

From: Tahra Nichols
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2008 4:23 PM
To: What Works
Cc: Jill Constantine; Mary Grider; Mark Dynarski; Daniel Player; Michael Ponza; Jean Knab
Subject: FW: WWC Beginning Reading Review of Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance
Attachments: RLI response to WWC on AR Oct08.pdf
Importance: High

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2008 4:22 PM
To: Tahra Nichols; info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: RE: WWC Beginning Reading Review of Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance

Dr. Dynarski,

I am attaching a letter outlining a grave concern with the embargoed AR Intervention Report your staff provided this morning. In essence, one of the studies found to have met standards isn't actually a study of Accelerated Reader. The letter provides more information, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

Thank you,

Eric Stickney
Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
phone 608.664.3880 x2009
fax 608.664.3882
eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: Tahra Nichols [mailto:TNichols@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2008 9:01 AM
To: Eric Stickney
Subject: WWC Beginning Reading Review of Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance

Dear Mr. Stickney,

The attached letter is to notify you that the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) has completed the review of the research on *Accelerated Reader* and determined that this intervention is

eligible for an intervention report according to the Beginning Reading review protocol. We have also attached a courtesy copy of the report which will be posted on the WWC website on October 14, 2008. As a reminder, this report is covered by the embargo agreement signed by you on June 12, 2008, requiring you not to copy, distribute, or discuss the report with members of the public outside your organization, prior to release of the report by the Institute of Education Sciences.

Sincerely,

Mark Dynarski

Director, What Works Clearinghouse

<<Developer_Courtesy_Copy_Letter - Accelerated Reader.pdf>> <<AccelerateReader_DC.pdf>>
<<Developer_Courtesy_Copy_FAQs.pdf>>



901 Deming Way
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
Phone: (800) 200-4848
Fax: (800) 295-4985
www.renlearn.com

October 13, 2008

Dr. Mark Dynarski
Director
What Works Clearinghouse
PO Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393

Dear Dr. Dynarski,

I have reviewed the embargoed WWC Intervention Report on Accelerated Reader and am writing to express a grave concern with the Clearinghouse's determination that the dissertation by Bullock (2005) met evidence standards.

We appreciated that the report's Program Description recognizes there are two components: Accelerated Reader software, and Accelerated Reader Best Classroom Practices, which "are a set of recommended principles on guided independent reading (or teacher's direction of students' interactions with text) that ensure Accelerated Reader is implemented with integrity," (p. 1). And the report goes on to correctly explain that best practices include teachers using AR Points to "set individual student goals for the quantity and quality of student reading practice and to monitor the student's progress," (p. 2).

Unfortunately, the Bullock study was not a valid study of the effectiveness of Accelerated Reader because, according to the author, students in the experimental group did not use the program. They may have used the software sparingly but clearly did not implement AR Best Classroom Practices.

Specifically, the author cautions that the extremely short 10-week duration and non-implementation are major limitations, reporting that, "the duration of the study limits the exposure students had to AR. The number of AR comprehension quizzes taken by students range from 0 to 14, with an **average of 3.69 per student** in the experimental group. This number of quizzes, combined with the number of participants, may not provide enough information for a significant difference to emerge," p. 37, emphasis added).

Classrooms using AR Best Practices dedicate at least 30 minutes per day for independent reading practice (book reading). Students take short comprehension quizzes on each book they've read to determine whether or not they actually read the book and understood its main points. As mentioned above, teachers set individual reading practice goals, and to do so they use a Goal Setting Chart (attached). As the Chart shows, students at a third grade level using Accelerated Reader will obtain an average of 1.3 AR Points per week if reading 30 minutes a day. Most books read by third graders are

worth between 0.5 and 1.0 Points. For third graders, this translates to an average of about 1.8 quizzes per student per week, or about **18 quizzes over a 10-week period**. In practice, we know that many students exceed this mark. Evidently, with just 3.69 quizzes total per student, there was no attempt to implement AR with any degree of fidelity in the Bullock study.

The most troubling aspect is that this small (n=32 students) study that took place over a 10-week period with no degree of implementation is being weighted equally by the WWC with the other study that met evidence standards—Ross, Nunnery, & Goldfeder (2004). In contrast, the Ross study included 572 students and was implemented with fidelity over an entire school year.

Most consumers of WWC reports will not take the time to read the Bullock dissertation to learn that AR was not actually implemented. They will most likely only review the effectiveness improvement index chart averaging findings from the two studies, and in doing so will be misled regarding AR's effectiveness.

Developers, researchers, and educators all have a stake in ensuring that the WWC produces the most accurate information possible. I strongly encourage you to reconsider the Bullock study in the Accelerated Reader Intervention report because it simply is not a valid study of Accelerated Reader. Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

(b)(6)

Eric Stickney
Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
eric.stickney@renlearn.com
608-664-3880 x2009

Attachment

Goal-Setting Chart

Use the chart and guidelines below to help plan goals for your students based on their reading level and the amount of daily reading practice that you provide.

Identify ZPD

Identify each student's grade-equivalent (GE) score with a standardized assessment, such as STAR Reading, or estimate a GE based on the student's past performance. The corresponding ZPD is a recommended book-level range for the student. If books in that range seem too hard or easy for a student, choose a new range or create a wider one that better matches the student's abilities.

Set Goals

Average percent correct—The most important goal for all students is to average 85% or higher on Reading Practice Quizzes. Meeting this goal has significant impact on reading growth.

Averages of 90% and higher are associated with even greater gains. If a student struggles to maintain the minimum average, talk to the student and find out why. Then decide on a strategy that will lead to success.

Point goals—The chart shows the number of points students are expected to earn based on GE and time spent reading. These are estimates—set goals that are realistic for individual students.

Grade-Equivalent Score	Suggested ZPD	60 Min. Daily Practice			30 Min. Daily Practice			20 Min. Daily Practice		
		Points per Week	Points per 6 Weeks	Points per 9 Weeks	Points per Week	Points per 6 Weeks	Points per 9 Weeks	Points per Week	Points per 6 Weeks	Points per 9 Weeks
1.0	1.0 – 2.0	1.7	10	15	0.9	5.0	7.5	0.6	3.3	5.0
1.5	1.5 – 2.5	1.9	11	17	1.0	5.5	8.5	0.6	3.7	5.7
2.0	2.0 – 3.0	2.1	13	19	1.1	6.5	9.5	0.7	4.3	6.3
2.5	2.3 – 3.3	2.3	14	21	1.2	7.0	10.5	0.8	4.7	7.0
3.0	2.6 – 3.6	2.5	15	23	1.3	7.5	11.5	0.8	5.0	7.7
3.5	2.8 – 4.0	2.7	16	24	1.4	8.0	12.0	0.9	5.3	8.0
4.0	3.0 – 4.5	2.8	17	25	1.4	8.5	12.5	0.9	5.7	8.3
4.5	3.2 – 5.0	3.2	19	29	1.6	9.5	14.5	1.0	6.3	9.7
5.0	3.4 – 5.4	3.5	21	32	1.8	10.5	16.0	1.2	7.0	10.7
5.5	3.7 – 5.7	3.9	23	35	2.0	11.5	17.5	1.3	7.7	11.7
6.0	4.0 – 6.1	4.2	25	39	2.1	12.5	19.5	1.4	8.3	13.0
6.5	4.2 – 6.5	4.6	28	41	2.3	14.0	20.5	1.5	9.3	13.7
7.0	4.3 – 7.0	4.9	29	44	2.5	14.5	22.0	1.6	9.7	14.7
7.5	4.4 – 7.5	5.3	32	48	2.7	16.0	24.0	1.8	10.7	16.0
8.0	4.5 – 8.0	5.6	34	50	2.8	17.0	25.0	1.9	11.3	16.7
9.0	4.6 – 9.0	6.3	38	57	3.2	19.0	28.5	2.1	12.7	19.0
10.0	4.7 – 10.0	6.9	41	62	3.5	20.5	31.0	2.3	13.7	20.7
11.0	4.8 – 11.0	7.6	46	68	3.8	23.0	34.0	2.5	15.3	22.7
12.0	4.9 – 12.0	8.3	50	75	4.2	25.0	37.5	2.8	16.7	25.0

From: Tahra Nichols
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 5:20 PM
To: What Works
Cc: Mary Grider; Jill Constantine; Daniel Player; Jan Watterworth; Kadri Kallikorm-Rhodes
Subject: FW: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

How should we handle this? - Tahra

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 5:15 PM
To: Tahra Nichols
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Tahra,

Regarding the AR review, there are some studies that we are still unable to locate. Some of these are not even complete citations, so we don't even know where to look. We would very much like to get copies of these, particularly since they're part of the WWC review of AR.

We have tried Google, Google Scholar, Scirus, Scientific Commons, Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, WorldCat, ProQuest's UMI Dissertation Express, and Scribd. In the case of the two studies that list universities, we have searched their university library system. We have also the authors for whom we found contact information. None of these efforts has worked for the six studies listed below.

Is it at all possible for you to either send copies of these six studies or tell us where we might find them?

Bielby, L. (2005). Accelerated Reader student reading program: An investigative study of student reading level growth as affected by the accelerated reader program. Unpublished (61356680)

Christianson, P. (2005). Is Accelerated Reader a viable reading enhancement program for an elementary school?

Miller, J.B. (2006). A study of public posting, formative assessment, and data based decision making implemented in a school-wide effort to improve student performance. Unpublished (79476454)

Ostrom, J. (2007). A study of reading achievement of students participating in the Accelerated reader program.

Taylor, D. (2007) Reading success through the use of accelerated reader. Unpublished Chapman University, (182817134)

Walasek, M. (2005). A study of the Accelerated Reader program on third grade students' motivation to read. Carthage College) (sic)

Thank you,

Eric Stickney

Director of Educational Research

Renaissance Learning

PO Box 45016

Madison, WI 53744-5016

phone 608.664.3880 x2009

fax 608.664.3882

eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: WhatWorks

Sent: Friday, September 19, 2008 5:37 PM

To: 'EMSTICKN@renlearn.com'

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Dear Mr. Stickney,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). Tahra Nichols forwarded your email to the WWC Help Desk.

As we noted in a previous email, the WWC cannot provide access to the full text of studies; however, we are happy to tell you where we found the studies you are interested in.

We were unable to obtain the Taylor (2007) and Miller (2006) studies (both fall under the thesis/dissertation category) from their respective libraries and these two studies are not included in the WWC Intervention Report for Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance.

The following lists details on where we obtained the citations for the remaining studies. The citations directed us to a particular university, who we then contacted to obtain the full text.

1. Bielby, L. (2005). Accelerated Reader student reading program: An investigative study of student reading level growth as affected by the accelerated reader program. Unpublished (61356680).
 - a. Found through OCLC's WorldCat – the original record is from the catalog of Northwest Missouri State University:
<http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22Accelerated+reader+student+reading+program%22&qt=mozilla-search>
2. Christianson, P. (2005). Is Accelerated Reader a viable reading enhancement program for an elementary school?
 - a. Found through WorldCat, original at the library of the Minnesota State University at Mankato:
<http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22%09Is+accelerated+reader+a+viable+reading+enhancement+program+for+an+elementary+school%22&qt=mozilla-search>
3. Miller, J.B. (2006). A study of public posting, formative assessment, and data based decision making implemented in a school-wide effort to improve student performance. Unpublished (79476454)

- a. Found through WorldCat, from the catalog of Valdosta State's library:
<http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22study+of+public+posting%2C+formative+assessment%2C+and+data+based+decision+making+implemented+%22&qt=mozilla-search>
4. Ostrom, J. (2007). A study of reading achievement of students participating in the Accelerated reader program.
 - a. Reference came from WorldCat, original is also at the at the library of the Minnesota State University at Mankato:
<http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22A+study+of+reading+achievement+of+students+participating+in+the+Accelerated+reader+program%22&qt=mozilla-search>
5. Taylor, D. (2007) Reading success through the use of accelerated reader. Unpublished Chapman University, (182817134)
 - a. Reference came from WorldCat:
http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22Reading+success+through+the+use+of+accelerated+reader%22&=Search&qt=owc_search
6. Walasek, M. (2005). A study of the Accelerated Reader program on third grade students' motivation to read. Carthage College.
 - a. This is also from WorldCat:
http://www.worldcat.org/search?q=%22study+of+the+Accelerated+Reader+program+on+third+grade+students%27+motivation+to+read%22&=Search&qt=owc_search

We hope you found this information helpful. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2008 5:15 PM

To: Tahra Nichols

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Tahra,

Regarding the AR review, there are some studies that we are still unable to locate. Some of these are not even complete citations, so we don't even know where to look. We would very much like to get copies of these, particularly since they're part of the WWC review of AR.

We have tried Google, Google Scholar, Scirus, Scientific Commons, Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations, WorldCat, ProQuest's UMI Dissertation Express, and Scribd. In the case of the two studies that list universities, we have searched their university library system. We have also the authors for whom we found contact information. None of these efforts has worked for the six studies listed below.

Is it at all possible for you to either send copies of these six studies or tell us where we might find them?

Bielby, L. (2005). Accelerated Reader student reading program: An investigative study of student reading level growth as affected by the accelerated reader program. Unpublished (61356680)

Christianson, P. (2005). Is Accelerated Reader a viable reading enhancement program for an elementary school?

Miller, J.B. (2006). A study of public posting, formative assessment, and data based decision making implemented in a school-wide effort to improve student performance. Unpublished (79476454)

Ostrom, J. (2007). A study of reading achievement of students participating in the Accelerated reader program.

Taylor, D. (2007) Reading success through the use of accelerated reader. Unpublished Chapman University, (182817134)

Walasek, M. (2005). A study of the Accelerated Reader program on third grade students' motivation to read. Carthage College) (sic)

Thank you,

Eric Stickney
Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
phone 608.664.3880 x2009
fax 608.664.3882
eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2008 10:56 AM
To: 'EMSTICKN@renlearn.com'
Subject: WWC - Accelerated Math/ Math Renaissance review

Dear Mr. Stickney:

I apologize, but there was an oversight and the courtesy copy for Accelerated Math was not sent as planned. We regret the error, and for any future reports you should receive a courtesy copy 24 hours in advance, as promised.

--Mary Grider
What Works Clearinghouse Help Desk

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2008 9:38 AM
To: Kristin Hallgren; GaryR@uark.edu
Subject: RE: WWC- Accelerated Math/ Math Renaissance review

I saw the Accelerated Math (middle school) review posted on WWC this morning. As promised in your letter of July 18, I never received a courtesy copy of the final intervention report.

What happened to the courtesy copy and 24 hour notice?

Eric Stickney
Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
phone 608.664.3880 x2009
fax 608.664.3882
eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: WhatWorks

Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2008 3:05 PM

To: 'EMSTICKN@renlearn.com'

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Dear Mr. Stickney,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). Tahra Nichols forwarded your questions to the WWC Help Desk.

The timeline for the revisions of the Beginning Reading report will be determined by IES and we are unable to provide a timeline for report releases at this time.

Due to copyright restrictions, we cannot send you copies of particular studies; however, if you would like to send us a list of citations, we will see if we can help with where to look.

I hope you found this information helpful. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]

Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2008 6:23 PM

To: Tahra Nichols

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Tahra,

We don't have any additional studies to suggest for your review of AR.

However, I do have a couple of questions:

1. There were several studies in your list that we had never seen before. We're always interested in adding to our research base and understanding how AR works in the field. Would it be possible for you to send us copies or provide information about where we could find them? We have searched extensively through several databases and not seen any reference to them. If this would be possible, I could send you the citations. There are a total of ten that we can't locate.

2. Do you have a timeline as to when you expect the review to be completed?

Thanks,

Eric Stickney

Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
phone 608.664.3880 x2009
fax 608.664.3882
eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: Tahra Nichols [mailto:TNichols@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2008 7:13 AM
To: Eric Stickney
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Thank you, I received it!

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2008 4:58 PM
To: Tahra Nichols
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Thanks. I've tried faxing the embargo form to 609-799-0005 but am getting a busy signal. Can you let me know if it's arrived?

From: Tahra Nichols [mailto:TNichols@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2008 9:16 AM
To: Eric Stickney
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Hi Mr. Stickney: I'll update my files with your contact information. Here is the site with the WWC evidence standards for the Beginning Reading review:

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/review.asp?ag=pj>. This review is an update of the first review and covers studies since 2005 (the approximate cut-off of the last review). The list I sent only represents the studies that we found about Accelerated Reading/Reading Renaissance through our review of the literature since 2005 (although there may be a few that were not reviewed in the last round and, thus, are included in this one). I hope that answers your questions.

– Tahra Nichols

From: Eric Stickney [mailto:EMSTICKN@renlearn.com]
Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 5:25 PM

To: Tahra Nichols

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

Tahra,

Hello, I wanted to let you know that for *Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance*, I'll be your contact because the prior contact (Laurie Borkon) went on maternity leave yesterday and won't be available for several weeks. My contact information is below. I will sign the Embargo Agreement Form and return it as requested.

I had two questions related to the re-review.

1. Are the WWC's Evidence Standards going to change, or will the existing standards (dated 2006 and available here http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/study_standards_final.pdf) be applied to the "re-review"?

2. From the list of citations you sent it appears that the studies included in the previous review that did not meet evidence standards were not included. In other words, the studies you listed have either been determined to have met evidence standards or have never been reviewed by WWC. Is that the intent?

Thank you,

Eric Stickney

Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning
PO Box 45016
Madison, WI 53744-5016
phone 608.664.3880 x2009
fax 608.664.3882
eric.stickney@renlearn.com

From: Tahra Nichols [<mailto:TNichols@mathematica-mpr.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2008 4:02 PM

To: Laurie Borkon; PR

Cc: Tahra Nichols

Subject: What Works Clearinghouse - Beginning Reading Review (Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance)

June 3, 2008

Laurie Borkon
Director of Public Affairs
Renaissance Learning, Inc.

Dear Ms. Borkon:

The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), an initiative of the U. S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences, was established to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. As such, we review studies on education interventions that may be included in our reports. The purpose of this letter is to notify you that we are in the process of conducting an updated review of Beginning Reading interventions and may be including Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance in our review. The attached letter provides more information on the three stages in which we will contact you and the forms we are requesting that you or your designee sign by June 17, 2008.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,
Tahra Nichols
Analyst, MPR, Inc.

<<|AcceleratedRead6-2.pdf>>

What Works Clearinghouse **WWC**

A central and trusted source of scientific evidence for what works in education.

October 27, 2008

Mr. Eric Stickney
Director of Educational Research
Renaissance Learning, Inc.
901 Deming Way, PO Box 45016
Madison, Wisconsin 53744-5016

Reference: 2008012

Dear Mr. Stickney:

Thank you for your letter voicing your concerns over the What Works Clearinghouse's (WWC's) recent review of Accelerated Reader. The WWC works to ensure the accuracy of each study that is reviewed and each intervention report we prepare. A senior WWC reviewer (who was not involved in earlier reviews of Accelerated Reader) conducted an independent review of the Bullock (2005) study and arrived at the same conclusion reached by other reviewers and the principal investigator for the WWC's Beginning Reading topic area. The reviewer concluded that while Bullock did not implement Accelerated Reader using the Accelerated Reader best practices, the study still is eligible for WWC review as a study of Accelerated Reader.

To understand why the WWC reached this conclusion, it is useful to understand the purpose of the WWC. The WWC is designed to produce a systematic review of literature on the effectiveness of education interventions. To be both informative to educators and comprehensive, the review includes evaluations of interventions in "real world" settings. This means that studies that do not follow all prescribed procedures for an intervention may still be eligible for review if the study's implementation reflects how educators might implement the intervention in actual practice.

Following this guideline, that the Bullock study did not implement Accelerated Reader using all Accelerated Reader best practices, as you asserted, does not mean the study should be ineligible for WWC review. Rather, the study provides evidence of the effectiveness of Accelerated Reader based on an approach educators may use to implement it.

Because implementation can vary across studies, the WWC ensures that each study's implementation procedures are described clearly in the intervention report. While, as you note, these differences are not captured in the WWC's summary ratings, the WWC does include an "extent of evidence" classification that summarizes the amount of research included in the WWC ratings.

Your letter notes that the WWC gives equal weight to the Bullock study along with other studies that may have a higher degree of fidelity to Accelerated Reader best practices. To clarify, in synthesizing the evidence from its systematic reviews of the literature, the WWC does not apply weights to studies based on fidelity, sample size or other factors. The only weight it applies is that studies meeting standards or meeting standards with reservations are counted in rating the evidence, whereas studies not meeting standards are not counted.

I hope this information has addressed your concerns about the WWC review of Accelerated Reader.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark Reynolds".

cc: (b)(6)

From: What Works
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 11:08 AM
To: 'eric.stickney@renlearn.com'
Subject: Accelerated Reader
Attachments: 2008012 Findings Response_fnl.pdf

Dear Mr. Stickney,

Attached is a response from Dr. Dynarski concerning your October 13, 2008 letter about Accelerated Reader.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse