

Peer-Reviewed Research Support for Renaissance Tools

As of June 2018

Reading

Accelerated Reader®

Gorard, S., Siddiqui, N., & See, B. H. (2017). What works and what fails? Evidence from seven popular literacy 'catch-up' schemes for the transition to secondary school in England. *Research Papers in Education*, 32(5), 626–648.

Hansen, L. E., Collins, P., & Warschauer, M. (2009). Reading management programs: A review of the research. *Journal of Literacy and Technology*, 10(3), 55–80. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.491.3652&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Husman, J., Brem, S., & Duggan, M. A. (2005). Student goal orientation and formative assessment. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 9(3), 355–359. Retrieved from <http://www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/5oct304715.htm>

Johnson, R. A., & Howard, C. A. (2003). The effects of the Accelerated Reader program on the reading comprehension of pupils in grades three, four, and five. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 87–96. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/johnson_howard/article.pdf

McGlinn, J., & Parrish, A. (2002). Accelerating ESL students' reading progress with Accelerated Reader. *Reading Horizons*, 42(3), 175–189. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1186&context=reading_horizons

Nunnery, J. A., Ross, S. M., & McDonald, A. (2006). A randomized experimental evaluation of the impact of Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance implementation on reading achievement in grades 3 to 6. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 11(1), 1–18.

Peak, J. P., & Dewalt, M. W. (1994). Reading achievement: Effects of computerized reading management and enrichment. *ERS Spectrum*, 12(1), 31–35.

Rodriguez, S. (2007). The Accelerated Reader program's relationship to student achievement on the English-Language Arts California Standards Test. *The Reading Matrix*, 7(3), 191–205. Retrieved from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/rodriguez/article.pdf>

Shannon, L. C., Styers, M. K., Wilkerson, S. B., & Peery, E. (2015). Computer-assisted learning in elementary reading: A randomized control trial. *Computers in the Schools*, 32(1), 20–34.

- Siddiqui, N., Gorard, S., & See, B. H. (2016). Accelerated Reader as a literacy catch-up intervention during primary to secondary school transition phase. *Educational Review*, 68(2), 139–154. Retrieved from <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/16393/1/16393.pdf>
- Topping, K. J. (in press). Implementation fidelity and pupil achievement in book reading: Variation between regions, local authorities and schools. *Research Papers in Education*.
- Topping, K. J. (2018). Implementation fidelity in computerized assessment of book reading. *Computers & Education*, 116, 176–190.
- Topping, K. J. (2015). Fiction and non-fiction reading and comprehension in preferred books. *Reading Psychology*, 36(4), 350–387.
- Topping, K. J., & Fisher, A. M. (2003). Computerised formative assessment of reading comprehension: Field trials in the U.K. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 26(3), 267–279. Retrieved from <http://www.renlearn.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Computerised%20formative%20assessment%20of%20reading%20comprehension.pdf>
- Topping, K. J., & Paul, T. (1999). Computer-assisted assessment of practice at reading: A large scale survey using Accelerated Reader data. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15(3), 213–231.
- Topping, K. J., Samuels, S. J., & Paul, T. (2008). Independent reading: The relationship of challenge, non-fiction and gender to achievement. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(4), 505–524.
- Topping, K. J., Samuels, S. J., & Paul, T. (2007). Computerized assessment of independent reading: Effects of implementation quality on achievement gain. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18(2), 191–208.
- Topping, K. J., Samuels, S. J., & Paul, T. (2007). Does practice make perfect? Independent reading quantity, quality and student achievement. *Learning and Instruction*, 17(3), 253–264. Retrieved from <http://d20uo2axdbh83k.cloudfront.net/20140124/97bcf2bae9f1fc7838658cfa60544c83.pdf>
- Topping, K. J., & Sanders, W. L. (2000). Teacher effectiveness and computer assessment of reading: Relating value-added and learning information systems data. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(3), 305–337.
- Vollands, S. R., Topping, K. J., & Evans, H. M. (1999). Computerized self-assessment of reading comprehension with the Accelerated Reader: Action research. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 15(3), 197–211. Retrieved from <https://dianedalenberg.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/computerized-self-ass-of-rdg-w-ar.pdf>

myON Reader™

- Ortlieb, E., Sargent, S., & Moreland, M. (2014). Evaluating the efficacy of using a digital reading environment to improve reading comprehension within a reading clinic. *Reading Psychology*, 35(5), 397–421.

Read Now™ Power Up!

- Algozzine, B. (2004). Effects of Read Now on adolescents at risk for school failure. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, 10(2), 1–8.

Star Early Literacy®

Clemens, N. H., Hagan-Burke, S., Luo, W., Cerda, C., Blakely, A., Frosch, J., Gamez, B., & Jones, M. (2015). The predictive validity of a computer-adaptive assessment of kindergarten and first-grade reading skills. *School Psychology Review*, 44(1), 76–97. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275040844_The_Predictive_Validity_of_a_Computer-Adaptive_Assessment_of_Kindergarten_and_First-Grade_Reading_Skills

Clemens, N. H., Hsiao, Y. Y., Simmons, L. E., Kwok, O. M., Greene, E. A., Soohoo, M. M., ... Otaiba, S. A. (in press). Predictive validity of kindergarten progress monitoring measures across the school year: Application of dominance analysis. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*.

McBride, J. R., Ysseldyke, J., Milone, M., & Stickney, E. (2010). Technical adequacy and cost benefit of four measures of early literacy. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 25(2), 189–204.

Star Reading®

Algozzine, B., Wang, C., & Boukhtiarov, A. (2011). A comparison of progress monitoring scores and end-of-grade achievement. *New Waves-Educational Research & Development*, 14(1), 3–21. Retrieved from

http://www.viethconsulting.com/members/publication/new_waves_article.php?aid=19290171

Mathematics

Accelerated Math®

Bolt, D. M., Ysseldyke, J., & Patterson, M. J. (2010). Students, teachers, and schools as sources of variability, integrity, and sustainability in implementing progress monitoring. *School Psychology Review*, 39(4), 612–630.

Burns, M. K., Klingbeil, D. A., & Ysseldyke, J. (2010). The effects of technology enhanced formative evaluation on student performance on state accountability math tests. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(6), 582–591. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/24491965/The_Effects_of_Technology-Enhanced_Formative_Evaluation_on_Student_Performance_on_State_Accountability_Math_Tests

Lambert, R., Algozzine, B., & McGee, J. (2014). Effects of progress monitoring on math performance of at-risk students. *British Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 4(4), 527–540. Retrieved from <http://sciencedomain.org/download/MzMxNUBACGY>

Spicuzza, R., Ysseldyke, J., Lemkuil, A., Kosciolk, S., Boys, C., & Teelucksingh, E. (2001). Effects of curriculum-based monitoring on classroom instruction and math achievement. *Journal of School Psychology*, 39(6), 521–542.

Springer, R. M., Pugalee, D., & Algozzine, B. (2007). Improving mathematics skills of high school students. *The Clearing House*, 81(1), 37–44.

Ysseldyke, J., Betts, J., Thill, T., & Hannigan, E. (2004). Use of an instructional management system to improve mathematics skills for students in Title I programs. *Preventing School Failure*, 48(4), 10–14.

- Ysseldyke, J., & Bolt, D. (2007). Effect of technology-enhanced continuous progress monitoring on math achievement. *School Psychology Review*, 36(3), 453–467. Retrieved from <http://questgarden.com/76/55/0/090212083730/files/progress%20monitoring%20math.pdf>
- Ysseldyke, J., & Tardrew, S. (2007). Use of a progress monitoring system to enable teachers to differentiate mathematics instruction. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 24(1), 1–28. Retrieved from <http://doc.renlearn.com/KMNet/R004282102GHDE61.pdf>
- Ysseldyke, J., Tardrew, S., Betts, J., Thill, T., & Hannigan, E. (2004). Use of an instructional management system to enhance math instruction of gifted and talented students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(4), 293–310. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ682720.pdf>
- Ysseldyke, J., Spicuzza, R., Kosciulek, S., & Boys, C. (2003). Effects of a learning information system on mathematics achievement and classroom structure. *Journal of Educational Research*, 96(3), 163–173.
- Ysseldyke, J., Spicuzza, R., Kosciulek, S., Teelucksingh, E., Boys, C., & Lemkuil, A. (2003). Using a curriculum-based instructional management system to enhance math achievement in urban schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 8(2), 247–265. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christopher_Boys/publication/241332637_Using_a_Curriculum-Based_Instructional_Management_System_to_Enhance_Math_Achievement_in_Urban_Schools/links/54ea2dc10cf25ba91c828a2c.pdf

MathFacts in a Flash®

- Burns, M. K., Kanive, R., & DeGrande, M. (2012). Effect of a computer-delivered math fact intervention as a supplemental intervention for math in third and fourth grades. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33(3) 184–191. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249835303_Effect_of_a_Computer-Delivered_Math_Fact_Intervention_as_a_Supplemental_Intervention_for_Math_in_Third_and_Fourth_Grades
- Burns, M. K., Ysseldyke, J., Nelson, P. M., & Kanive, R. (2015). Number of repetitions required to retain single-digit multiplication math facts for elementary students. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 30(3), 398–405. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268794384_Number_of_Repetitions_Required_to_Retain_Single-Digit_Multiplication_Math_Facts_for_Elementary_Students
- Kanive, R., Nelson, P. M., Burns, M. K., & Ysseldyke, J. (2014). Comparison of the effects of computer-based practice and conceptual understanding interventions on mathematics fact retention and generalization. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(2), 83–89. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271933620_Comparison_of_the_Effects_of_Computer-Based_Practice_and_Conceptual_Understanding_Interventions_on_Mathematics_Fact_Retention_and_Generalization
- Nelson, P. M., Burns, M. K., Kanive, R., & Ysseldyke, J. (2013). Comparison of a math fact rehearsal and a mnemonic strategy approach for improving math fact fluency. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(6), 659–667. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/24491984/Comparison_of_a_math_fact_rehearsal_and_a_mnemonic_strategy_approach_for_improving_math_fact_fluency

Stickney, E. M., Sharp, L. B., & Kenyon, A. S. (2012). Technology-enhanced assessment of math fact automaticity: Patterns of performance for low- and typically achieving students. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 37(2), 84–94.

Ysseldyke, J., Thill, T., Pohl, J., & Bolt, D. (2005). Using MathFacts in a Flash to enhance computational fluency. *Journal of Evidence Based Practices for Schools*, 6(1), 59–89.

Star Math®

Nelson, P. M., Van Norman, E. R., Klingbeil, D. A., & Parker, D. C. (2017). Progress monitoring with computer adaptive assessments: The impact of data collection schedule on growth estimates. *Psychology in the Schools*, 54(5), 463–471.

Shapiro, E. S., & Gebhardt, S. N. (2012). Comparing-computer adaptive and curriculum-based measurement methods of assessment. *School Psychology Review*, 41(3), 295–305.

Shapiro, E. S., Dennis, M. S., & Fu, Q. (2015). Comparing computer adaptive and curriculum-based measures of math in progress monitoring. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 30(4), 470–487.

Multiple Products

Accelerated Reader 360® and Accelerated Math®

Holmes, C. T., Brown, C. L., & Algozzine, B. (2006). Promoting academic success for all students. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10(3), 141–147.

Nunnery, J. A., & Ross, S. M. (2007). The effects of the School Renaissance program on student achievement in reading and mathematics. *Research in the Schools*, 14(1), 40–59.

Yeh, S. S. (2010). The cost-effectiveness of 22 approaches for raising student achievement. *Journal of Education Finance*, 36(1), 38–75. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=stuart_yeh

Yeh, S. S. (2010). The cost-effectiveness of NBPTS teacher certification. *Evaluation Review*, 34(3), 220–241. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=stuart_yeh

Yeh, S. S. (2010). Understanding and addressing the achievement gap through individualized instruction and formative assessment. *Assessment in Education*, 17(2), 169–182.

Yeh, S. S. (2009). Class size reduction or rapid formative assessment?: A comparison of cost-effectiveness. *Educational Research Review*, 4(1), 7–15.

Yeh, S. S. (2009). Shifting the bell curve: The benefits and costs of raising student achievement. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 32(1), 74–82. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1016&context=stuart_yeh

Yeh, S. S. (2009). The cost-effectiveness of raising teacher quality. *Educational Research Review*, 4(3), 220–232.

- Yeh, S. S., & Ritter, J. (2009). The cost-effectiveness of replacing the bottom quartile of novice teachers through value-added teacher assessment. *Journal of Education Finance*, 34(4), 426–451. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=stuart_yeh
- Yeh, S. S. (2008). The cost-effectiveness of Comprehensive School Reform and rapid assessment. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 16(13). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/viewFile/38/164>
- Yeh, S. S. (2007). The cost-effectiveness of five policies for improving student achievement. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(4), 416–436. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=stuart_yeh

Star Early Literacy[®], Star Math[®], and Star Reading[®]

- Haas, L. B., Stickney, E. M., & Ysseldyke, J. (2016). Using growth norms to set instructional goals for struggling students. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 32(1), 82–99.
- Li, Y., Marion, S., Perie, M., & Gong, B. (2010). An approach for evaluating the technical quality of interim assessments. *Peabody Journal of Education: Issues of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations*, 85(2), 163–185. Retrieved from <http://qualityrubrics.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/50323744/Approach%20for%20Evaluating%20Technical%20Quality%20of%20Interim%20Assessments.pdf>

Star Math[®] and Star Reading[®]

- Monpas-Huber, J. B. (2015). Just pressing buttons? Validity evidence for the STAR and Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments. *The WERA Educational Journal*, 8(1), 39–44. Retrieved from <https://www.wera-web.org/assets/docs//WEJ-November-2015-final.pdf#page=39>
- Ysseldyke, J., Scerra, C., Stickney, E., Beckler, A., Dituri, J., & Ellis, K. (2017). Academic growth expectations for students with emotional and behavior disorders. *Psychology in the Schools*, 54(8), 792–807.

Hardware

NEO™

Friedman, A. A., Zibit, M., & Coote, M. (2004). Telementoring as a collaborative agent for change. *The Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/jtla/article/view/1654/1502>

Russell, M., Bebell, D., Cowan, J., & Corbelli, M. (2003). An AlphaSmart for each student: Do teaching and learning change with full access to word processors? *Computers and Composition*, 20, 51–76.

Swan, K., van 't Hooft, M., Kratcoski, A., & Unger, D. (2005). Uses and effects of mobile computing devices in K-8 classrooms. *Journal of Research on Technology and Education*, 38(1), 99–112. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ719939.pdf>

To request a peer-reviewed journal article from Renaissance, or information about how to purchase articles from the publishers, please email research@renaissance.com