

Success for All®

No studies of *Success for All*® that fall within the scope of the English Language Learners 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 *Success for All*® on English language learners. Additional research is needed to determine the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of this intervention.

Program Description¹

Success for All® is a program for students in pre-K through eighth grade that focuses on reading, writing, and oral language development. Using a whole-school improvement approach, the goal of *Success for All*® is for all students (including English language learners) to read at grade level by the end of the third grade. The program consists of 90 minutes of daily instruction, during which time students are grouped by their instructional level rather than their current grade level. Students are moved to new reading groups every quarter based on their progress in pursuit of the program's goal.

The program's whole-school approach includes a collaborative leadership approach, a school-wide support system, early intervention for struggling students through teacher and computer-assisted tutoring, and extensive professional development and coaching for teachers. *Success for All*® also has a version focused on Spanish literacy, but outcomes associated with that program fall outside the scope of this report.

Research²

The WWC identified 30 studies of the impact of *Success for All*® on English language learners that were published or released between 1983 and 2012.

Eight studies are within the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol but do not meet WWC evidence standards.

- Four studies did not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the intervention group prior to the start of the intervention.
- Three studies had only one unit assigned to one or both conditions, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to the *Success for All*® intervention.
- One study had a separate technology intervention used in addition to *Success for All*® in some intervention schools and no comparison schools, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to the *Success for All*® intervention.

Fourteen studies are out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol because they have an ineligible study design.

Eight studies are out of the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol for reasons other than study design.

References

Studies that do not meet WWC evidence standards

Calderon, M., August, D., Slavin, R., Duran, D., Madden, N., & Cheung, A. (2005). Bringing words to life in classrooms with English-language learners. In E. H. Hiebert & M. L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 115–136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.

Chambers, B., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., & Gifford, R. (2004). *Effects of Success for All with embedded video on the beginning reading achievement of Hispanic children*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.

Additional sources:

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 73, 125–230.

Chambers, B., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., & Gifford, R. (2005). *Enhancing Success for All for Hispanic students: Effects on beginning reading achievement*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.

Dianda, M. R., & Flaherty, J. F. (1995). *Report on work station uses: Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory. 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.

Additional source:

Livingston, M., & Flaherty, J. (1997). *Effects of Success for All on reading achievement in California schools*. Los Alamitos, CA: WestEd.

Hofstetter, C. H. (2004). Effects of a transitional bilingual education program: Findings, issues, and next steps. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 28(3), 355–377. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.

Lassas, L. K. (2003). *An examination of SAT–9 reading scores of third grade Success for All students and non-SFA students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, Stanislaus. 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., & Madden, N. A. (1998). *Success for All/Exito Para Todos effects on the reading achievement of students acquiring English* (Report No. 19). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1992). *Success for All: Effects on students with limited English proficiency: A three year evaluation* (Report No. 29). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. 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.

Additional sources:

Slavin, R. E., Leighton, M., & Yampolsky, R. (1990). *Success for All: Effects on the achievement of limited English proficient children* (Report No. 5). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Effects of Success for All on students with limited English proficiency: A three year evaluation* (Draft). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Success for All: Effects on language minority students*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Urdegar, S. M. (1998). *Evaluation of the Success for All program 1997–98*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Public Schools, Office of Educational Evaluation. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.

Additional source:

Urdegar, S. M. (2000). *Evaluation of the Success for All program 1998–99*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Public Schools, Office of Educational Evaluation.

Studies that are ineligible for review using the English Language Learners Evidence Review Protocol

August, D., Carlo, M., Calderon, M., & Nuttall, M. (2006). Developing literacy in English-language learners: An examination of the impact of English-only versus bilingual instruction. In P. McCardle & E. Hoff (Eds.), *Childhood bilingualism: Research on infancy through school age* (p. 91). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine an intervention implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review—the intervention is delivered in English and the comparison is not.

Chambers, B., Cheung, A. C. K., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Gifford, R. (2006). Achievement effects of embedded multimedia in a Success for All reading program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 232–237. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Additional source:

Chambers, B., Cheung, A., Gifford, R., Madden, N., & Slavin, R. E. (2004). *Achievement effects of embedded multimedia in a Success for All reading program*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.

Christianson, A. M. (2011). A case study examining principal leadership behaviors that promote shared responsibility for English language learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 71(10-A), 3492. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.

Hurley, E. A., Chamberlain, A., Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2001). Effects of Success for All on TAAS reading scores—A Texas statewide evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(10), 750–756. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 60% English language learners.

James, D. W., Jurich, S., and Estes, S. (2001). *Raising minority academic achievement: A compendium of educational programs and practices*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Mytton, J. A., DiGuseppi, C., Gough, D., Taylor, R. S., & Logan, S. School-based secondary prevention programmes for preventing violence. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 3*. Art. No.: CD004606. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004606.pub2. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Nunnery, J. A., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Hunter, P., & Stubbs, J. (1997, March). *Effects of full and partial implementations of Success for All on student reading achievement in English and Spanish*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.

Additional source:

- Nunnery, J. A. (1995). An assessment of Success For All program component effects on the reading achievement of at-risk first grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(01), 155A.
- Ray-Subramanian, C., & Coffee, G. (2010). Practical considerations for selecting and implementing literacy interventions for use with English language learners. *School Psychology Forum*, 4(1), 34–42. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1998). *Longitudinal study of student literacy achievement in different Title I school-wide programs in Fort Wayne community schools—Year 2: First grade results*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 60% English language learners.
- Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., & Smith, L. J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater public schools—Year 1: 1995–1996*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 60% English language learners.
- Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Nunnery, J. A. (1998, April). *Title I as a catalyst for school improvement: Impact of alternative school-wide models on the reading achievement of students at risk*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 60% English language learners.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Chambers, B., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). *Effective beginning reading programs: A best-evidence synthesis*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University School of Education's Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Cheung, A., & Davis, S. (2009). *Beyond the basics: effective reading programs for the upper elementary grades*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University School of Education's Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., Lake, C., Davis, S., & Madden, N. A. (2009). *Effective programs for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University School of Education's Center for Data-Driven Reform in Education. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N., Calderón, M., Chamberlain, A., & Hennessy, M. (2011). Reading and language outcomes of a multiyear randomized evaluation of transitional bilingual education. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, 33(1), 47–58. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine an intervention implemented in a way that falls within the scope of the review—the intervention is delivered in English and the comparison is not.
- Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of Success for All on the reading achievement of students acquiring English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 4(4), 393–416. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2006). *Success for All/Roots & Wings: 2006 summary of research on achievement outcomes*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research and Reform in Education. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Chambers, B., & Haxby, B. (2009). *2 million children: Success for all* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. The study is ineligible for review because it is a secondary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Stewart, J. A. (2004). An analysis of bilingual programs in the context of a schoolwide reading program. *Masters Abstracts International*, 43(03), 74–663. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group design or a single-case design.
- Tychsen, A. (1999). The power of the purse: an examination of how schools reallocated resources to implement reform strategies (resource reallocation, school reform, elementary schools, class size). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(06A), 322-1917. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include a student outcome.
- Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (2003). *Comparisons between elementary school programs on reading performance: Albuquerque public schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Education Policy. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample aligned with the protocol—the sample includes less than 60% English language learners.

Endnotes

¹ The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program's website (www.successforall.net, downloaded May 2012). The WWC requests developers review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. The program description was provided to the developer in May 2012; however, the WWC received no response. 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 by June 2012.

² This report has been updated to include reviews of 16 studies that have been released since the previous WWC report was released in July 2007. Of the additional studies, 13 were not within the scope of the protocol, and three were within the scope of the protocol but did not meet evidence standards. The previous WWC report had 20 studies, but only 14 were unique; therefore, the list was updated, and six studies have been recategorized as additional sources. This report includes an updated review of all studies that previously met WWC standards with reservations. As a result, this report reflects the following revised disposition code for Chambers (2004): The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a quasi-experimental design in which the analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent. This revised disposition is due to a change in the WWC evidence standards; in particular, in the WWC Evidence Standards, version 2.1, page 14: If pre-intervention differences are 0.25 standard deviations or larger, then the study cannot meet standards (even after statistical adjustment). A complete list and disposition of all studies reviewed are provided in the references. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, version 2.1, as described in the English Language Learners review protocol, version 2.1. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.

Recommended Citation

U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. (2012, October). *English Language Learners intervention report: Success for All*[®]. Retrieved from <http://whatworks.ed.gov>.

Glossary of Terms

Attrition	Attrition occurs when an outcome variable is not available for all participants initially assigned to the intervention and comparison groups. The WWC considers the total attrition rate and the difference in attrition rates across groups within a study.
Clustering adjustment	If intervention assignment is made at a cluster level and the analysis is conducted at the student level, the WWC will adjust the statistical significance to account for this mismatch, if necessary.
Confounding factor	A confounding factor is a component of a study that is completely aligned with one of the study conditions, making it impossible to separate how much of the observed effect was due to the intervention and how much was due to the factor.
Design	The design of a study is the method by which intervention and comparison groups were assigned.
Domain	A domain is a group of closely related outcomes.
Effect size	The effect size is a measure of the magnitude of an effect. The WWC uses a standardized measure to facilitate comparisons across studies and outcomes.
Eligibility	A study is eligible for review and inclusion in this report if it falls within the scope of the review protocol and uses either an experimental or matched comparison group design.
Equivalence	A demonstration that the analysis sample groups are similar on observed characteristics defined in the review area protocol.
Extent of evidence	An indication of how much evidence supports the findings. The criteria for the extent of evidence levels are given in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (version 2.1).
Improvement index	Along a percentile distribution of students, the improvement index represents the gain or loss of the average student due to the intervention. As the average student starts at the 50th percentile, the measure ranges from -50 to +50.
Multiple comparison adjustment	When a study includes multiple outcomes or comparison groups, the WWC will adjust the statistical significance to account for the multiple comparisons, if necessary.
Quasi-experimental design (QED)	A quasi-experimental design (QED) is a research design in which subjects are assigned to intervention and comparison groups through a process that is not random.
Randomized controlled trial (RCT)	A randomized controlled trial (RCT) is an experiment in which investigators randomly assign eligible participants into intervention and comparison groups.
Rating of effectiveness	The WWC rates the effects of an intervention in each domain based on the quality of the research design and the magnitude, statistical significance, and consistency in findings. The criteria for the ratings of effectiveness are given in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook (version 2.1).
Single-case design	A research approach in which an outcome variable is measured repeatedly within and across different conditions that are defined by the presence or absence of an intervention.
Standard deviation	The standard deviation of a measure shows how much variation exists across observations in the sample. A low standard deviation indicates that the observations in the sample tend to be very close to the mean; a high standard deviation indicates that the observations in the sample tend to be spread out over a large range of values.
Statistical significance	Statistical significance is the probability that the difference between groups is a result of chance rather than a real difference between the groups. The WWC labels a finding statistically significant if the likelihood that the difference is due to chance is less than 5% ($p < 0.05$).
Substantively important	A substantively important finding is one that has an effect size of 0.25 or greater, regardless of statistical significance.

Please see the [WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook \(version 2.1\)](#) for additional details.