AN EVIDENCE-PROVEN APPROACH TO SUCCEED

WHAT WORKS CLEARINGHOUSE: READING RECOVERY WORKS

The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), an initiative of USDE’s Institute of Education Sciences, is a central, trusted source of information for school decision makers. Established in 2002, WWC reviews and assesses research evidence for educational programs, products, practices, and policies.

The WWC publishes intervention reports that assess research on beginning reading curricula and instructional strategies for students from kindergarten through third grade. To date, WWC has reviewed research studies for more than 228 programs in the beginning reading (K-3) domain. Only 56 of those programs had evidence of positive or potentially positive effects on at least one outcome measure.

The WWC translates effect sizes from research into an improvement index to reflect the change in a student’s percentile rank that can be expected if the student receives the intervention. Administrators use these index ratings to make informed decisions while selecting the right programs for their schools and districts.

READING RECOVERY’S EVIDENCE

Reading Recovery achieved strong results, receiving positive or potentially positive ratings across all four outcomes – alphabetics (phonics and phonemic awareness), fluency, comprehension, and reading achievement. Among programs reviewed, Reading Recovery received the highest improvement index in reading achievement and fluency.*

The following page shows the improvement index scores and effectiveness ratings for WWC’s top 25 programs with beginning reading reports. Reading Recovery has large and significant improvement index scores in all four domains.

*These ratings include the addition of the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) single study review of the four-year i3 scale-up report. The study has not yet been incorporated into the Reading Recovery beginning reading intervention report, last updated in 2013. Ratings were calculated following procedures in the WWC Handbook 4.0.

The inclusion of this study increases the outcome domains of alphabetics, comprehension, and reading achievement to the category of ‘medium to large’ and increases the rating for the alphabetics and comprehension outcomes from ‘potentially positive’ to ‘positive.’

The inclusion of this study increases the outcome domains of alphabetics, comprehension, and reading achievement to the category of ‘medium to large’ and increases the rating for the alphabetics and comprehension outcomes from ‘potentially positive’ to ‘positive.’
### Interventions with more outcomes and more studies that meet standards are higher in ranking list.

**FILTERS APPLIED—Grade: K, 1, 2, 3 (beginning reading); Delivery Method: Individual, Small Group; Outcomes: Literacy, selected outcomes**

**Improvement Index**

Scores indicate the expected change in percentile rank for an average comparison group student if the student had received the intervention. For example, an Improvement Index of 16 corresponds to moving performance for the average student from the 50th to the 66th percentile of the comparison group distribution.

**Effectiveness Rating**

Effectiveness ratings (shown in parentheses in the table and defined at right) are based on quality of the research, significance of the research findings, size of the differences between intervention participants and comparison groups, and consistency in findings across studies.

(++) Positive: strong evidence of positive effect on outcomes

(+) Potentially Positive: evidence of positive effect on outcomes with no overriding contrary evidence

(+-) Mixed: inconsistent evidence of effect on outcomes

(0) No Discernible: no evidence of effect on outcomes

(-) Potentially Negative: evidence of negative effect on outcomes with no overriding contrary evidence

(---) Negative: strong evidence of negative effect on outcomes

(Source: What Works Clearinghouse)