

What Works Clearinghouse



READ 180®

Effectiveness¹ No studies of *READ 180*® that fall within the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of *READ 180*® on students with learning disabilities.

Program Description² *READ 180*® is a reading program designed for students in grades 3–12 whose reading achievement is below the proficient level. *READ 180*® aims to address gaps in individual student’s skills through 90-minute sessions, during which students receive several different types of instruction. These sessions can be completed in multiple class periods and begin and end with whole-group, teacher-directed instruction. The sessions also

include a period of small group activities where students rotate among direct instruction from the teacher, independent computer work, and modeled and independent reading. The *READ 180*® program includes workbooks designed to address reading comprehension skills, paperback books for independent reading, audiobooks with corresponding CDs for modeled reading, and software designed to track each student’s progress.

The WWC identified 56 studies of *READ 180*® for students with learning disabilities that were published or released between 1989 and 2009.

- Two studies are within the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol, but the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.
- Twenty studies are out of the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol because they have an ineligible study design—specifically, they do not use a comparison group.
- Twenty-two studies are out of the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol because they have samples that are not aligned with the protocol—21 studies have a sample that includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities, and one study has a sample that is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Twelve studies are out of the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol because they do not include a primary analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention.

1. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
 2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program’s website (<http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/read180/>, downloaded February 2010). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review. The literature search reflects documents publicly available as of February 2010.

References Studies that fall outside the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol or do not meet WWC evidence standards

Admon, N. (2005). *READ 180 stage B: St. Paul school district, Minnesota*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.

Aguhob, M. (2007). *READ 180 in Miami-Dade County, Florida 2005–2006*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because the authors could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.

Alvermann, D. E., & Rush, L. S. (2004). Literacy intervention programs at the middle and high school levels. In J. A. Dole & T. Jetton (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 210–227). New York, NY: Guilford. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Banasik, B. (2002). *The effectiveness of Scholastic's READ 180 curriculum in improving reading comprehension in middle school-aged students having a specific learning disability*. Unpublished master's thesis, Cardinal Stritch University, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Barbato, P. F. (2006). A preliminary evaluation of the *READ 180* program (Doctoral dissertation, Fairleigh Dickinson University, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(11A), 46–4130. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.

Benavidez-Candelaria, M. R. (2006). *An investigation of the program READ 180 and the effect it has on students' reading scores and students' grades*. Unpublished master's thesis, New Mexico

Highlands University, Las Vegas, NM. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Brennan, T., Leuer, M., Boyer, D., Dalessi, M., Newman, D., & Yepes-Baraya, M. (2006). *Rhetoric to reality: Addressing reading achievement in secondary education*. Palo Alto, CA: Empirical Education, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Brown, L. (2006). *The impact of self-perception, reading attitude, and the use of the READ 180 program on reading achievement*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gwynedd-Mercy College, Gwynedd Valley, PA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Caggiano, J. A. (2007). Addressing the learning needs of struggling adolescent readers: The impact of a reading intervention program on students in a middle school setting (Doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(4-A), 1383. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.

Campbell, Y. C. (2006). Effects of an integrated learning system on the reading achievement of middle school students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(08A), 100–2923. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.

Chmielewski, T. (2005). *Differentiating reading instruction in an alternative high school using READ 180*. Unpublished master's thesis, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, WI. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

Daviess County Public Schools, Assessment, Research and Curriculum Department. (2005). *READ 180 implementation year study*. Owensboro, KY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the

References *(continued)*

- protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Denman, J. S. (2004). *Integrating technology into the reading curriculum: Acquisition, implementation, and evaluation of a reading program with a technology component (READ 180) for struggling readers*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Dynarski, M., Agodini, R., Heaviside, S., Novak, T., Carey, N., Campuzano, L., et al. (2007). *Effectiveness of reading and mathematics software products: Findings from the first student cohort*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Feifer, S. G. (2007). Tailor interventions for students with severe reading disabilities. *What Works in Teaching & Learning*, 39(7), 5–5. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Felty, R. L. (2008). *READ 180 implementation: Reading achievement and motivation to read within an alternative education middle school program (Doctoral dissertation, Immaculata College, 2008)*. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(01A), 182–161. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Giedd, D. (2008). *A study of the effectiveness of the READ 180 program measured by student test scores*. Unpublished research paper, Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, MO. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Hewes, G., Palmer, N., Haslam, M. B., & Mielke, M. (2006). *Five years of READ 180 in Des Moines: Improving literacy among middle school and high school special education students*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Interactive, Inc. (2002). *An efficacy study of READ 180: A print and electronic adaptive intervention program, grades 4 and above*. Ashland, VA: Author. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Irvin, J. L. (2006). *A resource guide for adolescent literacy: Prepared for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*. Tallahassee, FL: National Literacy Project. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Kratofil, M. D. (2006). A comparison of the effect of Scholastic *READ 180* and traditional reading interventions on the reading achievement of middle school low-level readers (Master's thesis, Central Missouri State University, 2006). *Masters Abstracts International*, 44(06), 52–2531. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Lang, L., Torgesen, J., Vogel, W., Chanter, C., Lefsky, E., & Petscher, Y. (2009). Exploring the relative effectiveness of reading interventions for high school students. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(2), 149–175. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Nave, J. (2007). An assessment of *READ 180* regarding its association with the academic achievement of at-risk students

References *(continued)*

- in Sevier county schools (Tennessee) (Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(06A), 116–2265. The study is ineligible for review because the authors could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Nelson, T. (2008). Predictive factors in student gains in reading comprehension using a reading intervention program (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 2008). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(06A), 147–2201. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Palubinsky, R. C. S. (2008). Factors impacting the effectiveness of Pennsylvania’s Educational Assistance Program (EAP) for eighth grade students as determined by increased reading proficiency on the Pennsylvania State System of Assessment (PSSA) (Doctoral dissertation, Widener University, 2008). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(05A), 115–1718. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Papalewis, R. (2003). *A study of READ 180 in middle schools in Clark county school district, Las Vegas, Nevada*. New York, NY: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Struggling middle school readers: Successful, accelerating intervention. *Reading Improvement*, 41(1), 24–37. The study is ineligible for review because the authors could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Policy Studies Associates. (2002). *Final report: A summary of independent research on READ 180*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Santa Rosa County School District. (n.d.). *READ 180 update: Santa Rosa county school district*. Santa Rosa, FL: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2003). *A study of READ 180 stages A and B in upper elementary and middle schools in Iredell-Statesville Schools, North Carolina*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2003). *READ 180 stage C: An evaluation within the federal Job Corps program*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2004). *A study of READ 180 at Shiprock High School in Central Consolidated school district on the Navajo Indian Reservation, New Mexico*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2006). *Compendium of READ 180 research*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2006). *Special education students Selbyville middle and Sussex central middle schools, Indian River school district (Delaware)*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2007). *Phoenix College, AZ*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample is not within the specified age or grade range.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2007). *Response to intervention: An RTI alignment guide for READ 180*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

References *(continued)*

- Scholastic, Inc. (2009). *System 44 and READ 180: Research-based literacy instruction for special education*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Blackhawk middle school*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Carthage central school district*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Indian River school district*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Madison middle school*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Socorro independent school district, TX*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Additional source:**
- Scholastic, Inc. (2005). *READ 180 implementation year study*. New York, NY: Author.
- Scholastic, Inc. (n.d.). *Platinum performers: Westwood middle school, Alachua county public schools, Gainesville, Florida*. New York, NY: Author. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Sigears, K. A. (2009). The impact of the implementation of the Scholastic *READ 180* model on reading skills development of middle school students with learning disabilities as compared to those using the Traditional Resource Reading model (Doctoral dissertation, Tennessee State University, 2009). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(8-A), 419–4209. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.
- Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). *Effective reading programs for middle and high schools: A best evidence synthesis. Educator's summary*. Retrieved February 24, 2009, from http://www.bestevidence.org/word/mhs_read_Sep_16_2008_sum.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Groff, C., & Lake, C. (2008). Effective reading programs for middle and high schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(3; 3), 290–322. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Smith, S., Rissman, L. M., & Grek, M. L. (2004). *READ 180*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Center for Reading Research. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Thomas, J. (2003). *Reading program evaluation: READ 180 grades 4–8*. Kirkwood, MO: Kirkwood School District. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Visher, M., & Hartry, A. (2007). *Can after-school programs boost academic achievement?* Washington, DC: MPR Associates, Inc. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Wahl, M. (2008). *READ 180 Enterprise Edition*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Center for Reading Research. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

References *(continued)*

- White, L. M. (2007). A middle school under review: A study on the effectiveness of two implementation models of the *READ 180* program on special education students' reading performance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(01A), 117–63. The study is ineligible for review because the WWC could not confirm that at least 50% of the sample was classified as students with learning disabilities.
- Witkowski, P. M. (2004). A comparison study of two intervention programs for reading-delayed high school students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri–Saint Louis, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(06A), 163–2142. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.
- Woods, D. E. (2007). An investigation of the effects of a middle school reading intervention on school dropout rates (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(03A), 165–836. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Zapata, J. M. (2007). *If I can read, I can learn: Examining the effects of READ 180 in the reading comprehension of English language learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University–San Marcos, San Marcos, CA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- Zvoch, K., & Letourneau, L. (2006). *Closing the achievement gap: An examination of the status and growth of ninth grade READ 180 students*. Las Vegas, NV: Clark County School District. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.