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EVIDENCE-BASED RESEARCH ON READING RECOVERY

We are an international group of researchers who study reading development and interventions with struggling readers. This letter responds to a number of questions that have been raised by educators, policymakers, and parents about the effectiveness of Reading Recovery, a tutoring program designed for struggling first grade students. We hope the following summary analysis will be helpful to those who are considering the most effective ways to help struggling students become proficient readers.

These are not isolated opinions and the findings here are summaries of several peer-reviewed studies and syntheses of research on Reading Recovery. However, it is not our goal to discredit Reading Recovery, but as with any other program, outline its weaknesses to suggest how it can be improved. We believe this should be done for any program that is widely used to address reading difficulties.

Reading Recovery is not successful with its targeted student population, the lowest performing students. There is little evidence to show that Reading Recovery has proved successful with the lowest performing students. Reading Recovery targets the lowest 10-20 percent of first graders who have the prerequisite skills for Reading Recovery. While research distributed by the developers of Reading Recovery indicates a positive effect of the program, analyses by independent researchers have found serious problems with these conclusions. Studies conducted by researchers associated with Reading Recovery typically exclude 25-40% of the poorest performing students from the data analysis. In contrast, the studies funded by the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in the Department of Education never purposely exclude a child. The data on efficacy is based on all those who are enrolled and available for follow-up. This is known as an “intent to treat” approach, which is standard for any evaluative research. Reading Recovery’s “in-house research” does not follow an “intent to treat” approach. In fact, for the poorest readers, empirical syntheses of “in-house” and independent studies indicate that Reading Recovery is not effective. In Elbaum et al. (2000), the gains for the poorest readers instructed with Reading Recovery were almost zero. There is also evidence that students who do complete the Reading Recovery sequence in first grade lose much of their gains, even in the 65-75% of better students who finish the program (Hiebert, 1994; Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Tunmer & Chapman, in press b). A recent study by a group from New Zealand (Chapman, Tunmer, & Prochnow, 2001) shows that students in Reading Recovery may experience problems with self-esteem when they do not perform well. One of the authors, Chapman, stated in an interview with a New Zealand newspaper (The Press, November 1, 1999) “Students actually declined in self-esteem throughout the course of the program and continued to show no acceleration or improvement in the period following the programme.” (See also Tunmer & Chapman, in press a).

Reading Recovery is not a cost effective solution. Even if it were maximally effective, Reading Recovery is not cost effective because the developers require one-to-one interventions by highly trained teachers. An analysis by Hiebert (1994) found that Reading Recovery was very expensive, costing over $8,000 per student, reflecting in part the costs of training. But Elbaum et al. (2000) found that students who participated in Reading Recovery did not outperform students who were provided one-on-one reading instruction by trained volunteers. At least two studies have compared Reading Recovery in a one-to-one grouping with a modified version of “Reading Recovery” administered to a small group (by definition this can’t be Reading Recovery; Evans, 1996; Iversen, 1997). There was no advantage of one-to-one instruction over small group instruction. There are other first grade programs that are demonstrably efficacious, impact more students because they do not require 1:1 tutoring, are easier to implement, and do a better job...
than Reading Recovery of improving student reading skills because they do not drop students (Snow et al., 1998; Torgesen, 2000).

Altogether, several studies indicate that teacher: student groupings of 1:3 work as well as groupings of 1:1 (Elbaum et al., 2000). Many of the current NICHD and OSEP pullout interventions utilize group sizes of 1:3 and higher. Thus, solely by virtue of the number of students who can be reached, Reading Recovery is at least 200% more expensive than other first grade interventions. Reading Recovery specifically states that it is not a program for groups, but provides little empirical support for this philosophy. This philosophy is inconsistent with the research on early intervention.

**Reading Recovery efficacy studies do not use standard assessment measures.** Most evaluations are restricted to the Reading Recovery developers’ own, nonstandard measures. These same measures are used to determine which students will be considered as part of the sample (continued versus discontinued students). Thus, outcomes are inflated and unconvincing to the research community. The primary outcome measure used by Reading Recovery “in-house” researchers that has shown the largest effect is an assessment of “text reading” developed by the authors. However, even Reading Recovery specialists acknowledge that “The text reading measure is not an equal interval scale, that is, there are smaller differences in the beginning levels than at upper levels. For beginning readers, it is necessary to look at the reader’s progress in more detail” (Askew et al., 1998, p.10). Obvious candidates would involve continuous progress monitoring as implemented in numerous research studies and norm referenced tests that are widely available and commonly used in reading intervention research. With use of standard measures like those implemented by independent researchers, student performance could be compared across studies, permitting calculation of response to instruction based on the number of hours of instruction across interventions (see Torgesen, 2000).

**Reading Recovery does not change by capitalizing on research.** Reading Recovery developers have been and continue to be resistant to integrating the findings of independent, scientifically based reading research into their program and making it more cost effective. The failure to attend to research in modifying the program is its major downfall. The lack of efficacy of Reading Recovery with the poorest readers is not surprising given the research base that highlights the importance of explicit teaching of phonics for this group. Reading Recovery teaches phonics, but the instruction is not sufficiently explicit. A common finding in research on Reading Recovery is that those students who do not respond are weak in phonological awareness (Snow et al., 1998; Tunmer & Chapman, in press b). In fact, research by New Zealand researchers Iverson and Tunmer (1993) in which an explicit phonics component was added to a standard Reading Recovery intervention reduced the time required to complete the program by about 30%. Morris, Tyner, and Perney (2000) found that a reading program constructed like Reading Recovery with the addition of an explicit component addressing spelling-to-sound patterns was highly effective, even with those students most at risk.

Reading Recovery has been independently evaluated in New Zealand, the country in which it was developed. These researchers, who have cosigned this letter, asked that this summary be included:

“In New Zealand, where Reading Recovery was developed, the programme has been independently examined on two occasions. Both studies found shortcomings. In essence, the programme is failing to meet the claims regarding its objectives and success. Senior Reading Recovery administrators have also overtly blocked attempts by graduate students to independently examine aspects of Reading Recovery. The New Zealand Ministry of Education has stated that because of copyright issues, the Ministry is unable to make changes to the program. Despite strong evidence in New Zealand, Australia, and the US that changes are needed to make Reading Recovery more effective, Reading Recovery leaders do not seem willing to incorporate the findings of such research to make the programme more effective. There is and has been considerable debate about the efficacy of Reading Recovery in New Zealand; this debate is indicative of an increasing dissatisfaction among researchers and some educators about the nature of the Reading Recovery programme. Finally, the Ministry of Education commissioned a report from the “Literacy Experts Group”, released in 1999. Included in this report was a recommendation, unanimously agreed to by experts from the full spectrum of views on reading: “We recommend that Reading Recovery place greater emphasis on explicit instruction in phonological awareness and the use of spelling-
to-sound patterns in recognizing unfamiliar words in text.” This recommendation has not been adopted by Reading Recovery.”

There are three additions that would impact positively the number of students who benefit from Reading Recovery, their rate of progress, and reduce costs: (1) increased group size; (2) explicit instruction in phonics and phonemic awareness; and (3) use of standardized outcome measures and continuous progress monitoring. These additions have been ignored despite research summarized in the National Research Council report, Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children, which specifically outlined many of these concerns (Snow et al., 1998, pp. 255-258), the National Reading Panel report, the New Zealand Ministry of Education, and various reviews suggesting that such steps would greatly benefit students who are placed in Reading Recovery.

In summary, the Reading First initiative, recently enacted into law as part of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002, requires the use of scientifically based classroom reading instruction for all students. Even with the best classroom instruction, there will still be some students who don’t make adequate progress and need additional, more intensive instruction. Reading Recovery has not met the needs of these lowest performing students. Most significantly, its excessive costs can make it more difficult for a school to provide help for all students in need, especially those who are behind in the upper grades. Thus, Reading Recovery is not a productive investment of taxpayers’ money or students’ time and is a classic example of a “one size fits all” method. No single method works with all students. Methods like Reading Recovery that are rigidly implemented and limited in the number of components of effective reading instruction will not work with all students. Reading Recovery leaves too many students behind.
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APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY TRAINING CENTERS

1 California State University at Fresno
   Dean: Paul Shaker
   Trainers: Jeanette Methven
           Judith Neal

2 Clemson University
   Dean: Lawrence Allen
   Trainer: Diane DeFord

3 Emporia State University
   Dean: Tes Mehring
   Trainer: Connie Briggs

4 Georgia State University
   Dean: Ronald Colarusso
   Trainers: Sue Duncan
           Clifford Johnson

5 Lesley University
   Dean: William Dandridge
   Trainers: Irene Fountas
           Eva Konstantellou

6 National-Louis University
   Dean: Elizabeth Hawthorne
   Trainer: Tina Lozano

7 New York University
   Dean: Ann Marcus
   Trainers: M. Trika Smith-Burke
           Jo Anne LoFaso
           Joe Yukish
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 Oakland University</th>
<th>16 University of Arkansas at Little Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Mary Otto</td>
<td>Dean: Angela Sewall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers: Mary Lose</td>
<td>Trainer: Linda Dorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Schwartz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Skandalaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 Purdue University</th>
<th>17 University of Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Jerry Peters</td>
<td>Dean: Richard Schwab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer: Maribeth Schmitt</td>
<td>Trainer: Mary Anne Doyle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Saint Mary’s College</th>
<th>18 University of Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Nancy Sorenson</td>
<td>Dean: Sandra Bowman Damico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers: Adria Klein</td>
<td>Trainer: Salli Forbes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Schubert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 San Diego State University</th>
<th>19 University of Kentucky</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Lionel Meno</td>
<td>Dean: James Cibulka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer: Sharan Gibson</td>
<td>Trainer: Judy Embry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 Shippensburg University</th>
<th>20 University of Maine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Robert Bartos</td>
<td>Dean: Robert Cobb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer: Janet Bufalino</td>
<td>Trainer: Paula Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 Texas Woman’s University</th>
<th>21 University of North Carolina–Wilmington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Keith Swigger</td>
<td>Dean: Cathy Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers: Nancy Anderson</td>
<td>Trainer: Noel Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billie Askew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Kaye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 The Ohio State University</th>
<th>22 University of South Dakota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Donna Evans</td>
<td>Dean: Hank Rubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers: Mary Fried</td>
<td>Trainer: Garreth Zalud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Lyons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Su Pinnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Rodgers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15 University of Alabama at Birmingham</th>
<th>23 Western Michigan University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean: Michael Froning</td>
<td>Dean: Rollin Douma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer: Kathleen Martin</td>
<td>Trainer: Beulah Lateef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A BROADER VIEW OF THE EVIDENCE: READING RECOVERY AS AN EXAMPLE

We are an international group of scholars and researchers who have studied language, literacy, and learning in many contexts. We represent a wide variety of perspectives and a range of respected research methodologies.

On the national scene early intervention programs, specifically Reading Recovery, have recently encountered one-sided and biased attacks that have misrepresented the efficacy of these programs. We write this letter to provide accurate information for the policy decision makers who must protect the interests of children. Of particular concern are children who have extreme difficulty learning to read. Below are five points advocating a broad view of the relationships among education, research, and government.

1. Educational dollars belong to citizens, not to a small group of researchers who have a particular point of view.
   Historically, local educational agencies have made decisions, based on their own examination of evidence, about the programs that will best serve children in their communities. Educational decision makers deserve access to a full body of evidence documenting the effectiveness of programs like Reading Recovery.

2. A scientific stance requires a complete, evidence-based analysis of any educational program.
   Early intervention has been found to be effective in preventing literacy difficulties. For example, for more than 20 years, Reading Recovery has been the subject of numerous studies using both quantitative and qualitative methodology. The preponderance of evidence suggests that this early intervention program has a positive and long-lasting effect on reading achievement in young children. Empirically controlled studies that are published in high level journals and fit the Department of Education’s criteria for “scientifically based research” support the results of Reading Recovery. Moreover, follow-up studies have documented the long-term effectiveness of Reading Recovery early intervention. These studies have used nationally normed measures. Empirical studies as well as yearly evaluations document the fact that Reading Recovery children grow in self-esteem as they increase their literacy skills. It is a mistake to deny children access to Reading Recovery based on selective and distorted reporting of a few studies, some unpublished or published without peer review, with flawed designs and/or with very small populations.

3. Policy makers have the responsibility to consider evidence from a wide range of perspectives and validated research models.
   The attacks on Reading Recovery are based on a very narrow view of evidence that excludes a great many high quality and informative quantitative and qualitative studies. A variety of models of research have met rigorous criteria in the fields of education, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and other areas of social science. We need a range of perspectives in the search for educational improvement. For example, qualitative studies provide evidence of Reading Recovery’s profound impact on teacher performance and development and the dynamic nature of teaching in the program. Qualitative research, carefully undertaken, represents accepted methodology in a broad number of fields and adds significantly to the body of knowledge we must consider in making educational decisions.

4. Responsibly and rigorously collected evaluation data provide legitimate and strong evidence of program success.
   All programs serving children in education should collect and publicly report evaluation data. For
example, Reading Recovery’s success has been carefully documented through systematic and simultaneous replications of the program for over one million children in 10,000 schools since its introduction into the United States. This documentation provides for public accountability for the progress of every child served. Reading Recovery has consistently reported results of program impact using accepted standard measures that are appropriate for young children. These results are available to the public. When examining any program purporting to be “scientifically based,” policy makers should ask for documentation of specific program outcomes for children.

5. An early intervention program like Reading Recovery is one part of a comprehensive literacy effort.

Early intervention programs serve as safety nets within comprehensive programs and insure that no child is left behind. Reading Recovery focuses on the lowest achieving first grade children and works in partnership with good classroom instruction, but it is only one component of a comprehensive program. Reading Recovery works as part of many different core instructional models for literacy education including basal approaches, Direct Instruction, Success for All, and other comprehensive programs.

We do not suggest that Reading Recovery or any other program be mandated or given preferential treatment. We do recommend that the federal government recognize the authority of local teachers, administrators, and board members to make educational decisions based on full and accurate disclosure of evidence.

Sincerely,

Lettie K. Albright, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Reading
Texas Woman’s University

JoBeth Allen
Professor
Language Education
University of Georgia

Richard L. Allington, Ph.D.
Irving and Rose Fien Distinguished Professor of Elementary and Special Education
School of Teaching and Learning
University of Florida

Mark Alter, Ph.D.
Chair and Professor
Teaching and Learning
New York University

Patricia L. Anders, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Language, Reading, & Culture
University of Arizona

Terry A. Astuto, Ed.D.
Professor of Educational Administration and Department Chair
Administration, Leadership and Technology
New York University

Kathryn Au, Ph.D.
Dai Ho Chun Professor of Education Teacher Education & Curriculum Studies
University of Hawaii

Mary Kathleen Barnes, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Teaching and Learning
The Ohio State University at Marion

Constance K. Barsky, Ph.D.
Director
Learning by Redesign
The Ohio State University

Eurydice Bauer, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Penny Beed, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Coordinator of Literacy Education
Curriculum and Instruction
University of Northern Iowa

Mary Bendixen-Noe, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Teaching & Learning
The Ohio State University

Jacques S. Benninga, Ph.D.
Director
Bonner Center for Character Education
California State University at Fresno

Laura Benson
Literacy Consultant, Writer & College Instructor
Literacy and Language
University of Colorado at Denver

Mollie Blackburn, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Teaching and Learning
The Ohio State University

David Booth, Ph.D.
Professor
Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
University of Toronto

Gregory W. Brooks, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Education Department
Nazareth College of Rochester

Anthony S. Bryk, Ed.D.
Marshall Field IV Professor of Urban Education and Sociology
Director of the Center for School Improvement and the Consortium on Chicago School Research
University of Chicago

Terry L. Bullock, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Reading and Critical Thinking
University of Cincinnati
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Riddle Buly, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Anne Calhoon, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Teaching and Leadership</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy McCormick Calkins, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of English Education</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas A. Caron, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Reading Education</td>
<td>Marshall University Graduate College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn S. Carr, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Professor Emerita</td>
<td>Department of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Central Missouri State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles William Eliot Professor of Education (Emerita)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline T. Clark, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Language, Literacy &amp; Culture</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cloer, Jr., Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Education</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Furman University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila G. Cohen, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Literacy Department</td>
<td>SUNY Cortland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Compton-Hall, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Department of Reading</td>
<td>Texas Woman’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Cooley, Ed.D.</td>
<td>Professor and Chair</td>
<td>Teaching, Learning, and Leadership</td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly E. Cox, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Literacy and Language</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald L. Cramer, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor of Education</td>
<td>Reading &amp; Language Arts</td>
<td>Oakland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Crowell, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Education</td>
<td>Teaching, Learning, and Leadership</td>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice Cullinan, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor Emerita</td>
<td>Department of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Cunningham, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor of Literacy Education</td>
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<td>UNC – Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia M. Cunningham, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Professor</td>
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<td>Professor</td>
<td>School of Teaching and Learning</td>
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<td>Lead Reading Teacher</td>
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<td>Teacher Education</td>
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<td>Director of Federal Programs</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Elster, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Department of Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Enciso, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
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<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
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