

Evaluating reading interventions using research-based features analysis.

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 to 1 tutorials | | 1 to 3 groups | | 1 to 7+ groups |
| Pupil/text matches | | Most pupil/text matches | | Standard texts with little pupil/text matching |
| Triples daily reading volume | | Doubles daily reading volume | | No increase in reading volume |
| Expert teacher provides instruction | | Certified teacher provides instruction | | Teaching assistant or aide or volunteer provides instruction |
| Focused on meaning and meta-cognition development | | Some focus on meaning and meta-cognition | | Focused on skills development in isolation |
| Easy access to interesting texts and student choice | | Easy access to interesting texts some student choice | | Standard texts with no student choice |
| Well coordinated with classroom lessons | | Some coordination with classroom lessons | | Standard texts with no coordination with classroom lessons |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Monitoring of student progress is frequent and full – Running records, QRI, oral and silent reading comprehension | | Monitoring of student progress is sporadic but full | | Monitoring of student progress is narrow – DIBELS or AIMSWeb |
|---|--|---|--|--|

Points 5

4

3

2

1

Rating your programs proximity to a research-based intervention that will accelerate student reading development.

40 Points

Very well designed

35 points

Well designed

30 points

Design could be improved

25 points

Not well matched to research

20 points

Close to traditional non-research-based designs

15 points or less

No evidence of a research-based design

© Richard L. Allington, University of Tennessee