slower here because of this. Karol King is aware of this and will be imaging the computers and locking them down. This school is also in need of a network upgrade. Class management may be contributing to problems. Students are not adequately supervised.

Franklin: Patch applied and tested. Printing issues for two of the three teachers is not a software issue, but a printer/driver issue. Karol King is aware of this and will fix it.

Harding: READ 180 school that was not reporting issues. We did not visit this site.

McKinley: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

Monroe: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

Roosevelt: We visited this site to investigate some of the conflicts READ 180 was having with other applications. The two suspects are Carmen SanDiego and Kid Pix. Both these application's support sites do not list OSX 10.5 as a supported operating system. Kid Pix also has issue without READ 180 installed. It is looking like a QuickTime version conflict, but we are still investigating.

SBCA: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

Washington: READ 180 school that was not reporting issues. We did not visit this site.

Goleta Valley JH: Applied patch, but kids reported recording issues. Re-visited site and found that the installer did not overwrite the previous version properly. This was isolated to the unique iMac model at this site. We were able to fix and test this and no other sites had this issue.

La Colina JH: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

SBJH: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

Dos Pueblos HS: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

San Marcos HS: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

SBHS: Patch applied and tested. No other issues reported.

What Works Clearinghouse



INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Adolescent Literacy

October 2009

READ 180

Program Description¹

READ 180 is a reading program designed for students in elementary through high school whose reading achievement is below the proficient level. The goal of *READ 180* is to address gaps in students' skills through the use of a computer program, literature, and direct instruction in reading skills. The software component of

the program aims to track and adapt to each student's progress. In addition to the computer program, the *READ 180* program includes workbooks designed to address reading comprehension skills, paperback books for independent reading, and audiobooks with corresponding CDs for modeled reading.

Research

No studies of *READ 180* that fall within the scope of the Adolescent Literacy (AL) review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards,² but seven studies meet WWC evidence standards with reservations. The seven studies included 10,638 students, ranging from grade 4 to grade 9, who attended elementary, middle, and high schools in Arizona, California, Florida, New York, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia.³

Based on these seven studies, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for *READ 180* on adolescent learners to be medium to large for comprehension and general literacy achievement. No studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations examined the effectiveness of *READ 180* on adolescent learners in the alphabetics or reading fluency domains.

Effectiveness

READ 180 was found to have potentially positive effects on comprehension and general literacy achievement for adolescent learners.

	Alphabetics	Reading fluency	Comprehension	General literacy achievement
Rating of effectiveness	na	na	Potentially positive effects	Potentially positive effects
Improvement index ⁴	na	na	Average: +4 percentile points	Average: +12 percentile points
	na	na	Range: -22 to +25 percentile points	Range: +3 to +17 percentile points

na = not applicable

1. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program's website (<http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/read180/overview/>, downloaded July 2009). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review.
2. The studies included in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 1.0 (see the WWC Standards).
3. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.
4. These numbers show the average and range of student-level improvement indices for all findings across the studies.

Additional program information

Developer and contact

Developed by the Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt University, the Orange County Literacy Project in Florida, and the development staff at Scholastic Inc., *READ 180* is distributed by Scholastic Inc. In 1985, research by Dr. Ted Hasselbring led to the creation of the software prototype for *READ 180*.

Address: 577 Broadway, New York, NY 10012. Email: spuccherella@scholastic.com (Suzanne Puccherella, Director, *READ 180*). Web: <http://www.scholastic.com/read180>. Telephone: (212) 965-7441.

Scope of use

Scholastic published the *READ 180* program in 1999. Since then, more than 10,000 classrooms in all 50 states have used *READ 180*.

Teaching

The *READ 180* instructional model is 90 minutes long and is composed of three parts: whole-group direct instruction, small-group rotations, and whole-group wrap-up. The 90-minute instructional model begins with 20 minutes of whole-group direct instruction, in which the teacher provides instruction in reading,

writing, and vocabulary to the entire class. This is followed by 20-minute rotations of smaller groups of students through three activities:

- small-group direct instruction, in which the teacher uses resource books and works closely with individual students
- students' independent use of the *READ 180* computer program to practice reading skills
- modeled and independent reading, in which students use *READ 180* paperbacks or audiobooks

Finally, the session ends with a 10-minute wrap-up discussion with the whole group. The goal of the *READ 180* software is to continually adjust the level of instruction based on student performance. Reports and periodic updates on student progress are intended to alert teachers to students' needs and direct them to resources for individualizing instruction.

Cost

READ 180 pricing depends on implementation.

Research

One hundred one studies reviewed by the WWC investigated the effects of *READ 180* on adolescent learners. Seven studies (Haslam, White, & Klinge, 2006; Interactive Inc., 2002; Lang, Torgesen, Petscher, Vogel, Chanter, & Lefsky, 2008; Scholastic Research, 2008; White, Haslam, & Hewes, 2006; White, Williams, & Haslem, 2006; Woods, 2007), one of which is a randomized controlled trial and six of which are quasi-experimental designs, meet WWC evidence standards with reservations.⁵ The remaining 94 studies do not meet either WWC evidence standards or eligibility screens.

5. During the period covered by the studies in this report, two versions of *READ 180* (version 1.6 and the Enterprise Edition) were available. The WWC was unable to obtain information about which version of *READ 180* was used in the studies included in this report.

Meets evidence standards with reservations

- Haslam, White, and Klinge (2006) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on struggling readers in grades 7 and 8 in the Austin Independent School District of Texas. Intervention students were matched with comparison-group students using a one-to-one propensity score matching method. The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons of the 307 students that received *READ 180* and the 307 comparison-group students that received the standard district curriculum. The

Research *(continued)*

study reported student outcomes after one year of program implementation.

- Interactive Inc. (2002) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on students in grades 6, 7, and 8 in three urban school districts in Texas and Ohio.⁶ The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons of the 52 control students and 119 students enrolled in *READ 180* in Columbus, the 142 control students and 101 students enrolled in *READ 180* in Dallas, and the 36 control students and 59 students enrolled in *READ 180* in Houston.⁷ The study reported student outcomes after one year of program implementation.
- Lang et al. (2008) conducted a randomized controlled trial of 1,265 struggling readers in seven high schools in Florida. Ninth-grade students who scored in the high-risk or moderate-risk categories on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) were randomly assigned to one of four groups (Appendix A1.3 provides more details about these groups). The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons of the 100 high-risk students who received *READ 180* and 90 high-risk students who were in the school-designed “business as usual” control group, as well as comparisons between 207 moderate-risk students who received *READ 180* and 202 moderate-risk students who were in the control group. The inability to determine whether differential attrition occurred and the use of multiple imputation of missing data led to the study’s rating of “meets standards with reservations.” The study reported student outcomes after one year of program implementation.
- Scholastic Research (2008) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on students in grades 6, 7, and 9 in California. *READ 180* students who scored at the

below-basic or basic performance level on the prior-year state reading test were matched to comparison-group students on the basis of reading scores and demographic characteristics. The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons of the 285 students that received *READ 180* and the 285 comparison-group students that received either the Holt Literature and Language Arts curriculum (grades 6 and 7) or the Prentice Hall Literature curriculum (grade 9). The study reported student outcomes after one year of program implementation.

- White, Haslam, and Hewes (2006) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on three cohorts of students in 12 schools in Arizona. *READ 180* students in grade 9 who were reading one or more grade levels below their assigned grade level were matched to comparison-group students with similar reading levels and demographic characteristics. The comparison-group students received the standard district curriculum. The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from three cohorts of students. Cohort 1 was formed in the 2003–04 school year and consisted of 826 students in grade 9 who received *READ 180* and 826 comparison-group students in grade 9 who did not receive *READ 180*. Cohort 2 was formed in the 2004–05 school year and consisted of 815 students in grade 9 who received *READ 180* and 815 comparison-group students in grade 9 who did not receive *READ 180*. Cohort 3 was formed in the 2005–06 school year and consisted of 1,029 students in grade 9 who received *READ 180* and 1,029 comparison students who did not receive *READ 180*. The study reported student outcomes after the first year of program implementation.
- White, Williams, and Haslem (2005) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on students in grades 4–8 in 16 schools in New York City. *READ 180* students’ test outcomes were compared to outcomes of their

6. The study was originally designed as a randomized controlled trial, but none of the districts ultimately followed through with the research design.

7. The intervention and comparison groups in the grade 7 sample in Houston were not shown to be equivalent at baseline, so they were excluded from the review.

Research (continued)

peers attending the same schools who did not receive *READ 180* but instead received the standard reading instruction in the 2001–02 school year. Comparisons were made between students with the same proficiency levels (1, 2, and 3)⁸ within each grade.⁹ The WWC based its effectiveness ratings on findings from comparisons between 362 students in the treatment group and 2,528 students in the control group, across grades 4, 6, and 8.¹⁰ The study reported student outcomes after one year of program implementation.

- Woods (2007) conducted a quasi-experiment that examined the effects of *READ 180* on three annual cohorts of students in an urban middle school in Virginia. Based on pretest scores and teacher recommendations, the school’s guidance counselor assigned students in grades 6–8 who needed additional literacy support to either the *READ 180* treatment group or the comparison group that would participate in the school’s traditional reading-remediation program. The WWC based its effectiveness

ratings on findings from comparisons of 58 middle-school students who received *READ 180* during the 2003–04 school year and 58 matched students who received the school’s traditional reading-remediation program.¹¹ The study reported student outcomes after the first year of program implementation.

Extent of evidence

The WWC categorizes the extent of evidence in each domain as small or medium to large (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix G). The extent of evidence takes into account the number of studies and the total sample size across the studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations.¹²

The WWC considers the extent of evidence for *READ 180* for adolescent learners to be medium to large for comprehension and medium to large for general literacy achievement. No studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations examined the effectiveness of *READ 180* for adolescent learners in the alphabetics or reading fluency domains.

Effectiveness Findings

The WWC review of interventions for AL addresses student outcomes in four domains: alphabetics, reading fluency, comprehension, and general literacy achievement. The studies included in this report cover two domains: comprehension and general

literacy achievement. Comprehension includes two constructs: reading comprehension and vocabulary development. The findings below present the authors’ estimates and WWC-calculated estimates of the size and the statistical significance of the effects of *READ 180* on adolescent learners.¹³

8. There were only two treatment students in proficiency level 4 across grades 4–8; therefore, proficiency level 4 was excluded from the review.
9. The sample sizes, means, and standard deviations that were used to calculate the intervention group values by grade and proficiency level were not reported in White, Williams, and Haslem (2005), but were provided to the WWC by the author.
10. The intervention and comparison groups at grade 5 (proficiency levels 1, 2, and 3) were not shown to be equivalent at baseline and were excluded from the review. In addition, there were no treatment students in the grade 7 analysis sample, so grade 7 students were excluded from the review.
11. The 2004–05 and 2005–06 student cohorts, though included in the study, do not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one *READ 180* teacher in the treatment condition in both cohorts. This information was not reported in Woods (2007), but was provided to the WWC by the author.
12. The extent of evidence categorization was developed to tell readers how much evidence was used to determine the intervention rating, focusing on the number and size of studies. Additional factors associated with a related concept—external validity, such as the students’ demographics and the types of settings in which studies took place—are not taken into account for the categorization. Information about how the extent of evidence rating was determined for *READ 180* is in Appendix A6.
13. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, where necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For an explanation, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. In the cases of Haslam, White, and Klinge (2006); Scholastic Research (2008); White, Haslam, and Hewes (2006); and Woods (2007), no corrections for clustering or multiple comparisons were needed. In the cases of Lang et al. (2008) and White, Williams, and Haslem (2005), corrections for multiple comparisons were needed, so the significance levels may differ from those reported in the original study. In the case of Interactive Inc. (2002), corrections for clustering and multiple comparisons were needed, so the significance levels may differ from those reported in the original study.

Effectiveness *(continued)*

Comprehension. Six studies reviewed findings in the comprehension domain. Haslam, White, and Klinge (2006) reported a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills Reading Test. The WWC found that the effect was not statistically significant or large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria. Interactive Inc. (2002) reported statistically significant effects of *READ 180* on the Stanford Achievement Test for the Columbus and Dallas school districts but did not report a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* in the Houston school district. According to WWC calculations, the Columbus and Dallas effects were not statistically significant, but the average effect size across the three sites was large enough to be considered substantively important (that is, an effect size of at least 0.25).¹⁴ Lang et al. (2008) reported, and the WWC confirmed, a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test for moderate-risk students. For high-risk students, the effect was not statistically significant or large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria. White, Haslam, and Hewes (2006) found, and the WWC confirmed, a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the Reading Comprehension subtest of the Stanford Achievement Test. White, Williams, and Haslem (2005) did not find a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the New York State English Language Arts Test for grades 4 or 8 or on the CTB/McGraw-Hill Reading Test for grade 6. The WWC-calculated average effect across these three grades and two tests was not statistically significant or large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria. Woods (2007) did not find a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the Degrees of Reading Power test. The effect also was not

statistically significant or large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

For the comprehension domain, two studies showed statistically significant positive effects, one study showed substantively important positive effects, and three studies showed indeterminate effects.

General literacy achievement. Two studies reviewed findings in the general literacy achievement domain. Scholastic Research (2008) reported, and the WWC confirmed, a statistically significant effect of *READ 180* on the English Language Arts subtest of the California Standards Test. White, Haslam, and Hewes (2006) reported a statistically significant positive effect of *READ 180* on the TerraNova Reading Test among cohort 2 and cohort 3 students. The WWC confirmed the statistically significant positive effect for cohort 2 students but found that the effect for cohort 3 students was not statistically significant or large enough to be considered substantively important according to the WWC criteria.

For the general literacy achievement domain, two studies showed statistically significant positive effects.

Rating of effectiveness

The WWC rates the effects of an intervention in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative. The rating of effectiveness takes into account four factors: the quality of the research design, the statistical significance of the findings, the size of the difference between participants in the intervention and the comparison conditions, and the consistency in findings across studies (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E).

improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and the percentile rank of the average student in the comparison condition. Unlike the rating of effectiveness, the improvement index is entirely based on the size of the effect, regardless of the statistical significance of the effect, the study

The WWC found *READ 180* to have potentially positive effects for comprehension and general literacy achievement for adolescent learners

Improvement index

The WWC computes an improvement index for each individual finding. In addition, within each outcome domain, the WWC computes an average improvement index for each study and an average improvement index across studies (see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix F). The

14. The WWC computes an average effect size as a simple average of the effect sizes across all individual findings within the study domain.

The WWC found *READ 180* to have potentially positive effects for comprehension and general literacy achievement for adolescent learners for adolescent learners
(continued)

design, or the analysis. The improvement index can take on values between -50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group. The average improvement index for comprehension is +4 percentile points across the six studies, with a range of -22 to +25 percentile points across findings. The average improvement index for general literacy achievement is +12 percentile points across the two studies, with a range of +3 to +17 percentile points across findings.

References

Meets WWC evidence standards with reservations

- Haslam, M. B., White, R. N., & Klinge, A. (2006). *Improving student literacy: READ 180 in the Austin Independent School District, 2004–05*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- Interactive Inc. (2002). *An efficacy study of READ 180, a print and electronic adaptive intervention program, grades 4 and above*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc.
- Lang, L. H., Torgesen, J. K., Petscher, Y., Vogel, W., Chanter, C., & Lefsky, E. (2008, March). *Exploring the relative effectiveness of reading interventions for high school students*. Paper presented at the annual research conference of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, Crystal City, VA.
- Scholastic Research. (2008). *Desert Sands Unified School District, CA*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc.
- White, R. N., Haslam, M. B., & Hewes, G. M. (2006). *Improving student literacy: READ 180 in the Phoenix Union High School District, 2003–04 and 2004–05*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- Additional source:**
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *READ 180: Longitudinal evaluation of a ninth-grade reading intervention (2003–2006)*. New York: Scholastic Inc.
- White, R. N., Williams, I. J., & Haslem, M. B. (2005). *Performance of District 23 students participating in Scholastic READ 180*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- Woods, D. E. (2007). *An investigation of the effects of a middle school reading intervention on school dropout rates*. Unpub-

Summary

The WWC reviewed 101 studies on *READ 180* for adolescent learners. Seven of these studies meet WWC evidence standards with reservations; the remaining 94 studies do not meet either WWC evidence standards or eligibility screens. Based on the seven studies, the WWC found potentially positive effects in comprehension and general literacy achievement for adolescent learners. The conclusions presented in this report may change as new research emerges.

lished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.

Studies that fall outside the Adolescent Literacy review protocol or do not meet WWC evidence standards

- Admon, N. (2003). *READ 180 stage C: An evaluation within the Federal Job Corps Program*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Aguhob, M. (2006). *READ 180 in Seminole County, Florida*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Aguhob, M. (2007). *READ 180 in Miami-Dade County, Florida, 2005–2006*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Rush, L. S. (2004). Literacy intervention programs at the middle and high school levels. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 210–227). New York: Guilford Press. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Banasik, B. (2002). *The effectiveness of Scholastic’s READ 180 curriculum in improving reading comprehension in middle school aged students having a specific learning disability*. Unpublished master’s thesis, Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

References (continued)

- Barbato, P. F. (2007). A preliminary evaluation of the *READ 180* program (Doctoral dissertation, Fairleigh Dickinson University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(11A), 46–4130. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Bebon, C. D. (2007). The impact of a reading program designed to increase comprehension and proficiency of middle school migrant students in a south Texas school district (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University–Kingsville, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(7A), 104–2877. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Benavidez-Candelaria, M. R. (2006). *An investigation of the program READ 180 and the effect it has on students' reading scores and students' grades*. Unpublished master's thesis, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Bishop-Temple, C. (2008). The effects of interactive read-alouds on the reading achievement of middle grade reading students in a core remedial program. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(10A), 4179. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Blasewitz, M. R., & Taylor, R. T. (1999). Attacking literacy with technology in an urban setting. *Middle School Journal*, 30(3), 33–39. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Brennan, T., Leuer, M., Boyer, D., Dalessi, M., Newman, D., & Yepes-Baraya, M. (2006). *Rhetoric to reality: Addressing reading achievement in secondary education*. Palo Alto, CA: Empirical Education. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Brown, L. (2006). *The impact of self-perception, reading attitude, and the use of the READ 180 program on reading achievement*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gwynedd-Mercy College, Gwynedd Valley, PA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Brown, S. H. (2006). The effectiveness of the *READ 180* intervention for struggling readers in grades 6–8 (Doctoral dissertation, Union University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(8A), 246–2922. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Caggiano, J. A. (2007). Addressing the learning needs of struggling adolescent readers: The impact of a reading intervention program on students in a middle school setting (Doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(4A), 1383. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.
- Campbell, Y. C. (2006). Effects of an integrated learning system on the reading achievement of middle school students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(8A), 100–2923. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Chmielewski, T. (2005). *Differentiating reading instruction in an alternative high school using READ 180*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Denman, J. S. (2004). Integrating technology into the reading curriculum: Acquisition, implementation, and evaluation of a reading program with a technology component (*READ 180*) for struggling readers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(5A), 1717. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.

References (continued)

- Deshler, D. D., Palincsar, A. S., Biancarosa, G., & Nair, M. (2007). *Informed choices for struggling adolescent readers: A research-based guide to instructional programs and practices*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Dunn, C. A. (2002). *An investigation of the effects of computer assisted reading instruction versus traditional reading instruction on selected high school freshmen*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, IL. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.
- Dynarski, M., Agodini, R., Heaviside, S., Novak, T., Carey, N., Campuzano, L., et al. (2007). *Effectiveness of reading and mathematics software products: Findings from the first student cohort*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the effects are not reported separately for the intervention.
- Felty, R. L. (2008). *READ 180 implementation: Reading achievement and motivation to read within an alternative education middle school program* (Doctoral dissertation, Immaculata College, 2008). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(1A), 182–161. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Ferguson, J. M. (2005). *The implementation of technology in reading classrooms and the impact of technology integration and student perceptions on reading achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University–Commerce. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Gentry, L. (2006). *An evaluation of READ 180 in an urban secondary school* (Doctoral dissertation, American University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(9A), 151–3346. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the overall attrition rate exceeds WWC standards for this area.
- Goodloe-Johnson, M. L., McGinley, N. J., Rose, J. S., & Kokkins, A. (2006). *Implementation of READ 180 (reading intervention program) in CCSD schools*, Brief No. 06-Brief 014. Charleston, SC: Charleston County School District Department of Assessment and Accountability. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Hasselbring, T. S., & Goin, L. I. (2004). Literacy instruction for older struggling readers: What is the role of technology? *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 20(2), 123–144. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Hasselbring, T. S., Goin, L. I., Taylor, R., Bottge, B., & Daley, P. (1997). The computer doesn't embarrass me. *Educational Leadership*, 55(3), 30–33. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Hewes, G. M., Palmer, N., Haslam, M. B., & Mielke, M. B. (2006). *Five years of READ 180 in Des Moines: Improving literacy among middle school and high school special education students*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Holyoke Public Schools. (2006). *READ 180 overview*. Holyoke, MA: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Iwamiya, C., & Pritchard, R. (2005). *Application and effects of Scholastic's READ 180 as an after-school reading intervention program for English language learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Knutson, K. A. (2006). *Because you can't wait until spring: Using the SRI to improve reading performance*. New York, NY:

References *(continued)*

- Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Kratofil, M. D. (2006). A comparison of the effect of Scholastic *READ 180* and traditional reading interventions on the reading achievement of middle school low-level readers (Master's thesis, University of Central Missouri, 2006). *Master's Abstracts International*, 44(6), 52–2531. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Lupino, E. (2005). Taking place: The teacher in reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(1), 4. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Moore, S. A. (2007). *Impact of READ 180 on reader's lexile scores in grades three through five*. Unpublished master's thesis, Troy University, Troy, AL. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Nave, J. (2007). An assessment of *READ 180* regarding its association with the academic achievement of at-risk students in Sevier County schools (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(6A), 2265. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.
- Palmer, N. (2003). *READ 180 middle-school study: Des Moines, Iowa, 2000–2002: An evaluation of READ 180 with special education students*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Papalewis, R. (2002). *A study of the intensive academic support program and READ 180 in the Los Angeles Unified School District*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Additional source:**
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Struggling middle school readers: Successful, accelerating intervention. *Reading Improvement*, 41(1), 24–37.
- Papalewis, R. (2003). *A study of READ 180 in middle schools in Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Pearson, L. M., & White, R. N. (2004). *Study of the impact of READ 180 on student performance in Fairfax County Public Schools*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Santa Rosa County School District. (n.d.). *READ 180 update: Santa Rosa County School District*. Santa Rosa, FL: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (2005). *READ 180 implementation year study*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Blackhawk Middle School*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Carthage Central School District*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Glendale Union High School District*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Indian River School District*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Madison Middle School*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Martin Luther King Elementary School*. New York, NY: Author. The study is

References (continued)

- ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Sebastopol Attendance Center*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Socorro Independent School District, TX*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Westwood Middle School, Alachua County Public Schools, Gainesville, Florida*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *A study of READ 180 stages A and B in upper elementary and middle schools in Iredell-Statesville Schools, North Carolina*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Calera Elementary School, Calera, Alabama*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Carter Junior High School, Arlington, Texas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Harding Senior High School, St. Paul, Minnesota*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Highview Elementary School, Nanuet, New York*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Holmes Middle School, Alexandria, Virginia*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Lufkin High School, Lufkin, Texas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Marshall Middle School, Beaumont, Texas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Miami Lakes Educational Center, Miami Lakes, Florida*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Raba Elementary School, San Antonio, Texas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *READ 180: Compilation of school studies: Impact study. READ 180 reports guide: Using data to drive instruction* (pp. 80). New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Rochester Elementary School, Rochester, Pennsylvania*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Rogers Middle School, Boston, Massachusetts*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *South Ocean Middle School, Patchogue, New York*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Transitional Resource Education Center, Kansas City, Kansas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

References (continued)

- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Two Eagle River School, Pablo, Montana*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Washington Middle School, Kenosha, Wisconsin*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2003). *Wyandotte County Juvenile Center, Kansas City, Kansas*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2004). *A study of READ 180 at Shiprock High School in Central Consolidated School District on the Navajo Indian Reservation, New Mexico*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2006). *Compendium of READ 180 research*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2006). *READ 180: A heritage of research*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2007). *Department of Defense Education Activity Schools (DoDEA)*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine an intervention implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2007). *Phoenix College, AZ*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample within the age or grade range specified in the review protocol.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *Compendium of READ 180 research*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *Martin County Public Schools, FL*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *Peoria Public School District 150, IL*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *Socorro Independent School District, TX*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (2008). *Traverse City Area Public Schools, MI*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (n.d.). *New York City Public Schools, region 8 (third grade)*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation. (n.d.). *READ 180 stage B: St. Paul School District, Minnesota*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic Research and Validation & Indian River School District. (2006). *Special education students, Selbyville Middle and Sussex Central Middle Schools, Indian River School District (Delaware)*. New York, NY: Scholastic Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Shanahan, C. (2005). *Adolescent literacy intervention programs: Chart and program review guide*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates/North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.

References *(continued)*

- Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective reading programs for middle and high schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3), 290–322. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Soto, J. (2004). *The effects of READ 180 on the reading fluency of fifth grade students*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, San Marcos. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Sousa, D. A. (2005). *How the brain learns to read*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Thomas, D. M. (2005). Examining the academic and motivational outcomes of students participating in the *READ 180* program. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(1A), 96–112. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Thomas, J. (2003). *Reading program evaluation: READ 180, grades 4–8, November, 2003*. Kirkwood, MO: Kirkwood School District. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Thompson, L. T. (2005). *READ 180: An English language learner intervention strategy with grades 6–8*. Unpublished master's thesis, Alabama A&M University, Normal. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the review protocol.
- Thorpe, P. K. (2003). *Escher's intersecting worlds: Evaluation as a reflection of the evaluation, the evaluator being reflected in the evaluation*. Wichita, KS: Wichita Public Schools. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Visher, M., & Hartry, A. (2007). *Can after-school programs boost academic achievement? An impact evaluation of a reading intervention in an after-school program*. Washington, DC: MPR Associates, Inc. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it does not provide adequate information to determine whether it uses an outcome that is valid or reliable.
- Wahl, M. (2008). *READ 180 Enterprise Edition*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Center for Reading Research. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention.
- White, L. M. (2007). A middle school under review: A study on the effectiveness of two implementation models of the *READ 180* program on special education students' reading performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(1A), 63–117. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Witkowski, P. M. (2004). A comparison study of two intervention programs for reading-delayed high school students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri–Saint Louis, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(6A), 163–2142. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Zapata, J. M. (2007). *If I can read, I can learn: Examining the effects of READ 180 on the reading comprehension of English language learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, San Marcos. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the review protocol.
- Zvoch, K., & Letourneau, L. (2006). *Closing the achievement gap: An examination of the status and growth of ninth grade READ 180 students*. Las Vegas, NV: Clark County School District. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.