

Evidence-Based Intervention Services

Catapult Learning's academic intervention programs feature evidence-based learning objectives aligned to College and Career Readiness Standards and are built on research that **meets ESSA's revised definition of "evidence-based" intervention** in Sec. 8101(21)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).



How Catapult Learning Meets ESSA's "Evidence-Based" Criteria:

With programming supported by best-practice research and with ongoing data collection that examines the effects of our intervention activities on an annual basis, our intervention programs all meet 8101 (21) (A) (ii), Level 4 evidence. Furthermore, Catapult Learning is working with the Center for Research and Reform in Education at Johns Hopkins University to evaluate the efficacy of Intervention strategies in both Reading and Math through multiple studies that would qualify for 8101 (21) (A) (i).

We routinely evaluate our impact on student academic outcomes internally and participate in on-going efficacy trials with external evaluator, Johns Hopkins University.

Each of our intervention programs is evaluated on an annual basis to ensure we establish evidence of academic growth. These efforts also inform opportunities for continuous improvement and generate hundreds of examples of ongoing evaluation activities.

We demonstrate statistically significant gains on third-party, nationally-normed, demonstrably valid, and reliable assessments such as the i-Ready, NWEA MAP, and Iowa assessments. In addition, we regularly review academic performance data in tandem with instructional quality data and attendance data to assist in program refinement.

Catapult Learning also participates in efficacy trials conducted by researchers at the Center for Research and Reform in Education at Johns Hopkins University School of Education.

What is "Evidence-Based" Effectiveness Under ESSA?

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) ensures that all students, regardless of their zip code, have access to the support and services they need to reach their full potential. ESSA defines "evidence-based" as an activity, strategy, or intervention that either:

- (i) Demonstrates relevant outcomes: Levels 1-3
- (ii) Demonstrates a research-based rationale and includes ongoing efforts to evaluate relevant outcomes: Level 4

Levels of Evidence:

1) Strong Evidence: At least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study links the intervention to the outcome

2) Moderate Evidence: At least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study links the intervention to the outcome

3) Promising Evidence: At least one well-designed and well-implemented correlational study (with controls for selection bias) links the intervention to the outcome.

4) Demonstrates a Rationale:

Has logic model/theory of action that is research based and active effort to study the effects of the intervention underway

Our English/Language Arts and Math intervention programs both employ research-based best practices from sources such as the National Reading Panel (NRP), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel

Our programs and curricular materials are research-based.

Catapult Learning's signature intervention programs, AchieveLiteracy and AchieveMath™, are designed to accelerate student learning by providing a balance of systematic, explicit instruction in key concepts and skills that is best suited for students struggling academically (Foorman & Torgesen, 2001; Berninger et al., 2003; Crawford & Torgesen, 2007; Gersten et al., 2008; Nelson, Vadasy, & Sanders, 2011; Shanley, Clarke, Doabler; Kurtz-Nelson & Fien, 2017).

Our multi-tiered intervention framework stems from the work of E.J. Kame'enui (2002) around levels of intervention and focuses on the second tier of intervention designed to supplement, support, and enhance classroom instruction in order to meet the varied needs of low-achieving students. Our programs offer flexible, small-group environments that allow teachers to utilize initial diagnostic assessments to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students. Before working with students, Catapult teachers receive intensive training on research-validated instructional strategies and are provided with a wealth of instructional materials to support them in assessing, motivating, and teaching learners in our programs.

Our English/Language Arts and Math intervention programs both employ research-based best practices from sources such as the National Reading Panel (NRP), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Mathematics Advisory Panel. For instance, our AchieveLiteracy program integrates NRP-supported practices for comprehension, fluency, phonics, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary with oral and written language instruction enhanced specifically for linguistically-diverse learners (Akhtar & Jaswal, 2014; Edwards et al., 2014; Charity, Scarborough & Griffin, 2004; Cirino et al., 2009; Edmonds et al., 2009; Kamps et al., 2007; Mathes et al., 2005; O'Connor, Fulmer, Harty & Bell, 2005; Simmons et al., 2011).

Catapult Learning teachers assist students in connecting and integrating new learning to existing knowledge, provide student-centered instruction and differentiation, deliver immediate and appropriate feedback to the learner, incorporate ample guided practice, and help students to articulate their thinking; all of which represent best practices in differentiated instruction (Tomlinson, 2014).

Selected Bibliography Illustrating Research-Basis of Catapult Learning Intervention Services

- Akhtar, N. & Jaswal, V.K. (2013). Deficit or difference? Interpreting diverse developmental paths: An introduction to the special section. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(1), 1-3.
- Berninger VW, Vermeulen K, Abbott RD, McCutchen D, Cotton S, Cude J, ... Sharon T. (2003). Comparison of three approaches to supplementary reading instruction for low-achieving second-grade readers. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*, 34(2), 101-116.
- Charity-Hudley, Anne & Scarborough, Hollis & Griffin, Darion. (2004). Familiarity with school English in African American children and its relation to early reading achievement. *Child Development*, 75, 1340-56.
- Cirino, P., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J., & Francis, D. (2009). One-Year Follow-up Outcomes of Spanish and English Interventions for English Language Learners at Risk for Reading Problems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 744-781.
- Crawford, E., & Torgesen, J. (2007). Teaching all students to read: Practices from "Reading First" schools with strong intervention outcomes. Florida Center for Reading Research. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498784>
- Edwards, J., Gross, M., Chen, J., MacDonald, M. C., Kaplan, D., Brown, M., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2014). Dialect awareness and lexical comprehension of mainstream American English in African American English-speaking children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research: JSLHR*, 57(5), 1883-1895. http://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0228
- Edmonds, M., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C., Cable, A., Tackett, K., & Schnakenberg, J. (2009). A Synthesis of Reading Interventions and Effects on Reading Comprehension Outcomes for Older Struggling Readers. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 262-300. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40071166>
- Foorman, B. R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16, 203-212. doi: 10.1111/0938-8982.00020
- Gersten et al. (2008). Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades. Institute of Education Sciences: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. Retrieved from https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf
- Kame'enui, E.J., Carnine, D. W., Dixon, R.C., Simmons, D.C., & Coyne, M.D. (2002). *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners* (2nd edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., ... Walton, C. (2007). Use of Evidence-Based, Small-Group Reading Instruction for English Language Learners in Elementary Grades: Secondary-Tier Intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 30(3), 153-168.
- Mathes, P., Denton, C., Fletcher, J., Anthony, J., Francis, D., & Schatschneider, C. (2005). The Effects of Theoretically Different Instruction and Student Characteristics on the Skills of Struggling Readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(2), 148-182.
- Nelson, R. J., Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2011). Efficacy of a Tier 2 Supplemental Root Word Vocabulary and Decoding Intervention With Kindergarten Spanish-Speaking English Learners. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(2), 184-211.
- O'Connor, Fulmer, Harty & Bell, 2005
- O'Connor, R.E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(5), 440-55.
- Shanley, L., Clarke, B., Doabler, C. T., Kurtz-Nelson, E., & Fien, H. (2017). Early Number Skills Gains and Mathematics Achievement: Intervening to Establish Successful Early Mathematics Trajectories. *The Journal of Special Education*, 51(3), 177-188.
- Simmons, D. C., Coyne, M. D., Hagan-Burke, S., Oi-Man Kwok, Simmons, L., Johnson, C., Crevecoeur, Y. C. (2011). Effects of Supplemental Reading Interventions in Authentic Contexts: A Comparison of Kindergarteners' Response. *Exceptional Children*, 77(2), 207-228
- Tomlinson, Carol Ann. (2014). *The Differentiated Classroom: Responding to the Needs of All Learners*, 2nd Edition. ASCD.