Good news about Reading Recovery abounds! During the past few months, RRCNA has shared with you impactful information, some of which is highlighted here. Are you sharing all this good news with your colleagues and school decision makers?

**i3 Final Evaluation Report**

Findings from “one of the most ambitious and well-documented expansions of an instructional program in U.S. history” show the $55 million Investing in Innovation (i3) scale-up of Reading Recovery was “highly successful.”

*Reading Recovery: An Evaluation of the Four-Year i3 Scale-Up* by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) reports key findings on scale-up processes, challenges, and outcomes; immediate and sustained impacts; implementation fidelity, and implementation at both the lesson and school level. A total of 3,747 teachers were trained, serving 61,992 students in one-to-one lessons. In addition, these Reading Recovery-trained professionals taught 325,458 students in classroom or small-group instruction.

The randomized control trial (RCT) study of the immediate impacts in the scale-up schools—among the largest such studies ever conducted—revealed medium to large impacts across all outcome measures. Effect sizes at the end of 12 to 20 weeks of treatment ranged between 0.30 and 0.42 standard deviations.

The growth rate we observed in students who participated in Reading Recovery over approximately a five-month period was 131 percent of the national average rate for 1st-grade students. Moreover, these results were similar in two subgroups of interest to the i3 program: English Language Learners and students in rural schools. (p. 3)

**JESPAR**

A special themed issue of the *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, released in January, focuses on advances in Reading Recovery research. RRCNA worked with the editors of JESPAR and journal publisher Routledge to provide free online access to this issue until June.

The articles examine student motivation and achievement, effectiveness, scaling, and sustaining Reading Recovery:

- **Reading Recovery as an Epistemic Community**
  – Donald J. Peurach & Joshua L. Glazer

- **Scaling and Sustaining an Intervention: The Case of Reading Recovery**
  – Emily Rodgers

- **An International Meta-Analysis of Reading Recovery**
  – Jerome V. D’Agostino & Sinéad J. Harmey

- **Reading Recovery: Exploring the Effects on First-Graders’ Reading Motivation and Achievement**
  – Celeste C. Bates, Jerome V. D’Agostino, Linda Gambrell, & Meling Xu

- **Getting to Scale: Evidence, Professionalism, and Community**
  – Robert E. Slavin

JESPAR is published four times a year by the University of Cincinnati. The journal is dedicated to the improvement of the educational experience of at-risk students and assisting researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in identifying what programs work in our schools. Our thanks to the JESPAR editors and Routledge/Francis & Taylor Online for partnering with us to share the news!
What Works Clearinghouse
In October 2014, USDE’s What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) conducted a single study review of the CPRE evaluation of the first year of the i3 Reading Recovery scale-up project. WWC confirmed the study’s findings that Reading Recovery had significant positive impacts on general reading achievement and reading comprehension. While USDE hasn’t yet merged these results with their updated 2013 beginning reading intervention report on Reading Recovery, RRCNA recalculated the ratings following procedures in the WWC Handbook.

The inclusion of the i3 Year One study findings increases the extent of evidence in the outcome domains for comprehension and general reading achievement to the category of ‘medium to large,’ and increases the effectiveness rating for comprehension from ‘potentially positive’ to ‘positive.’ You can download an updated comparison chart of beginning reading programs in the WWC review on our website at http://readingrecovery.org/reading-recovery/research/what-works-clearinghouse.

Resources on Dyslexia
I hope you have had an opportunity to read and use an RRCNA resource posted on our website titled “Early Literacy Matters: Dyslexia, Specific Learning Disabilities, and Reading Recovery.” A number of states have passed legislation mandating that schools implement procedures to identify children with dyslexia or related disorders. These initiatives often require that teachers receive training and certification in the use of specific assessment and instructional procedures that show evidence of supporting the literacy learning of the most at-risk students. Our briefing paper provides further information:

Compliance with this mandate is complicated by the ongoing research debate regarding the definition of dyslexia and the role of RTI procedures in this identification process. The literature includes numerous diverse and often overlapping concepts of dyslexia — ranging from anyone who struggles with decoding to a much narrower set of children whose decoding difficulties are unexpected relative to their other intellectual skills and life circumstances and, therefore, may be assumed to be biologically determined (Elliott & Grigorenko, 2014).

Research suggests that since there is no adequate assessment to discern whether beginning readers’ difficulties are biologically determined, practitioners focus on assessments that identify students for educational support and instruction tailored to the child’s individual strengths and needs (Elliot & Grigorenko, 2014; Vellutino, Fletcher, Snowling, & Scanlon, 2004).

Response to intervention (RTI) dispenses with a search for deficits in specific cognitive functions when difficulties are first presented and instead places the emphasis on gauging the individual’s progress over time (Elliott & Grigorenko, 2014, p. 27).

(continues)
The International Literacy Association’s Literacy Research Panel recently released a research advisory on dyslexia. The 17-member panel produced a straightforward, comprehensive synthesis of the current understandings of dyslexia.

Here are a few excerpts from this advisory:

• As yet, there is no certifiably best method for teaching children who experience reading difficulty (Mathes et al., 2005). For instance, research does not support the common belief that Orton-Gillingham–based approaches are necessary for students classified as dyslexic (Ritchey & Goeke, 2007; Turner, 2008; Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2003).

• Assessment that gives us data on how to support instruction that is responsive to individuals’ needs and comprehensive in scope is more useful in meeting students’ needs than a one-size-fits-all process to determine dyslexia.

• Optimal instruction calls for teachers’ professional expertise and responsiveness, and for the freedom to act on the basis of that professionalism.

• So it may be that not using the term dyslexia would, on balance, benefit the teaching/learning process.

As developments unfold, RRCNA will update you with news that affects early literacy and the future of Recovery Recovery. And please keep sharing the good news!