National Board for Education Sciences

2010 Annual Report

July 2009 through June 2010

ies INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES

National Board for Education Sciences

2010 Annual Report

July 2009 through June 2010

INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION SCIENCES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL BOARD FOR EDUCATION SCIENCES

Background

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES, or the Institute), created as part of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (ESRA) (Pub. L. 107-279), is the primary research arm of the U.S. Department of Education (ED). ESRA established the National Board for Education Sciences (NBES, or the Board) to advise and consult with the Director of the Institute. The Board is responsible for considering and approving priorities proposed by the Director to guide the work of the Institute; reviewing and approving procedures for technical and scientific peer review of the activities of the Institute; and reviewing and regularly evaluating the work of the Institute to ensure that its research, development, evaluation, and statistical analyses are consistent with the standards set out in ESRA. The Board is also responsible for providing to the Director of IES, the Secretary of Education, and appropriate congressional committees a report that assesses the effectiveness of the Institute in carrying out its priorities and mission, especially as they relate to performing scientifically valid research, conducting unbiased evaluations, collecting and reporting accurate education statistics, and translating research into practice.

The Board consists of 15 voting members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Serving as nonvoting ex officio members are the Director of the Institute, each of the four Commissioners of the National Education Centers, the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Director of the Census, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics, and the Director of the National Science Foundation. As shown in appendix A, the Board is currently operating with 10 appointed members, including 4 who were nominated by President Barack Obama and confirmed by the Senate in 2010:

Deborah Loewenberg Ball is dean of the School of Education and William H. Payne Collegiate Professor at the University of Michigan. She conducts research on mathematics instruction and on professional education to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching.

Adam Gamoran is the John D. MacArthur Professor of Sociology and Educational Policy Studies and director of the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He has been on the faculty since 1984. From 2001 to 2004, he chaired the Department of Sociology, and from 2008 to 2009, he served as interim dean of the School of Education.

Bridget Terry Long is a professor of education and economics at the Harvard University Graduate School of Education. She is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and a research affiliate of the National Center for Postsecondary Research.

Margaret R. (Peggy) McLeod is Executive Director of Student Services and Special Education in the Alexandria City Public Schools in Virginia. She has also worked as a consultant to national advocacy and professional organizations, universities, states, and school districts.

Four more individuals received a presidential nomination in 2010 and are awaiting Senate confirmation:

Anthony S. Bryk is the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching at Stanford University and the cofounder of the Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Kris D. Gutiérrez is a professor in the School of Education at the University of Colorado at Boulder and the president of the American Educational Research Association.

Beverly L. Hall is superintendent of Atlanta Public Schools in Georgia.

Robert A. Underwood is the president of the University of Guam and a former delegate from that territory to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Under the leadership of Board chair Eric A. Hanushek and vice chair Jon Baron, the Board met in July 2009, November 2009, and April 2010. Since the Board's inception in 2004, it has approved 10 resolutions to serve as guidance for Congress, the Secretary of Education, and the Director of IES (see appendix B).

OFFICE OF IES DIRECTOR

Priorities

The work of IES is grounded in the principle that effective education research must be informed by the interests and needs of education practitioners and policymakers. To this end, the Institute will encourage close partnerships among researchers, practitioners and policymakers in the conceptualization, planning, and conduct of research and evaluation. The Institute will facilitate the use of education statistics, research, and evaluation in education planning, both by including members of the practitioner and policy communities in the design and conduct of the work and by producing reports that are accessible, timely, and meaningful to the day-to-day work of education practitioners and policymakers. Further, the Institute will seek to increase the capacity of education policymakers and practitioners to use the knowledge generated from high-quality data analysis, research and evaluation.

This commitment—supporting top-notch education research that matters to schools and improves educational outcomes for children—will drive the work at the Institute for the next 5 years. Key goals and initiatives include the following:

Make IES work more relevant and usable. This goal calls for IES to preserve the rigor of its work while turning its focus to relevance and usability. This means applying the same energy and effort that has gone into ensuring rigor to enhancing the relevance and utility of IES work to make sure it matters to schools. One of the key ways to do that is to engage practitioners and policymakers in the work at the ground level—not after a research project is completed and researchers want it to be translated or applied, but as the work is being envisioned, planned and conducted.

Enhance the relevance and usability of IES work by shifting from a model of dissemination to a model of facilitation. The key to this shift will be developing closer partnerships with practitioners and policymakers and ensuring researchers' commitment to assisting in school improvement efforts. When researchers listen to the voices of practitioners and policymakers throughout the research cycle—from planning and designing studies to interpreting findings and determining implications for policy and practice—those very people are more likely to respond to research findings and adopt them in schools. This means flipping the perspective on the relationship between research and practice so that it is viewed as an interactive process—not just "from research to practice" but also "from practice to research."

Build the capacity of states and school districts to use their longitudinal data systems, conduct research and evaluate their programs. Another project that will spark closer collaboration between researchers and practitioners is the work around the State Longitudinal Data Systems and the $250 million in grant awards to states, funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). These grants will promote the linking of data across time and databases, from early childhood into career, including matching teachers to students. Up until now, the states' focus has been on *building* these systems, not on *using* the data to drive improvement at the policy level and at the school level. IES intends to actively promote partnerships between district/state data experts and researchers—perhaps through training grants or the Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs)—that will support efforts to provide timely descriptive and analytic feedback to schools.

Develop a greater understanding of schools as organizations and how they can become learning organizations. IES needs to help the field develop a stronger understanding of schools as organizations, how schools and districts improve, and how they become learning organizations. Researchers need to fully understand the underlying principles, processes, and mechanisms of the interventions and programs they study—and the importance of context and setting to fidelity of implementation. IES has a new grant program, Organization

and Management of Schools and Districts, that attempts to dig deeper at this question. Through this program, researchers will study the organizational factors—such as the coherence of the instructional program, the degree of trust in a school, and how teachers learn from one another—that contribute to successful schools.

Propose a new set of research priorities that reflects these key goals. These research priorities will guide decisions about the kind of work to be funded by IES; the methods to be used in carrying out the work; the questions expected to be answered; and, ultimately, the audience for which the research findings is intended. The new priorities will call for IES to compile statistics, support research, conduct evaluations, and facilitate the use of scientific evidence addressing a broad range of education outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities. The Institute wants to sponsor work that develops and evaluates innovative approaches to improving education outcomes; understands the characteristics of high-quality teaching, and how better to train current and prospective teachers; and understands the processes of schooling through which educational policies, programs and practices affect students. The work of the Institute will include a variety of research and statistical methods, and IES will support the development of improved research methods.

Help shape a new generation of researchers. Far too much education research—including much that is done in universities—is driven by the interests and theories of the researchers themselves and not the needs and problems of practice. IES has rewritten the language of the postdoctoral grants to make it clear that the Institute is explicitly seeking trained scientists interested in engaging with practitioners and asking more of the relevant questions that really matter to schools and lead to lasting, meaningful improvement in student outcomes. This is a first step in creating incentives for young academics to pursue the action-oriented research needed to help schools improve. This new emphasis on practical relevance will also require a fundamental shift in how universities train and reward promising young researchers.

ORGANIZATION, STAFFING, AND BUDGET

In FY 2010, IES had a total budget of $927,475,000, including money from FY 2010 appropriations to IES ($650,283,000), additional funding through ARRA appropriated in FY 2009 ($250,000,000), and additional funds appropriated to other ED programs for evaluations or other national activities ($27,192,000). These funds were administered by the four centers of IES as follows: the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) administered $108,521,000 for statistics; $130,121,000 for assessment; $58,250,000 for statewide data systems; and $3,000,000 for surveys and assessments using funds from other ED components. The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional

Assistance (NCEE) administered $37,000,000 for dissemination and evaluation activities from the research, development and dissemination appropriation; $70,650,000 for the RELs; $11,460,000 for special education studies and evaluations; and $24,200,000 for evaluations of ED programs using funds appropriated to other ED principal offices. The National Center for Education Research (NCER) administered $162,900,000 for research and research training from the research, development and dissemination appropriation. The National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER) administered the $71,085,000 appropriation for research in special education. In addition, the NBES was budgeted approximately $300,000 of research, development and dissemination funds to carry out its activities.

The table below shows the budget by the various sources of funds.

Institute of Education Sciences FY 2010 Budget

	Amount (dollars in thousands)
From funds appropriated to IES:	
Research, development, and dissemination (NCER $162.9M; NCEE $37M; NBES $.3M)	$200,196
Statistics (NCES)	$108,521
Assessment (NCES)	$130,121
Regional Educational Laboratories (NCEE)	$70,650
Research in special education (NCSER)	$71,085
Statewide data systems (NCES)	$58,250
Special education studies and evaluations (NCEE)	$11,460
Subtotal	$650,283
From ARRA funds appropriated in FY 2009:	
Statewide data systems (NCES)	$250,000
From funds appropriated to other ED Principal Offices:	
Evaluation and national activity set-asides in the budgets of other ED programs (NCES $3.0M; NCEE $24.2M)	$27,192
Total	**$927,475**

OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATIONS

New Initiatives. The goal of the Outreach and Communications unit at IES is to make the work of the Institute more relevant and useful. Achieving this goal requires reaching out to stakeholders with findings that are timely and meaningful to their day-to-day work. It requires maintaining a commitment to unbiased reporting, rigorous standards and strict accuracy. IES communications over the past year focused on three key areas: External Communications, Outreach and Internal Communications.

External Communications launched the following initiatives: improve the writing and appearance of newsflashes; re-establish bimonthly external newsletters with short articles from the IES centers and the Director's Office; work with staff and contractors on developing "writing for relevancy" in reports, such as Statistics in Brief and evaluation executive summaries; create shorter, more accessible summary publications (e.g., Study Snapshots and Evaluation Briefs); improve and broaden relationships with education media by proactively disseminating high-profile reports and responding to inquiries quickly and succinctly; update the IES website with new content; and work with NCER to promote grantee work through updated web content and newsflashes.

2010 IES Research Conference. The Institute held the Fifth Annual IES Research Conference on June 28-30, 2010, at the Gaylord National Hotel and Convention Center in National Harbor, Maryland. More than 1,200 grant and contract awardees, policymakers, education research leaders, and IES staff attended. Conference participants had the opportunity to hear about the essential role of education researchers in education reform from Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and plenary luncheon speaker Charles M. Payne, the Frank P. Hixon Professor at the University of Chicago. IES Director John Q. Easton expanded on the theme of the conference, "Connecting Research, Policy and Practice," in his opening plenary address, detailing the new direction of the Institute and how the nexus of research, policy and practice will inform future research initiatives. Attendees also heard opening remarks by NBES Chair Eric A. Hanushek. The conference featured 32 panel and open-forum sessions in four topical research tracks (methodology, teaching and learning, social and behavioral, and policy) and nearly 500 poster presentations in 20 IES-supported research categories. This year's research conference represented a milestone in the Institute's effort to build a national community of education researchers, with conference attendance having grown from approximately 500 at the first conference in 2006 to more than 1,200 in 2010.

SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW

Research Grants. Between July 2009 and June 2010, the Standards and Review Office handled the processing and scientific peer review of applications to the Institute's FY 2010 research competitions. Across the competitions, 1,328 applications were scientifically reviewed by 31 review panels comprising 558 external reviewers. This

represents a 45 percent increase over the number of applications reviewed in the previous fiscal year. In addition, the Office managed the scientific peer review of 53 applications to the Institute's Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant competition under ARRA, as well as applications submitted in April 2010 that proposed to evaluate activities funded through Race to the Top awards.

Institute Reports. During the period from July 2009 through June 2010, the Standards and Review Office handled the scientific peer review of 101 reports from IES Centers. Of the 101 reports, 45 were from NCES, 39 from NCEE, 16 from NCSER, and 1 from NCER.

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES CENTERS

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

As reauthorized by Congress under ESRA, NCES has the responsibility to "collect, report, analyze, and disseminate statistical data related to education in the United States and in other nations. …" NCES publishes datasets and reports that describe, estimate, forecast, and analyze education statistics, and ensures that all users have equitable and timely access to data. In the 12-month period ending on June 30, 2010, NCES released 29 datasets—early childhood through postsecondary, domestic and international, and sample surveys and universe collections. The Center also released seven compendia volumes (e.g., *The Condition of Education* and *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*); 19 statistical reports (e.g., *The Nation's Report Card: Mathematics 2009* and *Changes in Postsecondary Awards Below the Bachelor's Degree: 1997-2007*); 14 First Look reports, which announce the release of a dataset with tables and illustrative statistics; 14 user manuals/data file documentation reports; 11 technical/methodological reports explaining aspects of NCES data collection or data properties; and various other web tables, issue briefs, and brochures.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

State-Level International Benchmarking for Student Assessments. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has been the national standard for evaluating what our nation's students know and can do since the early 1970s. NAEP assesses students in reading, mathematics, science and other subjects on a regular schedule and in a consistent manner, and the "main" NAEP generates estimates at the state, large-district and national levels. NAEP has earned credibility and influence through research-based content and methodology and guidance from a cross-section of experts and stakeholders. International benchmarking of our students' performance is based on NCES's participation in international assessments, which are currently coordinated by

one of two international bodies. While international assessments cover the same core subjects as NAEP, their depth is necessarily compromised by the need to make the assessments work across countries and cultures. Further, international assessments have been administered only to national samples because the cost of direct international assessments at the subnational level would be prohibitive, and the competition with NAEP for school cooperation could harm both types of assessments. However, states have a keen interest in state-level international benchmarks, and some have even paid in the past for their own state samples. There has been some progress in addressing that interest through statistical linking studies between NAEP and international assessments, though there are limitations to ex post linking.

NCES has developed a design for a stronger linking study and is starting to implement it. It capitalizes on the fact that the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) is scheduled to be administered in early 2011, just after the NAEP field test period. TIMSS is an assessment of the mathematics and science achievement of 4th and 8th graders in about 60 countries. It aligns with NAEP on some important dimensions, including key subjects, curricula-based assessments with similar content, grades covered, and timing and frequency of administration. The linking study is designed to produce a TIMSS-equivalent score in 8th-grade mathematics and science, core STEM fields, for all states and the District of Columbia, based on the state-level NAEP results. The NAEP-TIMSS linking study starts with assessment booklets that include both NAEP and TIMSS grade 8 mathematics and science items. Two sets of such booklets will be given to samples of 8th-graders, one during the regular NAEP assessment window and the other during the regular TIMSS assessment window in 2011. The national data from these two sets of booklets will be used to link NAEP and TIMSS by estimating a function that predicts, on the basis of state NAEP performance, how each state would have performed on TIMSS. To validate the methodology, NCES will compare the projections to actual state TIMSS scores by administering TIMSS to state samples in up to eight states. If the methodology proves robust, it may be possible to internationally benchmark state performance in the future at low cost and burden through projections.

Career and Adult Education. At the request of the Undersecretary of Education, acting in concert with the Council of Economic Advisers and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), NCES has taken the lead in improving federal data collection and statistics on the education that youth and adults need and acquire to prepare for jobs and contribute to the growth of the economy. Currently, no national data source exists for the subbaccalaureate degrees that often mark the achievement of job skills. To fill this gap and help guide future job skills education policy, NCES is developing a new set of survey items to more accurately enumerate industry-based certifications and education certificates below the bachelor's degree level. NCES is collaborating with staff from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (Current Population Survey) and the Census Bureau (American Community Survey) as hosts of "quick" efforts to close the data gap.

For a more complete solution, NCES is reviewing its portfolio of adult data collections and planning a new household study of adults to examine a wide range of post-high school credentials and probe the educational, social and economic correlates of such credentials. Tentatively called the Adult and Career Education Study, it is being designed to address such issues as the education required for various levels of jobs, the prevalence of industry-recognized certifications among adults with and without formal postsecondary educational credentials, the relationship between industry-recognized certifications and employment, barriers to adults seeking certifications and other education credentials, and the career pathways of adults with various types and levels of credentials. In conjunction with its expanded scope, the Postsecondary Division of NCES has been reconstructed as the Postsecondary, Adult, and Career Education Division.

Privacy and Confidentiality. Development of statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDS), including their extensions into postsecondary education and the workforce, has focused attention on the need for good and consistent guidance on issues of data stewardship—privacy, confidentiality and data security. Requirements to protect personally identifiable information (PII) are delineated in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), other legislation, and guidance from OMB and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Understanding and complying with privacy regulations can be a complex task for the organizations and individuals tasked with assimilating and using these data, especially as they balance these regulations with the goal of using the richness of the data to improve education at local and even individual levels. NCES, in consultation with the Family Policy Compliance Office (which oversees FERPA) and the Office of the General Counsel, is developing nonregulatory guidance and technical assistance for states and organizations engaged in building and using data systems. NCES is initiating the process with a series of technical briefs on such topics as managing PII; statistical methods for protecting PII in aggregate reports; and written agreements for data sharing, electronic data security, and privacy training. Nonregulatory guidance will follow a period of dissemination and comment.

Technical assistance to states, districts and other education data users will be provided by a new Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC), to be established by NCES by the fall of 2010. PTAC will adopt a one-stop approach to supporting the SLDS field in privacy, confidentiality, and security by disseminating information, answering individual questions, conducting training and, as appropriate, referring questions to experts in the Department.

**National Center for
Education Research
(NCER)**

NCER supports rigorous research that contributes to the solution of significant education problems in the United States.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Across the fall and spring competitions in FY 2010, NCER reviewed a total of 997 applications, which resulted in 108 new research and training awards at a total cost of about $305 million. By contrast, the total number of applications reviewed across both funding rounds in FY 2009 was 622, the total number of proposals funded was 100, and the total cost of grants awarded was approximately $228 million. The newly funded research projects address a wide range of issues. For example, researchers at Stanford University will examine the attributes, skills, orientations and behaviors of school leaders to identify characteristics associated with well-functioning schools. An intelligent tutoring system for teaching high school physics will be developed by a team of researchers at the University of Memphis. Researchers at the University of Georgia will evaluate the efficacy of a teacher professional development program intended to improve the academic development of English learners in the upper elementary grades. A team of researchers at the Southwest Educational Development Corporation will conduct a scale-up evaluation of the *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum in kindergarten through grade 5 to determine whether the curriculum improves mathematics learning and, if so, for which students and under what conditions.

Among the major awards were the six grants representing NCER's new Reading for Understanding Research Initiative (described below), two new research and development centers, and four new evaluations of state or local education programs and policies. The goals of a new center on scaling up effective schools (the Developing Effective Schools Center) are to (a) identify school-level practices that distinguish between more and less effective schools and are associated with improved student outcomes, including high school graduation and college enrollment rates for students from traditionally underachieving groups; and (b) develop and test processes to transfer these strategies to less effective schools. The purpose of a new center on cognition and mathematics instruction (the Math Center) is to apply what is currently known about improving the acquisition, retention and transfer of knowledge to redesign a mathematics curriculum in ways that will improve student learning. After the curriculum redesign is completed, the Math Center will test the efficacy of the revised curriculum to determine if it leads to better student learning. Among the four new evaluations of state or local education programs is an evaluation of the impact of the Ohio Department of Education's professional development course for preschool teachers on both teacher outcomes and young children's early literacy skills at the

end of preschool and kindergarten. NCER is also funding an evaluation of the impact of two Michigan high school programs—the Michigan Merit Curriculum, which requires students to complete more advanced coursework, and the Michigan Promise Scholarship program, which provides financial assistance for postsecondary education premised on students' course taking, achievement on the state 11th-grade examination, high school graduation, college enrollment and college completion.

Reading for Understanding Research Initiative. The Reading for Understanding Research Initiative (Reading for Understanding) was created to develop effective approaches to improving reading comprehension for all students. Six teams were selected through a competitive, scientific review process to participate in the Reading for Understanding Network. Five of the teams—those at Florida State University, the Strategic Education Research Partnership, Ohio State University, University of Texas at Austin, and the Board of Trustees at the University of Illinois—will focus on increasing understanding of the basic processes that contribute to reading comprehension and developing and evaluating instructional approaches, curricula, technology, and professional development for enhancing reading comprehension. The sixth team, at Educational Testing Service, will develop assessments designed to measure the developmental trajectories of reading comprehension skills. Central to the success of the initiative is the full participation of teachers and other school-based personnel in the design and interpretation of the research studies and interventions.

Activities of the National Research and Development (R&D) Centers. This was a productive year for NCER's R&D centers. The third conference of the National Center for Research on the Educational Achievement and Teaching of English Language Learners focused on methods for building literacy skills and oral language development for English language learners across the school curriculum. Conference attendees included instructional leaders in state and regional agencies, school districts, schools, colleges of education and publishing companies. At the National Center for Research on Early Childhood Education's leadership conference, researchers presented work on the early childhood experiences of dual-language learners to an audience of state specialists, policymakers and researchers. Conferences for state and local education leaders, practitioners, policymakers, and researchers were also held this year by the National Center for Performance Incentives, the Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, the National Research Center on Rural Education Support, the Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education, and the National Center for Postsecondary Research.

Research Findings. Among the many studies that were completed by NCER researchers this past year, two postsecondary education research projects—one focusing on improving college readiness and the other on increasing enrollment in college—are highlighted below.

California's Early Assessment Program. Through California's Early Assessment 0of high school in order to receive feedback on their college readiness. Under a small 2007 Exploration project, researcher Michal Kurlaender found that participation in the Early Assessment Program was associated with a reduction in the probability of students' needing remediation in English (6.1 percentage points) and in math (4.1 percentage points) for one California State University campus.[1] This year, she received an Efficacy Award to further evaluate the impact of the Early Assessment Program on the need for college remediation in the California State University system.

H&R Block FAFSA Experiment. Researchers at the National Center for Postsecondary Research examined the effects of a program to streamline both the financial aid application process and students' access to accurate and personalized higher education financial aid information.[2] Through the program, H&R Block tax professionals helped low- to middle-income families in Ohio and North Carolina complete the free application for federal student aid (FAFSA). The professionals also gave families in the program an immediate estimate of their eligibility for federal and state financial aid, as well as information about local postsecondary education options. The findings from this randomized experiment indicate that individuals who received assistance with the FAFSA and information about aid were substantially more likely to submit the aid application as compared to a group of students who did not receive this extra help. High school seniors in the treatment group were also much more likely to enroll in college and receive need-based financial aid the following fall. In addition, the intervention increased college enrollment for independent adults with no prior college experience.

---

1 Howell, J.S., Kurlaender, M., and Grodsky, E. (in press). Postsecondary Preparation and Remediation: Examining the Effect of the Early Assessment Program at California State University. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*.

2 Bettinger, E., Long, B.T., Oreopoulos, P., and Sanbonmatsu, L. (2009). *The Role of Simplification and Information in College Decisions: Results from the H&R Block FAFSA Experiment*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 15361.

National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER)

In December 2004, Congress reauthorized the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and in doing so, authorized NCSER as part of IES. NCSER began operation on July 1, 2005. As specified in Public Law 108-446, NCSER's threefold mission is to (a) sponsor research to expand knowledge and understanding of the needs of infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities in order to improve the developmental, educational, and transitional results of such individuals; (b) sponsor research to improve services provided under, and support the implementation of, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.); and (c) evaluate the implementation of the effectiveness of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in coordination with the NCEE.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

FY 2010 marked the fifth anniversary of NCSER. During this year, NCSER released a technical paper on power analysis[3] and a report from the National Study on Alternate Assessments on teachers' perspectives on the implementation of alternate assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities.[4] NCSER received more than 330 applications and made 35 new research and postdoctoral research training awards. These projects cover a broad range of issues related to improving outcomes for children with disabilities, including intellectual disabilities, language impairments, autism spectrum disorder, behavioral disorders and learning disabilities.

Major New Activities. This year, NCSER launched one new special education R&D center and announced competitions for four additional R&D centers. The centers are intended to contribute to the solution of important problems in special education. The new center and one of the centers under competition are described below.

> **Researching how to improve the understanding of fractions among students with mathematical learning difficulties.** Difficulty with fractions is well documented in children with and without math disabilities and is a major obstacle to further progress in mathematics. The two major goals of the new R&D center, Improving Understanding of Fractions among Students with Mathematical Learning Difficulties, are to (a) increase knowledge of how children acquire and fail to acquire an understanding of rational numbers (i.e., fractions), and

---

3   Hedges, L.V., and Rhoads, C. (2010). *Statistical Power Analysis in Education Research* (NCSER 2010-3006). Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

4   Cameto, R., Bergland, F., Knokey, A.-M., Nagle, K.M., Sanford, C., Kalb, S.C., Blackorby, J., Sinclair, B., Riley, D.L., and Ortega, M. (2010). *Teacher Perspectives of School-Level Implementation of Alternate Assessments for Students With Significant Cognitive Disabilities: A Report from the National Study on Alternate Assessments* (NCSER 2010-3007). Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

(b) determine how children with math difficulties can be taught to understand and operate fluently with rational numbers. The new center will conduct three strands of research. The first strand entails small-scale experimental studies to examine the cognitive processes that underlie magnitude representations of rational numbers and the use of those representations in operations with rational numbers. The second strand will be longitudinal studies of students with and without math difficulties to examine how numerical magnitude representations, proficiency with whole number operations, working memory for numbers, and other factors contribute to understanding and operating with rational numbers. Findings from these two strands of research will be used to inform the design of instructional innovations, which constitutes the third strand of research. The instructional innovations are intended to compensate for the cognitive limitations of students with math difficulties that are identified in the earlier studies.

Increasing research on reading instruction for deaf and hard of hearing students. Students who are deaf or hard of hearing face significant challenges in developing reading skills. National data suggest that median literacy rates of deaf high school graduates have remained consistently around the fourth-grade level since the beginning of the twentieth century[5] and that about one in five deaf students who graduate from high school have reading skills at or below the second-grade level.[6] To address this issue, NCSER announced a competition for an R&D center on Reading Instruction for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students. This Center will conduct a focused program of research to explore underlying factors related to literacy for young students who are deaf or hard of hearing, and develop innovative approaches to improving reading instruction for these students. The Center will focus on students from kindergarten through grade 2 to maximize the potential long-term impact of early literacy skills intervention on literacy development and overall school performance, and it will be designed to be implemented in authentic education delivery settings.

Research Findings. Over the past 5 years, NCSER researchers have begun expanding the knowledge and understanding of infants, toddlers and children with disabilities. Three NCSER studies are highlighted below.

Reading instruction for students with intellectual disabilities. Traditionally, if students with significant intellectual disabilities received any literacy instruction, it was limited to teaching specific sight words deemed important for daily living. A common attitude was that such students did not have

---

5 Allen, T. E. (1994). *Who Are the Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Students Leaving High School and Entering Postsecondary Education?* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies.

6 Dew, D. (Ed.). (1999). *Serving Individuals Who Are Low-Functioning Deaf: Report of the Twenty-Fifth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues.* Washington, DC: George Washington University.

the basic capacities for learning to read. Patricia Mathes, Jill Allor, and their colleagues at Southern Methodist University have found that with a comprehensive early literacy intervention, students with moderate intellectual disabilities (IQs from 40 to 55) can develop basic word recognition skills (e.g., phonemic awareness and alphabetic decoding) and their improvements on vocabulary and word recognition surpass those of control students receiving traditional special education services.[7] This study is a step toward opening doors for students with moderate intellectual disabilities.

The value of special education teacher training. Although a number of studies have examined the relations between teacher preparation and student outcomes for typically developing students, very little research has examined the relation between teacher preparation and outcomes for students with disabilities. Is special education preservice or in-service training associated with better outcomes for students with disabilities? According to an analysis of the Florida K-20 Education Data Warehouse by NCSER researchers Li Feng and Tim Sass, teacher participation in professional development on special education issues does not appear to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.[8] However, preservice training does seem to make a difference; students with disabilities in general education classes who have teachers who were certified in special education do better in math and reading compared to students with disabilities whose teachers were not certified in special education.

Identification of children with learning difficulties in mathematics. Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Kindergarten Cohort, researchers Paul Morgan, George Farkas, and Qiong Wu mapped out the learning trajectories of four groups of children: (a) those who did not exhibit mathematics difficulties in the fall or spring of kindergarten,[9] (b) those with mathematics difficulties in the fall of kindergarten but not the spring, (c) those with mathematics difficulties in the spring but not the fall of kindergarten, and (d) those with mathematics difficulties in both the fall and spring of kindergarten.[10] Although students with mathematics difficulties at any time during kindergarten do show growth in math performance through the elementary school years, their math scores throughout elementary school remain substantially below their peers who never had math difficulty in kindergarten. The growth trajectories of the four

---

7 Allor, J., Mathes, P., Roberts, K., Jones, F., and Champlin, T. (2010). Teaching Students With Moderate Intellectual Disabilities to Read: An Experimental Examination of a Comprehensive Reading Intervention. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities, 45,* 3-22.

8 Feng, L., and Sass, T.R. (March, 2009). *Special Education Teacher Quality and Student Achievement.* Presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Finance Association, Nashville, TN.

9 Children exhibiting mathematics difficulties were defined as those scoring in the bottom 10 percent.

10 Morgan, P.L., Farkas, G., and Wu, Q. (2009). Five-year growth trajectories of kindergarten children with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities.*

groups provide insight into the magnitude and severity of mathematics learning difficulties, and suggest that early identification and more intensive intervention than what is typically provided by schools is needed if these students are to become proficient in mathematics.

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE)

The work of NCEE falls into four broad categories: (a) conducting evaluations of federal and other education programs, particularly those focused on assessing the impacts of various strategies for improving educational outcomes; (b) translating and disseminating evidence on the effectiveness of strategies for achieving educational goals; (c) providing resources and technical guidance to improve the quality, efficiency, and/or dissemination of education evaluations; and (d) providing technical support and assistance to state and local education agencies, and local evaluators, for federally supported program initiatives. Evaluations conducted during this past fiscal year number nearly 40 (see table C-1).

The evaluations have included congressionally mandated studies of federally funded programs as well as evaluations of non-federally funded programs. In addition to studies conducted by NCEE's evaluation division, each of the RELs is also engaged in conducting one or more intervention studies. Consistent with current policy interests, a large share of the studies addressed issues related to literacy (eight), teacher quality (eight), and students with disabilities. Notably, NCEE completed nine major evaluations this past year, including two high-profile studies of school choice—the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program evaluation and an evaluation of charter middle schools—and one high-profile study of support for novice teachers (an evaluation of two different teacher induction programs). The following are highlights of the findings from these three studies, all of which were large-scale, randomized controlled trials:

SCHOOL CHOICE

The **DC Opportunity Scholarship Program** evaluation examined the benefits of offering a generous scholarship that students could use to attend private schools. The study found no evidence that the scholarship offer resulted in improvement in the academic achievement of students, including those students who were the primary targets for the intervention—those attending schools that had been designated as "in need of improvement" under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. However, among the small group of students who could have graduated during the study period, a significantly higher proportion of those in the scholarship group than in the control group did so (82 versus 70 percent).

An evaluation of **charter middle schools** examined the impacts on outcomes for students who applied to and were offered admission to one of 36 oversubscribed charter schools distributed across 15 states. This study found that, on average, among students who applied to one of these oversubscribed schools, having the option to attend the charter school did not result in improved scores on standardized achievement tests, increased attendance, higher rates of grade promotion, or better conduct than would have been expected had they not had the option to attend the charter school. However, it also is notable that the estimated impacts of the charter school admissions offer varied significantly across subgroups of students defined by the charter school to which they applied. Students applying to charter schools in urban areas and those that served higher proportions of low-income and low-achieving students tended to show evidence of better student outcomes compared to the alternative schools students would attend. In contrast, students who were offered admission to charter schools in nonurban areas and that tended to serve relatively more advantaged students tended to do no better— and, in some cases, worse than expected—had they not been accepted to the charter.

NOVICE TEACHER SUPPORT

An evaluation examined the impacts of two different teacher induction programs— both widely used, highly regarded models of professional development and support for novice teachers—on teacher retention, classroom practices, and student achievement. Some teachers in the study sample received 2 years of induction support, some received 1 year of support, and others received a level of support described as "business as usual." The study, which looked at outcomes over 3 years, found no evidence of impacts on classroom practices or retention. Moreover, evidence of student achievement impacts were limited. There were no impacts on student achievement during the first 2 years of the study for those students taught by teachers in either of the induction programs, as compared with their counterparts whose teachers received business-as-usual support. The only evidence of impacts on student achievement was for a very small subgroup of the study sample whose teachers were assigned to receive 2 years of induction support and whose students had baseline and follow-up achievement tests.

The bulk of NCEE's translational and dissemination work falls under the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) or the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). While ERIC maintains and disseminates primary education research reports,[11] WWC focuses on translational and dissemination activities related specifically to the effectiveness of education programs, policies and practices. This past year, WWC invested heavily in

---

11 In May 2010, ERIC had a total of about 8,500 web hits across the 25 top search terms. In descending order of the number of hits, the top 25 search terms are as follows: mathematics (533), reading, special education, inclusion, motivation, classroom management, assessment, No Child Left Behind, technology, school violence, e-learning, cooperative learning, multiple intelligences, parental involvement, bullying, curriculum, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, teaching, learning styles, learning disabilities, learning, distance education, English language learners, home schooling, and educational technology (226).

reviews of evidence related to the effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving outcomes for students with disabilities (11 reviews), improving adolescent literacy outcomes (4 reviews), and improving outcomes for English language learners (3 reviews).

WWC also issued 19 Quick Reviews, which are designed to provide education practitioners and policymakers with timely and objective assessments of the quality of the research evidence from recently released research papers and reports whose public release is reported in a major national news source. Among the Quick Reviews conducted this past year, several addressed reasonably high-profile initiatives, including school choice (three studies of charter schools and one of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program, as previously noted) and an initiative to simplify the federal student aid application process.

Research to support improvements in the quality of education evaluation is carried out primarily through NCEE funding of commissioned Technical Methods Papers, which are made available on the IES website. Among the issues addressed this year are the timely questions regarding the reliability of teacher value-added measures and how reliability improves as the number of measures available for a given teacher increases (http://ies. ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20104004/pdf/20104004.pdf). This study of value-added measures has important implications for the design of evaluations of teacher quality initiatives, such as the evaluation of the teacher compensation plans being implemented under the Teacher Incentive Fund grants. Other methodological issues addressed include treatment of missing data in evaluations, standards for quality of evidence based on regression discontinuity designs, and the strengths and limitations of using state achievement test data in program evaluations.

The principal vehicle for providing technical support and assistance to state and local education agencies is the REL program. The RELs have continued to generate a variety of research products tailored to the needs of their constituents. These range from studies of student mobility patterns (Central Region) to descriptive studies of the range of response to intervention strategies being employed (Northeast and Islands Region).

As of mid-July of 2010, NCEE had released 11 evaluation reports, 7 reports on research resources and technical methods, and 10 reports (Issues & Answers and REL Technical Briefs) from the RELs (see table C-2); 24 WWC intervention reports (see table C-3); and 19 Quick Reviews (see table C-4).

As shown in table C-1, many current NCEE evaluations will continue into 2011. NCEE also will launch at least nine new evaluation initiatives in addition to the three ARRA evaluation projects currently under development, including four new studies in special education and four related to teacher quality (see table C-5). These include a collaborative initiative with the National Science Foundation to conduct a study of math

professional development, three new studies in special education, and four studies of teacher quality.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Dissemination and application of research to inform policy and practice. This year, the RELs increased the level and effectiveness of their work directed at translating research for policymakers and practitioners through the research-to-practice forums, or Bridge Events, which they began experimenting with a couple of years ago. By the end of this fiscal year, the labs will have held 84 of these events, collectively bringing together an estimated 8,000 educators, school officials and policymakers to learn about the evidence behind important educational strategies and practices (see table C-6).

Research-to-practice forums are typically full-day events that entail formal presentations by researchers and practitioners, as well as group activities designed to promote participants' abilities to apply the knowledge in their work settings. A vast majority (about 70) of these events have keyed off the WWC Practice Guides.[12]

Funding awards for IES studies through the OMB evaluation initiative. NCEE is positioned to embark on a portfolio of evaluations focused on various education initiatives supported under ARRA. Notably, these evaluations are being supported through two sources: new funding for the ARRA evaluations ($15 million in the IES FY 2010 budget and $37.5 million in the IES FY 2011 budget request) and the OMB's Evaluation Initiative competition. There will be five initiatives in this collection: (1) an impact evaluation of Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants; (2) an impact evaluation of math professional development for elementary school teachers; (3) an impact evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund; (4) an integrated evaluation of ARRA programs, which will look at how states and districts are using the stimulus money, coordination across funding streams, and policies formulated and strategies implemented under ARRA; and (5) technical assistance to the local evaluators for the Investing in Innovation (i3) grantees and synthesis of the local evaluation findings.

NCEE expects to award contracts for four of these initiatives by the end of this fiscal year; the contract for the impact evaluation of math professional development is expected to be awarded by September 2011, contingent upon approval of funding for the OMB award through the FY 11 budget.

The following are examples of the questions that will be addressed in this portfolio of evaluations:

> **Race to the Top and School Improvement Grants.** The evaluations will address the following types of questions:

---

12 Since 2007, the What Works Clearinghouse has published 12 Practice Guides. Currently, there are several guides in process.

- How well are Race to the Top and School Improvement Grant programs implemented at the state, district and school levels?

- Does grant receipt lead to significant improvements in the outcomes for students in schools targeted for turnaround under these programs?

- Is there evidence that particular strategies for turning around schools or qualities of implementation are related to the success (or lack thereof) in improving student outcomes?

Integrated Evaluation of ARRA Programs. This initiative is intended to provide an independent assessment of the implementation and outcomes across ARRA funding streams. The goals are to provide formative assessments that will be useful in monitoring the initiative, summative assessments that will incorporate analysis of information on ARRA in total, and assessments of specific strategies adopted by grantees—for example, to improve teacher effectiveness or to turn around low-performing schools.

Teacher Incentive Fund Program Evaluation. This is a large-scale randomized controlled trial to assess the impacts of pay-for-performance strategies implemented by Teacher Incentive Fund grantees. The primary research questions are the following:

- What is the impact of differentiated, performance-based compensation for teachers on student achievement?

- What is the impact on teacher recruitment and retention?

Secondary questions will examine whether the particular type of compensation strategy affects the impacts of the strategy on student achievement.

BOARD ACTIVITIES

Next Steps

IES Priorities. ESRA requires that the Director of the Institute develop priorities to guide the work of the Institute. The Board must approve the priorities, but before proposing the priorities to the Board, the Director must seek public comment on the priorities. In June 2010, IES Director John Q. Easton developed a proposed set of priorities and published them in the *Federal Register* to solicit public comment by September 7, 2010. The public comments will be provided to the Board prior to its action on the priorities.

CONCLUSION

BOARD'S MESSAGE

The NBES oversees the primary functions of IES. The Board is designed to include representatives of both the research community and the general policy community. The Board's design calls for rotating membership, with presidential appointments and Senate confirmation. The 15 members provide impartial advice on the key operations of IES along with fulfilling statutory requirements for review and approval of Institute activities.

The Board's ability to perform its role depends upon a nomination and confirmation process that ensures the regular appointment of highly qualified members. During 2009 and 2010, NBES membership dipped to low levels due to the completion of members' appointed terms. This diminished membership threatened the full functioning of the Board. We urge continual vigilance to ensure that the Board operates at its congressionally authorized level.

CHAIR'S MESSAGE

It is extraordinarily important to the nation that we improve our schools and that we become truly competitive with the other developed nations of the world. The strength of our nation is built on its human capital, and our schools must continually improve to ensure that our population reaches its full potential. The research and evaluation currently being conducted will have its impact over the next decades. Success will be seen in terms of the knowledge and skills of our society.

Over the short period of operation of IES, we have seen a remarkable transformation in the character of educational research. Where education research was once frequently viewed as being unscientific, that is no longer the case. IES has shown that it is possible to do rigorous research on the processes of education. This renaissance of education research is beginning to inform policy and practice.

We must build on the current solid base of research to enhance our schools. This will require a close and cooperative relationship between IES and our state and local school authorities. It will also require a continued commitment to maintaining the highest scientific standards for the research and evaluation of the federal government.

We applaud the continued support of the U.S. Congress and the Administration for improving and expanding the knowledge base for our schools and for educational policymaking.

—Eric A. Hanushek

APPENDIX A

**Members of the
National Board for
Education Sciences
(as of July 1, 2010)**

Mr. Jonathan Baron
Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy
Washington, DC
Term expires November 28, 2011

Dr. Carol A. D'Amico
Conexus Indiana
Indianapolis, IN
Term expires November 28, 2010

Dr. Deborah Loewenberg Ball
School of Education
University of Michigan
Dearborn, MI
Term expires November 28, 2012

Dr. Adam Gamoran
Wisconsin Center for Education Research
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI
Term expires November 28, 2011

Dr. David C. Geary
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO
Term expires November 20, 2010

Mr. F. Philip Handy
Strategic Industries, LLC
Winter Park, FL
Term expires November 28, 2011

Dr. Eric A. Hanushek
Hoover Institution
Stanford University
Stanford, CA
Term expires November 28, 2010

Dr. Bridget Terry Long
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA
Term expires November 28, 2012

Ms. Margaret R. (Peggy) McLeod
Alexandria City Public Schools
Alexandria, VA
Term expires November 28, 2012

Dr. Sally E. Shaywitz
Department of Pediatrics
Yale University School of Medicine
New Haven, CT
Term expires November 28, 2011

Ex Officio Members

Director of the Institute of Education Sciences
Each of the Commissioners of the IES National Education Centers
Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
Director of the Census Bureau
Director of the National Science Foundation
Commissioner of Labor Statistics

APPENDIX B

Approved National Board for Education Sciences Resolutions (since inception)

1. Congress, in authorizing and funding evaluations of federal education programs, should require [program] grantees, as a condition of grant award, to participate in the evaluation if asked, including the random assignment to intervention and control groups as appropriate. (April 2005)

2. Congress and the U.S. Department of Education should ensure that individual student data can be used by researchers (with appropriate safeguards for confidentiality) in order to provide evaluations and analyses to improve our schools. (September 2006)

3. Congress should designate the Institute of Education Sciences, in statute, as the lead agency for all congressionally authorized evaluations of U.S. Department of Education programs, responsible for all operations, contracts, and reports associated with such evaluations. (September 2006)

4. Congress should allow the U.S. Department of Education to pool funds generated by the 0.5 percent evaluation set-aside from smaller programs. (September 2006)

5. The U.S. Department of Education should use its "waiver" authority to build scientifically valid knowledge about what works in K-12 education. (September 2006)

6. Congress should create, in statute, effective incentives for federal education program grantees to adopt practices or strategies meeting the highest standard of evidence of sizeable, sustained effects on important educational outcomes. (May 2007)

7. Congress should revise the statutory definition of "scientifically based research" so that it includes studies likely to produce valid conclusions about a program's effectiveness, and excludes studies that often produce erroneous conclusions. (October 2007)

8. The Board will review and advise the IES Director on grant awards where the proposed grantee is selected out of rank order of applicant scores that result from peer review for scientific merit. (January 2008)

9. The Board commends the Secretary and the U.S. Department of Education for moving forward in developing new regulations and guidance about how to maintain confidentiality of educational data under the Family Educational

Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) while also providing for research uses of student and school data. The Department should finalize these regulations quickly, incorporating the major clarifications that have been submitted in comments. (May 2008)

10. Congress should expand on the program of supporting statewide longitudinal data systems by requiring that states accepting funding under this program agree to make data in these systems available to qualified researchers (subject to FERPA) for the purpose of research that is intended to help improve student achievement. (May 2008)

APPENDIX C

NCEE-Sponsored Evaluations, Reports, and Events

Table C-1: NCEE Evaluations FY 2010

Number	Title	Completed	Expected Completion Year	Policy Area	Contractor/REL
1	Integrated Evaluation of ARRA Funds			ARRA	TBD
2	Evaluation of Investing in Innovation (i3)			ARRA	TBD
3	Impact Evaluation of Race to the Top (RTT) and School Improvement Grants (SIGs)			ARRA	TBD
4	Charter Schools: Evaluation of the Impact of Charter School Strategies	✓	2010	Choice	Mathematica
5	Magnet School Assistance Program: Evaluation of Conversion Magnet Schools		2011	Choice	AIR, UCSD, BPA
6	DC Choice: Evaluation of the Impact of the DC Choice Program	✓	2011	Choice	Westat
7	Adult Education: Evaluation of the Impact of Literacy Instruction on Adult ESL (English as a Second Language) Learners		2010	Literacy	AIR, Lewin, ETS, BPA
8	English Language Learning: Effects of Transitional Bilingual Education, Two-Way Bilingual, and Structured English Immersion Programs on the Literacy and Oracy of Spanish-Dominant Children	✓	2010	Literacy	Johns Hopkins University
9	Reading Comprehension: Evaluation of the Reading Comprehension Programs		2010	Literacy	Mathematica, RG, RMC
10	Teacher Preparation in Early Reading		2010	Literacy	Optimal Solutions, AIR
11	Evaluation of the Impacts of Linguistic Modification of Math Test Item Sets for English Language Learner Students[a]	✓	2010	Literacy	REL
12	English Language Learning: Project ELLA (English Language/Literacy Acquisition)	✓	2010	Literacy	Texas A&M Foundation
13	Even Start: Even Start Classroom Literacy Interventions and Outcomes Study		2010	Literacy	Westat, Abt
14	Language Development: National Title I Study of Implementation and Outcomes: Early Childhood Language Development		2014	Literacy	Mathematica, DIR, UIC
15	Adolescent Literacy: Evaluation of the Impact of Supplemental Literacy Interventions in Freshman Academies		2010	Literacy	MDRC, AIR
16	Evaluation of Early Elementary Math Curricula		2010	Mathematics	Mathematica, SRI
17	Evaluation of the Impacts of CompassLearning Odyssey Math on Math Achievement[a]	✓	2010	Mathematics	REL Mid-Atlantic
18	National Assessment of IDEA: Study of Patterns of Identification of Outcomes for Children and Youth With Disabilities	✓	2010	Students with Disabilities	SRI
19	National Assessment of IDEA: IDEA National Assessment Implementation Study		2011	Students with Disabilities	Abt, Westat, Windwalker
20	Special Education Personnel Preparation: Evaluation of the Personal Preparation to Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities Program		2011	Students with Disabilities	Westat, CEC, Compass

See notes at end of table.

Table C-1: NCEE Evaluations FY 2010—Continued

Number	Title	Completed	Expected Completion Year	Policy Area	Contractor/REL
21	National Assessment of IDEA 2004: School Improvement Status and Outcomes for Students With Disabilities		2013	Students with Disabilities	AIR, SRM
22	National Assessment of IDEA 2004: Impact Evaluation of Response to Intervention (RTI)		2013	Students with Disabilities	MDRC, SRI, and SRM
23	National Assessment of IDEA 2004: National Evaluation of the IDEA Technical Assistance and Dissemination Program		2014	Students with Disabilities	Westat, Empatha
24	Design and IDEA-Related Analyses for the National Assessment			Students with Disabilities	TBD
25	Professional Development in Math: Impact of Professional Development Strategies on Teacher Practice and Student Achievement in Math		2010	Teacher Quality	AIR, MDRC
26	Teacher Induction: Impact Evaluation of Teacher Induction Programs	✓	2010	Teacher Quality	Mathematica, WestEd, Center for Education Leadership
27	Teacher Preparation in the United States: Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States	✓	2010	Teacher Quality	NRC
28	Alternative Certification Models: Impact on Secondary Math Achievement of Highly Selective Alternative Routes to Certification		2013	Teacher Quality	Mathematica, Chesapeake
29	Evaluation of Middle School Mathematics Professional Development			Teacher Quality	TBD
30	A Study of Teacher Residency Programs			Teacher Quality	TBD
31	Teacher Recruitment: Impact Evaluation of Moving High-Performing Teachers to Low-Performing Schools		2012	Teacher Quality	Mathematica, New Teacher Project, Optimal Solutions
32	Impact Evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund			Teacher Quality	Mathematica
33	Mandatory-Random Student Drug Testing: An Evaluation of the Impact of Mandatory-Random Student Drug Testing		2010	Other	RMC, Mathematica
34	Supplemental Education Services: Impact Evaluation of Title I Supplemental Education Services		2010	Other	Mathematica
35	Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers		2011	Other	Branch Associates, DIR, PSA
36	School-Based Violence Prevention: Impact Evaluation of School-Based Violence Prevention Programs		2011	Other	RTI, PIRE, Tanglewood
37	Regional Educational Laboratories: Evaluation of the Regional Educational Laboratories		2012	Other	Westat, Policy Studies
38	Technical Assistance With Evaluations of the U.S. Department of Education Grant Programs		2011	Technical Assistance	Westat, Compass
39	Striving Readers Technical Assistance: Technical Assistance to Local Impact Evaluations of Striving Readers Projects		2014	Technical Assistance	Abt

a This study was completed under one of the Regional Educational Laboratory contracts.
NOTE: The full names of the contractors noted in this table are as follows: AIR: American Institutes for Research; BPA: Berkeley Policy Associates; CEC: Center for Exceptional Children; DIR: Decision Information Resources, Inc.; ETS: Educational Testing Service; PIRE: Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation; PSA: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.; REL: Regional Educational Laboratory; RG: RG Research; RMC: RMC Research Corporation; RTI: RTI International; and UCSD: University of California, San Diego.

Table C-2: NCEE Evaluation Reports, Technical Reference and Methods Reports, Issues & Answers Documents, and REL Technical Briefs

Number	Release Date	Title
Evaluation Reports (Evaluation Division and Regional Educational Laboratories)		
1	November 2010	A Multisite Cluster Randomized Trial of the Effects of CompassLearning Odyssey Math on the Math Achievement of Selected Grade 4 Students in the Mid-Atlantic Region[a]
2	January 2010	Patterns in the Identification of and Outcomes for Children and Youth With Disabilities
3	April 2010	Middle School Mathematics Professional Development Impact Study: Findings After the First Year of Implementation
4	April 2010	Impacts of a Violence Prevention Program for Middle Schools: Findings From the First Year of Implementation
5	May 2010	Effectiveness of Selected Supplemental Reading Comprehension Interventions: Findings from Two Student Cohorts
6	June 2010	Evaluation of the Impact of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program: Final Report
7	June 2010	Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study
8	June 2010	The Evaluation of Charter School Impacts: Final Report
9	June 2010	Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers: Interim Report
10	July 2010	The Effectiveness of Mandatory-Random Student Drug Testing
11	July 2010	Effects of Problem Based Economics on High School Economics Instruction[a]
12	July 2010	Accommodations for English Language Learner Students: The Effect of Linguistic Modification of Math Test Item Sets[a]
Technical Reference and Technical Methods Reports		
1	December 2010	Survey of Outcomes Measurement in Research on Character Education Programs
2	November 2009	Using State Tests in Education Experiments: A Discussion of the Issues
3	October 2009	What to Do When Data Are Missing in Group Randomized Controlled Trials
4	October 2009	Do Typical RCTs of Education Interventions Have Sufficient Statistical Power for Linking Impacts on Teacher Practice and Student Achievement Outcomes
5	June 2010	Standards for Regression Discontinuity Designs
6	June 2010	The Single Case Design Standards (within the updated Technical Guidance for the What Works Clearinghouse Reviews)
7	July 2010	Error Rates in Measuring Teacher and School Performance Based on Student Test Score Gains
Issues & Answers Documents and REL Technical Briefs (Regional Educational Laboratory Reports)[a]		
1	October 2009	Indian Education Policies in Five Northwest Region States
2	November 2009	New and Experienced Teachers in a School Reform Initiative: The Example of Reading First
3	November 2009	Features of State Response to Intervention Initiatives in Northeast and Islands Region States
4	January 2010	School-Site Administrators: A California County and Regional Perspective on Labor Market Trends
5	February 2010	Processes and Challenges in Identifying Learning Disabilities Among Students Who Are English Language Learners in Three New York State Districts
6	March 2010	A Systematic Comparison of American Diploma Project English Language Arts College Readiness Standards With Those of ACT, College Board, and Standards for Success
7	March 2010	The Relationship Between Changes in the Percentage of Students Passing and in the Percentage Testing Advanced on State Assessments in Kentucky and Virginia
8	March 2010	Changes in the Cost of Energy in One State's School Districts
9	April 2010	Updated Multistate Review of Professional Teaching Standards
10	June 2010	Student Mobility in Five States in the Central Region: A Comparison of Rural and Nonrural Districts by State

a Completed by the Regional Educational Laboratories.

Table C-3: WWC Intervention Reports Released through July 15, 2010

Number	Date	Topic	Intervention
1	October 2009	Adolescent Literacy Intervention	Read 180
2	June 2010	Adolescent Literacy Intervention	Project CRISS
3	July 2010	Adolescent Literacy Intervention	Reading Apprenticeship
4	November 2009	Dropout Prevention Intervention	Youthbuild
5	October 2009	Early Childhood Education Intervention	Headsprout
6	April 2010	Early Childhood Education Interventions for Children With a Disability Intervention	Dialogic Reading
7	December 2009	English Language Learners Intervention	Reading Recovery
8	December 2009	English Language Learners Intervention	Accelerated Reader
9	June 2010	English Language Learners Intervention	Read Well
10	July 2010	English Language Learners Intervention	Read Naturally
11	January 2010	Middle School Math Intervention	Connected Math
12	March 2010	Middle School Math Intervention	Plato Achieve Now
13	April 2010	Middle School Math Intervention	Saxon
14	March 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Voyager Reading Program
15	March 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing (LiPS)®
16	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Alphabet Phonics
17	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Barton Reading and Spelling System
18	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Foundations
19	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Dyslexia Training Program
20	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Herman Method
21	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Wilson Reading System
22	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Unbranded-Orton-Gillingham-Based Interventions
23	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Project Read
24	July 2010	Students With Learning Disabilities Intervention	Read 180

Table C-4: WWC Quick Reviews Released through July 15, 2010

Number	Release Date	Topic	Title
1	June 2010	College Access	FAFSA Federal Student Aid Study
2	June 2010	Early Childhood	Summation Evaluation of the Ready to Learn Initiative
3	July 2010	Early Childhood	Head Start Impact Study
4	January 2010	Mathematics	Elementary School Math Curricula
5	March 2010	Other	Harlem's Children Zone Promise Academy Study
6	July 2010	Other	Effects of Displaced Students in Chicago Public Schools
7	February 2010	Reading	Supplemental Reading Comprehension Curricula Study
8	March 2010	Reading	The Use of Privatized School Management in Philadelphia
9	February 2010	School Choice	Charter School Performance in 16 States Study
10	February 2010	School Choice	DC Opportunity Scholarship
11	March 2010	School Choice	Effects of Privatized School Management on Academic Achievement of Eighth Graders
12	July 2010	School Choice	Charter School Performance in NYC Study (CREDO)
13	February 2010	Social and Behavioral	Recursive Processes in Self-Affirmation: Intervening to Close the Minority Achievement Gap Self-Affirmation
14	March 2010	Social and Behavioral	Reward Structure in Group Learning Study
15	July 2010	Social and Behavioral	Abstinence-only Education Program Study
16	February 2010	Supplementary Services	Experience Corps Program Study
17	February 2010	Teacher Quality	NYC Aspiring Principals Program Study
18	February 2010	Technology	Educational Benefits of Computer-Aided Instruction
19	March 2010	Technology	Reading and Math Software Products Study

Table C-5: New NCEE Evaluations Planned for 2011

Number	Title
	Special
1	Impact Study of Teacher Professional Development in Mathematics
	IDEA
2	Study of Outcomes From Preschool Special Education
3	Study of Transition Outcomes for Youth With Disabilities, Phase 1
4	Early Longitudinal Study of Kindergarten Class of 2010-11, Response to Intervention (RTI)
5	Design and IDEA-Related Analyses for the National Assessment
	Title I: Improving Academic Achievement
6	Study of Implementation of Reauthorized Title I Programs
	Title II(A): Teacher Quality
7	A Study of Promising Recruitment Strategies
8	A Study of Promising Teacher Preparation Programs
9	Teacher Recruitment: Impact Evaluation of Moving High-Performing Teachers to Low-Performing Schools
10	A Study of Teacher Quality Distribution
	Title V: Promise Neighborhoods
11	National Evaluation of Promise Neighborhoods

Table C-6: Regional Educational Laboratory Bridge Events

Number	Title	Topic of Relevant Practice Guide	Regional Laboratory	Date
1	Using Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking in Kentucky	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Appalachia	5/25/10
2	Using Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking for Rural Schools	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Appalachia	8/23/10
3	Using Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking in Kentucky	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Appalachia	10/26/10
4	Helping Students Navigate the Path to College: What High Schools Can Do: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	3/9/09
5	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	3/2/10
6	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	3/11/10
7	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	3/25/10
8	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	3/25/10
9	Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decisionmaking	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Mid-Atlantic	8/4/10
10	Instructional Decisionmaking Using Student Achievement Data: A Research Forum for Northwest Region Leaders	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Northwest	10/28/10
11	Instructional Decisionmaking Using Student Achievement Data: A Research Forum for Northwest Region Leaders	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Northwest	10/28/10
12	Instructional Decisionmaking Using Student Achievement Data: A Research Forum for Northwest Region Leaders	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Northwest	11/5/10
13	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Pacific	1/13/10
14	Using Data to Design and Evaluate Effective Professional Development	Data-Driven Decisionmaking	Southeast	4/6/10
15	Dropout Prevention: Keeping Our Students in School	Dropout Prevention	Northeast	2/9/10
16	Dropout Prevention: A Forum for Education Leaders in Washington High Schools	Dropout Prevention	Northwest	3/9/09
17	Dropout Prevention: A Forum for Education Leaders in Washington High Schools	Dropout Prevention	Northwest	5/17/10
18	Dropout Prevention: A Forum for Education Leaders in Washington High Schools	Dropout Prevention	Northwest	6/24/10
19	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Mid-Atlantic	3/16/10
20	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Mid-Atlantic	3/18/10

Table C-6: Regional Educational Laboratory Bridge Events—Continued

Number	Title	Topic of Relevant Practice Guide	Regional Laboratory	Date
21	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Mid-Atlantic	3/24/10
22	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Mid-Atlantic	6/16/10
23	Successful Strategies for English Language Learners	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Midwest	12/11/09
24	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Pacific	3/1/10
25	Pacific: Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades	Pacific	4/7/10
26	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Appalachia	4/19/10
27	Encouraging Girls in Math and Sciences	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Appalachia	10/25/10
28	Encouraging Girls in Math Science: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Mid-Atlantic	2/8/10
29	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Mid-Atlantic	3/1/10
30	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Mid-Atlantic	3/18/10
31	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Encouraging Girls in Math and Science	Mid-Atlantic	9/28/10
32	Research-Based Practices in K-12 Literacy	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Mid-Atlantic	12/10/09
33	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Mid-Atlantic	1/14/10
34	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Mid-Atlantic	2/25/10
35	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Vocabulary and Comprehension Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Northwest	2/17/10
36	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Pacific	8/16/10
37	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices (Webinar)	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Pacific	8/17/10
38	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Pacific	8/18/10
39	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Southeast	1/27/10
40	Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	West	12/3/09
41	Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	West	12/4/09

Table C-6: Regional Educational Laboratory Bridge Events—Continued

Number	Title	Topic of Relevant Practice Guide	Regional Laboratory	Date
42	Helping Students Navigate the Path to College: What High Schools Can Do	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Mid-Atlantic	3/19/10
43	Helping Students Navigate the Path to College: What High Schools Can Do: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Mid-Atlantic	5/10/10
44	Helping Students Navigate the Pathway to College: What High Schools Can Do	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Mid-Atlantic	5/21/10
45	Helping Students Navigate the Path to College	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Mid-Atlantic	6/24/10
46	Connecting Research to Practice: Helping Students Navigate the Path to College	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Midwest	5/18/10
47	Texas Consortium on School Research: College Readiness (Part one meeting)	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Southwest	1/25/10
48	Texas Consortium on School Research: College Readiness (Part two meeting)	Increasing Access to Higher Education	Southwest	2/26/10
49	Pathways to College: Next Steps for Nevada	Increasing Access to Higher Education	West	11/12/09
50	Research and Resources for Improving Graduation Rates and College Access in the Southwestern Region	Increasing Access to Higher Education	West	4/1/10
51	Pathways to College: Increasing Access to Postsecondary Education for all Canyons School District Students	Increasing Access to Higher Education	West	5/5/10
52	Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning	Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning	Mid-Atlantic	1/18/10
53	Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning	Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning	Mid-Atlantic	1/19/10
54	Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Out-of-School Time Programs	Mid-Atlantic	5/12/10
55	Structuring Out-of-School Time to Improve Academic Achievement: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Out-of-School Time Programs	Mid-Atlantic	5/18/10
56	Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning	Out-of-School Time Programs	Mid-Atlantic	6/2/10
57	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom: A Research Forum for Mid-Atlantic Region Leaders	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom	Mid-Atlantic	4/12/10
58	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom: A Research Forum for Mid-Atlantic Region Leaders	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom	Mid-Atlantic	4/12/10
59	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom: Policy Challenge Conference for Massachusetts	Reducing Behavior Problems in the Elementary School Classroom	Northeast	1/26/10
60	Assisting Students With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Grades	Response to Intervention–Math	Mid-Atlantic	1/21/10
61	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention in Elementary and Middle Schools: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Response to Intervention–Math	Mid-Atlantic	1/27/10
62	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools	Response to Intervention–Math	Mid-Atlantic	5/6/10
63	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools	Response to Intervention–Math	Mid-Atlantic	10/12/10

Table C-6: Regional Educational Laboratory Bridge Events—Continued

Number	Title	Topic of Relevant Practice Guide	Regional Laboratory	Date
64	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools	Response to Intervention–Math	Mid-Atlantic	11/3/10
65	Policy Challenges Conference: Implementing Response to Intervention in Mathematics: Research-Based Strategies for Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont Grades K-8 schools	Response to Intervention–Math	Northeast	2/9/10
66	Policy Challenges Conference: Implementing Response to Intervention in Mathematics: Research-Based Strategies for Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont Grades K-8 schools	Response to Intervention–Math	Northeast	3/3/10
67	Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School Mathematics (Webinar)	Response to Intervention–Math	Northwest	3/23/10
68	Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School Mathematics (Webinar)	Response to Intervention–Math	Northwest	3/30/10
69	Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle School Mathematics (Webinar)	Response to Intervention–Math	Northwest	4/6/10
70	Assisting Students Struggling With Mathematics: Response to Intervention for Elementary and Middle Schools: Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice	Response to Intervention–Math	Pacific	1/13/10
71	Assisting Students Struggling With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	11/16/09
72	Assisting Students Struggling With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	11/16/09
73	Assisting Students Struggling With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	12/4/09
74	Assisting Students With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	1/20/10
75	Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	9/17/10
76	Assisting Students Struggling With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Mid-Atlantic	10/5/10
77	Using Research to Strengthen Response to Intervention Decisionmaking and Implementation	Response to Intervention–Reading	Southeast	3/13/09
78	Assisting Students Struggling With Reading: Response to Intervention and Multi-Tier Intervention for Reading in the Primary Grades	Response to Intervention–Reading	Southeast	11/5/09
79	Connecting Research to Practice: Improving Adolescent Literacy Using Effective Classroom Interventions and Practices	Response to Intervention–Reading	Southeast	6/22/10
80	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Appalachia	11/18/09
81	Research-Based Practices for Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Mid-Atlantic	8/10/10
82	Connecting Research to Practice: Transforming Struggling Schools	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Midwest	3/16/10
83	Connecting Research to Practice: Effective Leadership to Transform Struggling Schools	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Midwest	6/25/10
84	School Turnarounds: A Forum for Montana Educators	Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	Northwest	3/24/10