Appendix

Appendix A1 Extent of evidence

Intervention name	Reading achievement			Mathematics achievement			English language development		
	Number of studies	Sample size (schools/ students)	Extent of evidence	Number of studies	Sample size (schools/ students)	Extent of evidence	Number of studies	Sample size (schools/ students)	Extent of evidence
Arthur	0	na	na	0	na	na	1	6/102	Small
Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition	1	7/85	Small	0	na	na	1	7/85	Small
Enhanced Proactive Reading	2	8/131	Small	0	na	na	2	8/131	Small
Fast ForWord Language	2	Over 7/249[1]	Small	0	na	na	2	Over 7/249[1]	Small
Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs	2	11/116	Small	0	na	na	2	11/116	Small
Peer Tutoring and Response Groups	3	5/106	Small	0	na	na	3	5/106	Small
Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies	1	nr/119	Small	0	na	na	0	na	na
Reading Mastery	1	9/17	Small	0	na	na	0	na	na
Read Naturally	1	5/60	Small	0	na	na	0	na	na
Read Well	1	5/33	Small	0	na	na	1	5/33	na
Success for All	1	8/324	Small	0	na	na	1	8/324	na
Vocabulary Improvement Program	1	2/142	Small	0	na	na	1	2/142	Small

nr = not reported
na = not applicable

Note: A rating of "medium to large" requires at least two studies and two schools across studies in one domain and a total sample size across studies of at least 350 students or 14 classrooms. Otherwise, the rating is "small."

1. The number of schools in one study was not reported.

Appendix A2 Sample characteristics by program

Program name	Targeted students (grade levels/ages)	Students in studies reviewed (grade levels)
Arthur	Ages 4–8	K
Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition	Grades 2–5	2–3
Enhanced Proactive Reading	Grade 1	1
Fast ForWord Language	Grades K–12	K–6
Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs	nr	2–5
Peer Tutoring and Response Groups	nr	1–6
Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies	Grades K–12	3–6
Reading Mastery	Grades K–6	K–4
Read Naturally	Grades 1–8	2–5
Read Well	K–1	2–5
Success for All	Pre-K–Grade 8	K–1
Vocabulary Improvement Program	Grades 4–6	5

nr = not reported

Appendix A3 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings[3]

	Reading achievement[4]		English language development[4]	
	Statistically significant positive findings	Reading achievement across outcomes	Statistically significant positive findings	English language development across outcomes
Arthur				
Uchikoshi, 2005 (randomized controlled trial)	na	na	ns	ns, Substantively important
Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition				
Calderón, Hertz-Lazarowitz, & Slavin, 1998 (quasi-experimental design)	ns	ns, Substantively important	ns	ns, Substantively important
Enhanced Proactive Reading				
Vaughn, Cirino, et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial)	ns	ns, Substantively important	ns	ns, nsi
Vaughn, Mathes, et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial with failed random assignment)	Word attack; Passage comprehension	Statistically significant, Substantively important	ns	ns, nsi
Fast ForWord Language				
Scientific Learning Corporation, 2004 (randomized controlled trial)	na	na	Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language-Revised	Statistically significant, Substantively important
Troia, 2004 (quasi-experimental design)	ns	ns, nsi	na	na
Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs				
Saunders, 1999 (quasi-experimental design)	Performance assessment	Statistically significant, Substantively important	ns	ns, Substantively important
Saunders & Goldenberg, 1999 (randomized controlled trial with a confound)	Factual comprehension; Interpretive comprehension	Statistically significant, Substantively important	na	na

(continued)

na = not studied
ns = not statistically significant
nsi = not substantively important

1. According to WWC criteria, if a program finds a statistically significant effect, there is less than a 5% chance that this difference is due to chance. The level of statistical significance was calculated by the WWC and, where necessary, corrects for clustering within classrooms or schools, and for multiple comparisons. For an explanation about the clustering correction, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see the Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations.
2. For rating purposes, the WWC considered the statistical significance of the findings and the magnitude of the effect, also called the effect size. An average effect size is the sum of all the effect sizes of the student outcomes in a study in a single domain divided by the number of those outcomes. The WWC considers an average effect size across all student outcomes in one study in a given domain to be substantively important if it is equal to or greater than 0.25.
3. In this topic review, no studies that met WWC evidence standards with or without reservations addressed mathematics achievement.
4. No studies showed statistically significant or substantively important negative findings in the domain. For a detailed description of the outcome measures, see Appendix A2 in the WWC intervention report at www.whatworks.ed.gov.

Appendix A3 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings[3] *(continued)*

	Reading achievement[4]		English language development[4]	
	Statistically significant positive findings	**Reading achievement across outcomes**	**Statistically significant positive findings**	**English language development across outcomes**
Peer Tutoring and Response Groups				
Jun-Aug, 1985 (randomized controlled trial)	na	na	Language behavior – talking to peers; Language behavior – addressed from subject to peer	Statistically significant, Substantively important
Prater & Bermudez, 1983 (randomized controlled trial)	na	na	Total idea units written	ns, Substantively important
Serrano, 1987 (randomized controlled trial)	na	na	ns	ns, nsi
Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies				
Sáenz, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005 (randomized controlled trial)	ns	ns, Substantively important	na	na
Read Naturally				
Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004 (quasi-experimental design)	ns	ns, nsi	na	na
Read Well				
Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004 (randomized controlled trial with differential attrition)	ns	ns, Substantively important	na	na
Reading Mastery				
Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ari, 2000 (randomized controlled trial)	ns	ns, Substantively important	na	na
Success for All				
Chambers et al., 2004 (quasi-experimental design)	ns	ns, Substantively important	na	na
Vocabulary Improvement Program				
Carlo et al., 2004 (randomized controlled trial with differential attrition)	ns	ns, Substantively important	Word mastery	ns, Substantively important

na = not applicable
ns = not statistically significant
nsi = not substantively important

Appendix A4 Methodology

Seventy-three studies, which provided data on 32 English language learning interventions, were classified for the strength of their design. To be fully reviewed, a study had to be a randomized controlled trial or a quasi-experimental design with evidence of equating between treatment and comparison groups. Twenty studies could not be categorized by an intervention, and are not cited in the report.

Eligibility for review

Quasi-experiments eligible for review include those equating through matching or statistical adjustment, regression discontinuity designs, and single case designs. Although single case designs were identified for the English language learning review, they were not included in intervention reports as we are currently developing evidence standards for regression discontinuity designs and single case designs.

The review considered the properties of measurement instruments, the percentage of students, classrooms, or schools in the study sample that were not included in the reported results, and any sample characteristics or events that might serve as alternative explanations for the observed effect. For details please see the WWC Evidence Standards. Long-term outcomes were preferred over immediate outcomes for inclusion in our analysis of program effects.

The research evidence for programs and practices that have at least one study meeting WWC evidence standards with or without reservations is summarized in individual intervention reports posted on the WWC website. See http://www.whatworks.ed.gov. So far, 16 unique or independent studies of 12 English language learning interventions have met evidence standards with or without reservations. The lack of evidence for the remaining programs and practices does not mean that those programs and practices are ineffective; some programs and practices have not yet been studied using a study design that permits the WWC to draw any conclusions about their effectiveness. And for some studies, not enough data were reported (such as descriptive statistics of the findings) to enable us to confirm statistical findings, so they were not fully reviewed.

Rating of effectiveness

Each English language learning program that had at least one study meeting WWC standards received a rating of effectiveness in at least one outcome domain; the rating of effectiveness aims to characterize the existing evidence base in a given domain. The intervention's effect based on the research evidence can be rated 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 Intervention Rating Scheme).

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. Because of these corrections, the level of statistical significance as calculated by the WWC may differ from the one originally reported by the study authors. For an explanation, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas that we used to calculate statistical significance, see Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations. If the average effect size across all outcomes in one study in a single domain is at least 0.25, it is considered substantively important, contributing toward the rating of effectiveness. See the technical appendices of the English language learning intervention report for further details.

Extent of evidence

The WWC categorizes the extent of evidence in each domain as small or medium to large (see the What Works Clearinghouse Extent of Evidence Categorization Scheme). The extent of evidence takes into account the number of studies and the

Appendix A4 Methodology *(continued)*

total sample size across the studies that met WWC evidence standards with or without reservations.[1]

Improvement index

The WWC computed an improvement index for each individual finding. In addition, within each outcome domain, the WWC computes an average improvement index for each domain and each study as well as a domain average improvement index across studies of the same intervention (see the Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations). The 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. The improvement index can take on values between –50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting results favorable to the intervention group. Unlike the rating of effectiveness, the improvement index is based only on the size of the difference between the intervention and the comparison conditions.

1. 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.

Appendix A5 References

Studies that met WWC standards

Arthur

Uchikoshi, Y. (2005). Narrative development in bilingual kindergartners: Can Arthur help? *Developmental Psychology, 41*(3), 464–478.

Enhanced Proactive Reading

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Carlson, C. D., Cardenas-Hagan, E., et al. (2006). Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(3), 449–487.

Fast ForWord Language

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by children with low reading performance who used Fast ForWord Language: MAPS for learning. *MAPS for Learning, 3*(1), 1–13.

Peer Tutoring and Response Groups

Jun-Aust, H. (1985, March). *Individual differences in second language learning of Korean immigrant students.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Second/Foreign Language Acquisition by Children, Oklahoma City, OK.

Prater, D. L., & Bermudez, A. B. (1983). Using peer response groups with limited English proficient writers. *Bilingual Research Journal, 17*(1, 2), 99–116.

Serrano, C. J. (1987). The effectiveness of cross-level peer involvement in the acquisition of English as a second language by Spanish-speaking migrant children. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*(07), 1682–A. (UMI No. 8723149)

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies

Sáenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 231–247.

Reading Mastery/SRA/McGraw-Hill[1]

Gunn, B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. (2000). The efficacy of supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school. *Journal of Special Education, 34*, 90–103.

Additional citation for this study:

Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., & Black, C. (2002). Supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school: A follow-up. *Journal of Special Education, 36*, 69–79.

Studies that met WWC standards with reservations

Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition

Calderón, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R. (1998). Effects of Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition on students making the transition from Spanish to English reading. *Elementary School Journal, 99*(2), 153–165.

Additional citation for this study:

Calderón. M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Ivory, G., & Slavin, R. E. (1997). *Effects of Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition on students transitioning from Spanish to English reading* (Report No. 10). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED405428)

Enhanced Proactive Reading

Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P., Carlson, C., Pollard-Durodola, S., et al. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *Elementary School Journal, 107*(2), 153–180.

Additional citation for this study:

Mathes, P. G., Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., Francis, D. J., & Schnatschneider, C. (2005). The effects of theoretically different instruction and student characteristics on the skills of struggling readers. *Reading Research Quarterly, 4*(2), 148–182.

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

Fast ForWord Language

Troia, G. A. (2004). Migrant students with limited English proficiency: Can Fast ForWord make a difference in their language skills and academic achievement? *Remedial and Special Education, 25*(6), 353–366.

Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs

Saunders, W. M. (1999). Improving literacy achievement for English learners in transitional bilingual programs. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 5*(4), 345–381.

Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (1999). Effects of instructional conversations and literature logs on limited- and fluent-English-English-proficient students' story comprehension and thematic understanding. *Elementary School Journal, 99*(4), 277–301.

Read Naturally

Denton, C. A., Anthony, J. L., Parker, R., & Hasbrouck, J. E. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English reading development of Spanish-English bilingual students. *The Elementary School Journal*, *104*(4), 289–305.

Additional citations for this study:

Denton, C. A. (2000). *The efficacy of two English interventions in a bilingual education program*. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(11), 4325A. (UMI No. 9994233)

Ihnot, C. (1992). *Read Naturally*. St Paul, MN: *Read Naturally*.

Read Well

Denton, C. A., Anthony, J. L., Parker, R., & Hasbrouck, J. E. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English reading development of Spanish-English bilingual students. *Elementary School Journal, 104*(4), 289–305.

Additional citation for this study:

Denton, C. A. (2000). The efficacy of two English interventions in a bilingual education program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(11), 4325A. (UMI No. 9994233)

Success for All

Chambers, B., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., & Gifford, R. (2004). *Effects of Success for All with embedded video on the beginning reading achievement of Hispanic children*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Additional citation for this study:

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research,* 73, 125–230.

Vocabulary Improvement Program

Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C. E., Dressler, C., Lippman, D. N., et al. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English-language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39*, 188–215.

Additional citation for this study:

McLaughlin, B., August, D., Snow, C., Carlo, M., Dressler, C., White, C., et al. (2000, April). *Vocabulary Improvement in English language learners: An intervention study.* Symposium presented at the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, Washington, DC.

Studies that did not meet evidence screens

Accelerated Reader

McGlinn, J. M., & Parrish, A. (2002). Accelerating ESL students' teading progress with Accelerated Reader. *Reading Horizons, 42*(3), 175–189.[2]

Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills (ATTLAS)

Rothfarb, S. H., & Abella, R. (1987). *Evaluation of the ATTLAS program (augmenting thinking through language acquisition skills).* Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED299285)[3]

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

Curriculum-Based Instruction

Kucer, S. B., & Silva, C. (2000). The English literacy development of bilingual students within a transition whole language curriculum. *Bilingual Research Journal, 23*(4), 345–371.[2]

Moats, L. C. (2004). Efficiency of a structured, systematic language curriculum for adolescent poor readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 20*(2), 145–159.[2]

Effective Use of Time

Waxman, H. C., de Felix, J.W., Martinez, A., Knight, S. L., & Padron, Y. (1994). Effects of implementing classroom instructional models on English language learners' cognitive and affective outcomes. *Bilingual Research Journal, 18*(3, 4), 1–22.[4]

ESL in the Content Areas

Waxman, H. C., de Felix, J.W., Martinez, A., Knight, S. L., & Padron, Y. (1994). Effects of implementing classroom instructional models on English language learners' cognitive and affective outcomes. *Bilingual Research Journal, 18*(3, 4), 1–22.[4]

Fast ForWord Language

Hall, S. L. (2002). *Final report: Scientific Learning/Fast ForWord program: 2001–2002.* Dallas, TX: Dallas Independent School District.[5]

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved language and early reading skills of English-language learners in the Paradise Valley Unified School District who used Fast ForWord Language. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports, 7*(1), 1–5.[2]

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004a). Improved language and early reading skills by students in school district 54 in Schaumburg, Illinois, who used Fast ForWord Language. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports, 8*(6), 1–4.[2]

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004b). Improved reading achievement by students in the Killeen Independent School District who used Fast ForWord products. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports, 8*(23), 1–9.[2]

Front Row Phonics

De la Cal-Fasani, L. (2000). Front Row Phonics: A CAI field test. *Masters Abstracts International, 39*(02), 343. (UMI No. 1401814)[2]

Instructional Practices

Alonso, C. M. (1991). *Improving academic achievement of ESOL kindergarten students using a centers approach to instruction*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED333754)[2]

Amaral, O. M., Garrison, L., & Klentschy, M. (2002). Helping English learners increase achievement through inquiry-based science instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(2), 213–239.[2]

Edwards, L. D. & Langbort, C. (2003). Collaborative problem solving in mixed-language groups. *Teaching Children Mathematics, 9*(9), 534–538.[2]

Gersten, R. (1996). Literacy instruction for language-minority students: The transition years. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(5), 227–244.[6]

Hampton, E., & Rodriguez, R. (2001). Inquiry Science in bilingual classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(4), 417–434.[2]

Mansaray, H. A. (1997). The effects of vocabulary instruction on English-as-a-Second Language and bilingual learners (Doctoral disseration, Boston University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(03), 801A. (UMI No. 9724199)[7]

Padron, Y. N. (1992). The effect of strategy instruction on bilingual students' cognitive strategy use in reading. *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*(3, 4), 35–52.[8]

Proctor, C., Dalton, B., & Grisham, D. (in press). Scaffolding English language learners and struggling readers in a digital environment with embedded strategy instruction and vocabulary support. *Journal of Literacy Research, 39*(1), 71-93.[2]

Rudes, B., Young, M., Shaycoft, M., Zehler, A., Day, H., & Kaplan, L. (1988). *Instructional services for Native American students with limited-English-proficiency: Year one report for the national evaluation of services for limited-English-proficient Native Americans*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED297928)[9]

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

Russell, V. M. (1997). Effects of reciprocal teaching on reading and oral language proficiency and reader self-perception of sixth-grade ESL. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(09), 3408A. (UMI No. 9809016)[10]

Learning Centers

Offenberg, R. M., Rodriquez-Acosta, C., Epstein, B., & Holden, B. (1984). *Bilingual learning centers in elementary schools, 1982, 1983* (Report No. 8418). Philadelphia, PA: Office of Research and Evaluation.[2]

Metacognitive Teaching Approaches

Cardelle-Elewar, M. (1990). Effects of feedback tailored to bilingual students' mathematics needs on verbal problem solving. *Elementary School Journal, 91*(2), 165–176.[8]

Carrasquillo, A., & Nunez, D. (1988). *Computer-assisted metacognitive strategies and the reading comprehensive skills of ESL Elementary School Students*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED301838)[2]

NEARStar

Horowitz, J. E., Bojorquez, J. C., Stout, J. L., Ramsden, S., & Tafoya, A. (2002). *Evaluation of the NEARStar Project: First Implementation Report*. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.[11]

On Our Way to English

Educational Research Institute of America. (2004a). *A study of the effectiveness of On Our Way to English* (Technical Report No. 139). Austin, TX: Harcourt Achieve.[2]

Educational Research Institute of America. (2004b). *Addendum to the Report: A study of the effectiveness of On Our Way to English in Clark County, Nevada*. Austin, TX: Harcourt Achieve.[2]

Pre-Teaching Vocabulary

Bos, C. S., Allen, A.., & Scanlon, D. J. (1989). Vocabulary instruction and reading comprehension with bilingual learning disabled students. *Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 38*(20), 173–179.[5]

Project MASTER

Office of Educational Assessment, Bilingual Educational Evaluation Unit. (1986). *Project MASTER, 1985–1986. OEA Evaluation Report.* Brooklyn, NY: Office of Educational Assessment, New York City Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED279774)[2]

Reading Recovery®

Escamilla, K., Loera, M., Ruiz, O., & Rodriguez, Y. (2003). An examination of sustaining effects in Descubriendo la Lectura programs. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 193–214). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.[3]

Neal, J. C., & Kelly, P. R. (2003). The success of Reading Recovery for English language learners and Descubriendo la Lectura for bilingual students in California. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 257–280). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.[2]

Story Structure Strategies/Story Structure Utilization

Vaughn-Shavuo, F. (1990). *Using story grammar and language experience for improving recall and comprehension in the teaching of ESL to Spanish-dominant first-graders. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(05), 1501. (UMI No. 9027421)[12]

Structured Immersion

Gersten, R. (1985). Structured Immersion for Language Minority Students: Results of a Longitudinal Evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7*(3), 187–196.[13]

Success for All

Chambers, B., Cheung, A., Gifford, R., Madden, N., & Slavin, R. E. (2004). *Achievement effects of embedded multimedia in a Success For All reading program*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.[14]

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

Dianda, M. R., & Flaherty, J. F. (1995). *Report on work station uses: Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED394327)[15]

Hurley, E. A., Chamberlain, A., Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2001). Effects of Success for All on TAAS reading scores—A Texas statewide evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(10), 750–756.[5]

Livingston, M., & Flaherty, J. (1997). *Effects of Success for All on reading achievement in California schools*. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.[16]

Nunnery, J. A. (1995). An assessment of Success for All program component effects on the reading achievement of at-risk first-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(01), 155A. (UMI No. 9615378)[8]

Nunnery, J. A., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Hunter, P., et al. (1997, March). *Effects of full and partial implementations of Success for All on student reading achievement in English and Spanish*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.[8]

Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1998). *Longitudinal study of student literacy achievement in different Title I school-wide programs in Fort Wayne community schools—Year 2: First grade results*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.[5]

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., & Smith, L. J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater public schools—Year 1: 1995–1996*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.[5]

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Nunnery, J. A. (1998, April). *Title I as a catalyst for school improvement: Impact of alternative school-wide models on the reading achievement of students at risk.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.[5]

Slavin, R. E., Leighton, M., & Yampolsky, R. (1990). *Success For All: Effects on the achievement of limited English proficient children* (Report No. 5). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED331585)[15]

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1998). *Success for All/Éxito Para Todos—Effects on the reading achievement of students acquiring English* (Report No. 19). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED423327)[17]

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of Success for All on the reading achievement of students acquiring English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *4*(4), 393–416.[18]

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.[19]

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Effects of Success for All on students with limited English proficiency: A three year evaluation* (Draft). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.[15]

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Success for All: Effects on language minority students*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.[15]

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1992). *Success for All: Effects on students with limited English proficiency: A three year evaluation* (Report No. 29). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED346199)[15]

Urdegar, S. M. (1998). *Evaluation of the Success for All program 1997–98*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Public Schools, Office of Educational Evaluation.[13]

Urdegar, S. M. (2000). *Evaluation of the Success for All program 1998–99*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Office of Evaluation and Research.[13]

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (2003). *Comparisons between elementary school programs on reading performance: Albuquerque Public Schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.[5]

Supplemental Reading Instruction

Linan-Thompson, S., & Hickman-Davis, P. (2002). Supplemental reading instruction for students at risk for reading disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 17*(4), 242–251.[2]

Linan-Thompson, S., Vaughn, S., Hickman-Davis, P., & Kouzekanani, K. (2003). Effectiveness of supplemental reading instruction for second-grade English language learners with reading difficulties. *Elementary School Journal, 103*(3), 221–238.[2]

Studies with dispositions pending[20]

Peer Tutoring and Response Groups

Greenwood, C. R., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Utley, C. A., Gavin, K. M., & Terry, B. J. (2001). ClassWide peer tutoring learning management system: Applications within elementary-level English language learners. *Remedial & Special Education, 22*(1), 34–47.

Whole-Language Instruction

Kuball, Y.E., & Peck, S. (1997). The effect of whole language instruction on the writing development of Spanish-speaking and English-speaking kindergartners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 21*(2, 3), 213–231.

Pre-teaching Vocabulary

Rousseau, M. K., & Tam, B. K. Y. (1991). The efficacy of previewing and discussion of key words on the oral reading proficiency of bilingual learners with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatment of Children, 14*, 199–209.

Rousseau, M. K., & Tam, B. K. Y. (1993). Increasing reading proficiency of language-minority students with speech and language impairments. *Education and Treatment of Children, 16*, 254–271.

Interventions with no studies

Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) (www.gwu.edu/~calla)

Into English (no website available)

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (www.cal.org/siop)

1. This program is sometimes known as *Direct Instruction* using the *Reading Mastery* texts or *SRA Direct Instruction—Reading Mastery*.
2. The study did not use a comparison group.
3. Lack of evidence for baseline equivalence: the study, which used a quasi-experimental design, did not establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.
4. Confound: there was only one school in one study condition and two in the other, so in the analysis it was difficult to separate the effects of the intervention from the effects of the school.
5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: data were not disaggregated, so the WWC could not examine the results for the sample that is relevant to this review.
6. The study had only qualitative data.
7. The comparison group was inappropriate to the focus of the review: students in the intervention group were in ESL and bilingual classrooms, and students in the control group were not in classrooms designated for ESL or bilingual students.
8. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review.
9. The sample is not appropriate to this review.
10. Confound: there was only one teacher in each study condition, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from the effects of the teacher.
11. Incomparable groups: the intervention and comparison groups cannot be considered equivalent.
12. Confound: there was only one teacher in both study conditions, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from the effects of the teacher.
13. Complete data were not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes.
14. The effects of two interventions were studied: the WWC could not examine the results for the intervention that is relevant to this review.
15. Confound: the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from the effects of the school.
16. Incomparable groups: the language of instruction differed between groups.
17. Incomparable groups: there were differences in the amount of native language used.
18. For studies in which outcomes of the intervention appropriate to this review were examined, two had confounds, in which there was one school in one of the study conditions (Arizona) or one school in each study condition (Francis Scott Key), so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from the effects of the school. Complete data were not reported in one study (El Vista), so the WWC could not calculate effect sizes.

Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

19. For studies in which outcomes of the intervention appropriate to this review were examined, the samples are not appropriate to the review: data were not disaggregated, so the WWC could not examine the results of the sample that is relevant to this review.
20. Single-case design studies were identified but are not included in this review because the WWC does not yet have standards for reviewing single-case design studies.