Dyslexia Training Program

Effectiveness

No studies of the *Dyslexia Training Program* that fall within the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities 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 the *Dyslexia Training Program* on students with learning disabilities.

Program Description

The *Dyslexia Training Program*, developed at the Texas Scottish Rite Hospital for Children, is a Tier III reading intervention program that provides intensive phonics instruction to children with dyslexia, primarily in grades two through five. It is a comprehensive two-year program that bridges the gap for school districts in which a trained dyslexia therapist or appropriately trained teacher is not available. The video series offers classroom instruction, while an onsite facilitator provides attention to individual needs and observes progress in the classroom. The program teaches reading and spelling through multisensory lessons with a strong emphasis on phonemic awareness and alphabetic code knowledge. For students, the *Dyslexia Training Program* provides 336 one-hour lessons on DVD using two trained dyslexia therapists. For educators, there are five orientation and training modules for staff development and supplemental teaching strategies.

1. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program’s website (http://www.tsrhc.org/dyslexiatraining.htm, downloaded October 2009). The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. 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 October 2009.
3. The *Dyslexia Training Program* is one of many curricula that are based, in part, on the principles of the sequential, multisensory Orton-Gillingham approach to teaching reading. Other WWC intervention reports related to the multisensory Orton-Gillingham approach include *Barton Reading & Spelling System®*, *Fundations®*, *Herman Method™*, *Orton-Gillingham–based Strategies (Unbranded)*, *Wilson Reading System®*, *Project Read®*, and *Alphabetic Phonics*.
None of the four studies meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations for the WWC review protocol for Students with Learning Disabilities.

One study is within the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol, but the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit assigned to one or both conditions.

Three studies are out of the scope of the Students with Learning Disabilities review protocol and are ineligible for review.

- Two studies have samples that are not aligned with the WWC review protocol—the sample includes less than 50% students with learning disabilities.
- One study did not include a student outcome.
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