



Navigating Evidence-Based Clearinghouses

Ohio Department of Education Literacy Academy

Lyzz Davis, PhD


1/18/18



Agenda

1. Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) evidence tiers
2. Aligning standards with other resources
3. Navigating clearinghouses
4. Questions

Regional Educational Laboratories



* The Pacific Region contains Hawaii, pictured on the map, and American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia (Chuuk, Kosrae, Pohnpei, & Yap), Guam, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, & the Republic of Palau, not pictured on the map.

ESSA Tiers 1–3

**Strong, Moderate, and Promising
Evidence**

Strong Evidence

Moderate Evidence

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+** **effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Well-designed and

attrition

Significant **+** **effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Well-designed and

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study or

well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**


Significant **+** **effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Aligns with WWC Meets Standards w/o Reservations

Strong Evidence	Moderate Evidence	Promising Evidence
<p>Well-designed and implemented experimental study</p> <p>Significant + effect on relevant outcome</p> <p>No overriding negative effects from causal studies</p> <p>Large, multisite sample</p> <p>Overlaps with population of interest</p>	<p>Well-designed and implemented QED or RCT with high attrition</p> <p>Significant + effect on relevant outcome</p> <p>No overriding negative effects from causal studies</p> <p>Large, multisite sample</p> <p>Overlaps with population of interest</p>	<p>Well-designed and implemented correlational study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED without a large sample</p> <p>Statistical controls for selection bias</p> <p>Significant + effect on relevant outcome</p> <p>No overriding negative effects from causal studies</p>

Aligns w/ WWC positive and potentially positive evidence ratings



Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

At least 500 students

At least 2 districts (can combine across multiple studies)

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Different for each district

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies



Aligns with WWC
Meets Standards with
Reservations

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Aligns with WWC positive and potentially positive effectiveness

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

At least 2 districts (pool across several studies)

population of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

At least 500 students

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Different for each district

Strong Evidence

Moderate Evidence

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Well-designed and implemented

Correlational studies not aligned with WWC standards

RCT with high attrition

RCTs and QEDs that would otherwise meet Tier 1 or 2

relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

Control for other variables associated with the outcome

causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population** of interest

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Strong Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **experimental** study

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population of interest**

Moderate Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **QED or RCT with high attrition**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Large, multisite **sample**

Overlaps with **population of interest**

Promising Evidence

Well-designed and implemented **correlational** study or well-designed and implemented RCT or QED **without** a large/multisite sample

Statistical controls for **selection bias**

Significant **+ effect** on relevant outcome

No **overriding negative** effects from causal studies

Aligns with WWC positive and potentially positive effectiveness ratings















Aligning ESSA standards with other clearinghouses




Evidence-based clearinghouses focusing on literacy

- What Works Clearinghouse
- Top Tier Evidence
- Blueprints Programs

WWC-ESSA—Alignment

WWC standard	Positive/ potentially positive	Large, multisite sample	ESSA standard
Meets standards without reservations			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
			Does not meet ESSA Tiers 1–3
Meets standards with reservations			Moderate Evidence (Tier 2)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
			Does not meet ESSA Tiers 1–3

TTE-ESSA—Alignment

TTE standard	Large multisite sample	ESSA standard
Top Tier		Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
		Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
Near Top Tier		Promising Evidence (Tier 3)

Blueprints Criteria

- Experimental and Quasiexperimental designs
- Study design, implementation, magnitude of effect, sustained benefits, replicability
- Requires “an absence of iatrogenic effects” for participants
- Provide sample size, cost, and sample characteristics in evaluation abstracts

Blueprints ratings

Model + Programs

- Two RCTs or one RCT and one QED
- Sustained positive effects, no negative effects
- Well described implementation, outcomes, and logic model
- Results independently replicated

Blueprints ratings

Model Programs
















- Two RCTs or one RCT and one QED
- Sustained positive effects, no negative effects
- Well described implementation, outcomes, and logic model

Blueprints ratings

Promising Programs

- One RCT or two QEDs
- Sustained positive effects, no negative effects
- Well described implementation, outcomes, and logic model


Blueprints-ESSA—Alignment

Blueprint standard	Large multisite sample	RCT	ESSA standard
Model+ programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
Model programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
Promising programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Moderate Evidence (Tier 2)
		 or 	Promising Evidence (Tier 3)



Navigating clearinghouses

What Works Clearinghouse



WWC-ESSA—Alignment

WWC standard	Positive/ potentially positive	Large, multisite sample	ESSA standard
Meets standards without reservations	✓	✓	Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
	✓	⊘	Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
	⊘	⊘	Does not meet ESSA Tiers 1–3
Meets standards with reservations	✓	✓	Moderate Evidence (Tier 2)
	✓	⊘	Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
	⊘	⊘	Does not meet ESSA Tiers 1–3

WWC: Finding interventions with positive outcomes



Evidence of effectiveness icons (by intervention)

223 Results filtered by:

Literacy x

Evidence of effectiveness ⓘ

Intervention ⓘ

	Literacy Express
	Phonological Awareness



Positive/potentially positive effects



Mixed/no discernable evidence



No evidence



WWC: Finding interventions with positive outcomes

Six effectiveness ratings (by outcome):

--	-	0	+ -	+	++
----	---	---	-----	---	----

Negative

Potentially negative

No discernable

Mixed



WWC: Finding interventions with positive outcomes

Six effectiveness ratings (by outcome):

--	-	0	+ -	+	++
----	---	---	-----	---	----

Potentially positive
Positive

 **ESSA Tiers 1-3**

WWC: Finding interventions with positive outcomes

FIND RESEARCH WITH STUDENTS LIKE YOURS ▶

Filter by topic

Literacy

Mathematics

Science










Behavior

Children and Youth

How to Use FWW  Print

223 Results filtered by:

Literacy x


Evidence of effectiveness 	Intervention 	Grades examined 	Compare 
	Literacy Express		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Phonological Awareness Training	PK	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reading Recovery®	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
	READ 180®	4-10	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Sound Partners	K-1	<input type="checkbox"/>

Click on an intervention

WWC: Summary of evidence pages

Beginning Reading

September 2017

 EVIDENCE SNAPSHOT

 INTERVENTION REPORT (863 KB)

 REVIEW PROTOCOL

Outcome domain 	Effectiveness rating 	Studies meeting standards 	Grades examined 	Students 	Improvement index 
Alphabetics		<u>1 study meets standards</u>	K-2	422	--
Reading achievement		<u>2 studies meet standards</u>	K-2	747	
Reading fluency		<u>1 study meets standards</u>	K-2	281	

WWC: Summary of evidence pages












Beginning Reading


September 2017

 EVIDENCE SNAPSHOT

 INTERVENTION REPORT (863 KB)

 REVIEW PROTOCOL

Outcome domain 	Effectiveness rating 	Studies meeting standards 	Grades examined 	Students 	Improvement index 
Alphabetics		<u>1 study meets standards</u>	K-2	422	--
Reading achievement		<u>2 studies meet standards</u>	K-2	747	
Reading fluency		<u>1 study meets standards</u>	K-2	281	



WWC: Summary of evidence pages














Beginning Reading


September 2017

 EVIDENCE SNAPSHOT

 INTERVENTION REPORT (863 KB)

 REVIEW PROTOCOL

Outcome domain 	Effectiveness rating 	Studies meeting standards 	Grades examined 	Students 	Improvement index 
Alphabetics		1 study meets standards	K-2	422	--
Reading achievement		2 studies meet standards	K-2	747	
		Ransford-Kaldon, C., Flynt, E. S., Ross, C. L., Franceschini, L., Zoblotsky, T., Huang, Y., & Gallagher, B. (2010)	K-2	427	
		Ransford-Kaldon, C., Ross, C., Lee, C., Sutton Flynt, E., Franceschini, L., & Zoblotsky, T. (2010)	K-2	320	
Reading fluency		1 study meets standards	K-2	281	



WWC: Summary of evidence pages

RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL EXAMINING 320 STUDENTS, GRADES K-2

Review Details Findings Sample Characteristics Study Details

Reviewed: September 2017

For:

 **Leveled Literacy Intervention Intervention Report - Beginning Reading**

Using:

 **Beginning Reading Review Protocol 3.0**

 **Review Standards 3.0**

Rating:

Meets WWC standards without reservations because it is a randomized controlled trial with low attrition.

This review may not reflect the full body of research evidence for this intervention. Please see the **WWC summary of evidence for Leveled Literacy Intervention**.



MEETS WWC
STANDARDS
WITHOUT
RESERVATIONS



AT LEAST ONE
STATISTICALLY
SIGNIFICANT
POSITIVE FINDING

WWC: Summary of evidence pages

Review Details

Findings

Sample Characteristics

Study Details

Additional Sources

Characteristics of study sample as reported by study author.



13% English language learners



84% Free or reduced price lunch

Race



Ethnicity



Rural, Suburban



WWC: Summary of evidence pages

Review Details | Findings | Sample Characteristics | **Study Details** | Additional Sources

Setting

The study took place in five rural elementary schools in Tifton, Georgia and four suburban elementary schools in Middletown, New York.

Study sample

The study participants, who were in grades K-2, were predominantly economically disadvantaged, with 84% being eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The study included predominantly minority students; 37% were Hispanic, 33% were African American, and 29% were White. Approximately 13% of students were classified as English learners.

WWC: Summary of evidence pages

RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL EXAMINING 320 STUDENTS, GRADES K-2

Review Details

Findings

Sample Characteristics

Study Details

Reviewed: September 2017

For:

 **Leveled Literacy Intervention Intervention Report - Beginning Reading**

Using:

 **Beginning Reading Review Protocol 3.0**

 **Review Standards 3.0**

Rating:

Meets WWC standards without reservations because it is a randomized controlled trial with low attrition.

This review may not reflect the full body of research evidence for this intervention. Please see the **WWC summary of evidence for Leveled Literacy Intervention**.



MEETS WWC
STANDARDS
WITHOUT
RESERVATIONS




AT LEAST ONE
STATISTICALLY
SIGNIFICANT
POSITIVE FINDING

WWC: Summary of evidence pages












Beginning Reading

September 2017

 EVIDENCE SNAPSHOT

 INTERVENTION REPORT (863 KB)

 REVIEW PROTOCOL

Outcome domain 	Effectiveness rating 	Studies meeting standards 	Grades examined 	Students 	Improvement index 
Alphabetics		Does not meet Tiers 1–3	2	422	--
Reading achievement		Strong evidence (Tier 1)	2	747	
Reading fluency		Promising evidence (Tier 3)	2	281	

WWC: Contextual information provided

Evidence snapshots:

- Summary of all research settings and samples from studies meeting standards can include:
 - Race/ethnicity
 - Gender
 - English learners
 - Free/Reduced Lunch
 - Delivery method
 - Locale

Summary of all Research Settings and Samples that Met Standards

Race



Ethnicity



Gender



Male: 50%
Female: 49%

Free & Reduced-Price Lunch



82%

English Learners



28%

WWC: Meeting the needs of diverse learners

Literacy interventions can also be reviewed under other topics, such as:

- Early childhood
- English learners
- Students with disabilities



WWC: Meeting the needs of diverse learners

FIND RESEARCH WITH STUDENTS LIKE YOURS ▶

20 Results filtered by:

Literacy x Children and Youth with Disabilities x

Filter by topic

- Literacy
- Mathematics
- Science
- Behavior
- Children and Youth with Disabilities
- English Learners
- Teacher Excellence

Evidence of effectiveness	Intervention	Grades examined	Compare
	Phonological Awareness Training	PK	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Dialogic Reading	PK	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies	K-6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fast Track: Elementary School	K	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing® (LiPS®)	1-4	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Read Naturally®	2-6	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Self-Regulated Strategy Development	2-10	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Repeated Reading	5-12	<input type="checkbox"/>

WWC: Meeting the needs of diverse learners

Reviewed Research

Beginning Reading

Adolescent Literacy

English Language Learners










Students with a Specific Learning Disability

July 2010

 EVIDENCE SNAPSHOT

 INTERVENTION REPORT (205 KB)

 REVIEW PROTOCOL

Outcome domain 	Effectiveness rating 	Studies meeting standards 	Grades examined 	Students 	Improvement index 
Reading fluency		1 study meets standards	4-6	20	--
Writing achievement		1 study meets standards	4-6	20	



Blueprints programs

Blueprints: Finding interventions for emergent literacy skills

Blueprints
FOR HEALTHY YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

ABOUT US

ASSESS NEEDS

BLUEPRINTS CRITERIA

VIEW ALL PROGRAMS

PROGRAM SEARCH

NOMINATE PROGRAM

RESOURCES
















BLUEPRINTS: YOUR RESOURCE FOR
HEALTHY YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

FIRST TIME HERE?
TRY OUR STEP-BY-STEP SEARCH APPROACH

GET STARTED >>

Blueprints Programs = POSITIVE YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Blueprints-ESSA—Alignment

Blueprint standard	Large multisite sample	RCT	ESSA standard
Model+ programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
Model programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Promising Evidence (Tier 3)
Promising programs			Strong Evidence (Tier 1)
			Moderate Evidence (Tier 2)
		 or 	Promising Evidence (Tier 3)

Navigating Blueprints programs

	<u>PROGRAM</u> ▶	<u>RATING</u> ▲	<u>BENEFITS AND COSTS</u>	<u>IMPACT</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	NURSE-FAMILY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM INFORMATION TARGET POPULATION FUNDING STRATEGIES	Model	BENEFITS MINUS COSTS	Child Maltreatment, Delinquency and Criminal Behavior, Early Cognitive Development, Internalizing, Mental Health - Other, Physical Health and Well-Being, Preschool Communication/Language Development, Reciprocal Parent-Child Warmth
<input type="checkbox"/>	CHILD FIRST PROGRAM INFORMATION TARGET POPULATION FUNDING STRATEGIES	Promising	BENEFITS MINUS COSTS	Child Maltreatment, Early Cognitive Development, Externalizing
<input type="checkbox"/>	EARLY LITERACY AND LEARNING MODEL PROGRAM INFORMATION TARGET POPULATION FUNDING STRATEGIES	Promising	BENEFITS MINUS COSTS	Early Cognitive Development, Preschool Communication/Language Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	HEAD START REDI PROGRAM INFORMATION TARGET POPULATION FUNDING STRATEGIES	Promising	BENEFITS MINUS COSTS	Antisocial-aggressive Behavior, Emotional Regulation, Positive Social/Prosocial Behavior, Preschool Communication/Language Development, School Readiness

Navigating Blueprints programs

EARLY LITERACY AND LEARNING MODEL

Blueprints Program Rating: Promising

A literacy-focused curriculum and support system designed for preschool children ages 3, 4, and 5 years old. The program is designed to enhance existing classroom curricula by specifically focusing on improving children's early literacy skills and knowledge.



FACT SHEET

PROGRAM COSTS

FUNDING STRATEGIES

DETAILED EVALUATION ABSTRACT

VIDEO

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Early Cognitive Development
Preschool Communication/Language Development

PROGRAM TYPE

Academic Services
School - Individual Strategies
Teacher Training

PROGRAM SETTING

Home
School

CONTINUUM OF INTERVENTION

Universal Prevention (Entire Population)
Selective Prevention (Elevated Risk)

AGE

Early Childhood (3-4) - Preschool

GENDER

Male and Female

RACE/ETHNICITY

All Race/Ethnicity

ENDORSEMENTS

Blueprints: Promising

PROGRAM INFORMATION CONTACT

Dr. Madelaine Cosgrove (mcosgrove@unf.edu)
or Howaida Mousa (h.mousa@unf.edu)
Florida Institute of Education at the University of
North Florida
Adam W. Herbert University Center
12000 Alumni Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224
(904) 620-2496

Curriculum information and materials available at:

Navigating Blueprints programs

DETAILED EVALUATION ABSTRACT

Here you may find:

- Sample size information
- Study design

A word of caution:

It's necessary to read both the **evaluation methodology** and **outcomes** sections.

BRIEF EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Early Literacy and Learning Model (ELLM) study that took place simultaneously with the first of a subset of the classes sampled for the comparison of subsidized, faith-based, and public school-based

The national study (PCERC, 2008) included a control intervention group during the national pilot study of children between the ages of 3 and 5 years (average overall classroom environment, teacher-child interaction assessment took place at the end of the children's literacy skills).

The complimentary experimental study (Cosgrove) on emergent literacy skills and alphabet recognition in kindergarten data to the original study) was conducted



Thank you! Questions?



Elisabeth (Lyzzy) Davis

*AIR Senior
Researcher*

edavis@air.org