

Creating New Models for Learning: Units of Sound: Literacy that fits

Margaret Rooms

Project Overview

Sixty students were given the Units of Sound: Literacy that fits (UofS:ltf) programme for 10 weeks to use at home with support from their parents. The students were split into three groups:

Model One: This model involves using the UofS:ltf programme at home as well as in a lesson.

Model Two: The student and helper are introduced to the programme over 3 initial sessions.

Model Three: This is the stand alone model where the students use the programme on their own at home with a parent or helper to support them.

All students were given baseline testing at the beginning of the project and again after ten weeks consisting of WRAT-4 Reading, Spelling and Reading Comprehension.

This was not a controlled experimental study. Instead we were looking at a comparison of the different models, exploring how they worked in practice.

The results, whilst bearing in mind the limitations of the study, showed that UofS:ltf can be used as an effective tool for developing literacy skills in the home, with a minimal amount of support.

Method

Sixty students, mostly children, were given the *Units of Sound: Literacy that fits* (UofS:ltf) programme for 10 weeks to use at home with support from their parents. The students were split into three groups:

Model One: This model involves using the UofS:ltf programme at home as well as in school or in a Dyslexia Action lesson. We are looking here to see the effect increasing the amount of time spent on the programme each week has on the rate of progress in literacy.

Model Two: In this model the student is introduced to the programme by a Dyslexia Action teacher over three sessions. The parent or helper also attends these sessions so that both student and helper are shown how to use the different aspects of the programme and have the opportunity to ask questions.

Model Three: This is the stand alone model where the students use the programme on their own at home with a parent or helper to support them. We are looking here to

compare the results with model two to see the effect of the initial lessons on motivation and sustainability.

All students were given baseline testing at the beginning of the project and again after ten weeks consisting of WRAT-4 Reading, Spelling and Reading Comprehension. We wanted to see the differences between the models; what the issues were when working at home; how much support students needed in order to make good use of the programme at home.

Rationale

Units of Sound is a PC based literacy intervention programme which focuses on Reading (decoding), Spelling (by analogy), Memory (visual), and Dictation sentences. It is used within Dyslexia Action centres and in schools and colleges, mostly in the UK. What makes *Units of Sound* different from most other structured literacy programmes is that because up to 80% of the work is carried out independently on a computer there is no need for expensive 1:1 provision. Again because so much of the teaching is built into the programme, *Units of Sound* can be used by any teacher or teaching assistant without extensive training – although we do recommend a day's training where possible.

The natural extension of this programme has to be a version that can be used at home with parents supporting their children and so *Units of Sound: Literacy that fits* was developed in Spring 2007. The programme is essentially the same as that used in schools with the addition of a few key features which enable parents to support their children on the programme. These are:

- A screening system which does not require any prior knowledge of the student's reading and spelling skills
- 'Stops' on the Spelling, Memory and Dictation programmes whereby the student is not able to proceed through the programme before getting a required score of accuracy in these programmes
- Audio 'Helpsound' on every screen so that if the student or parent is unsure what to do on that screen, Helpsound will tell them.

Why do we need a programme to use at home when children are in school with trained teachers for five days a week? Leaving aside the question of why some children fail to develop literacy skills as fast as their peers in the first few years at school, the issue is – once there is a literacy gap how do we find the time to put in the teaching needed to close it during a school day

which is already full? Also, because there is a literacy gap, we probably already need to find extra time to cover curriculum support. So that leaves the time outside of school – the time at home. Can we use some of that? This time is sometimes used for private tutors and attending Dyslexia Action centres but there are many students unable to access such services due to finance, travel difficulties, parents working etc etc. We wanted to provide a *different* tool. Something flexible enough that anyone could make good use of if they wanted to.

Although parents have always helped their children with their schoolwork at home there is often an insurmountable barrier when literacy intervention is needed. We know that qualified teachers struggle with this and so the task for parents without the skills to teach phonics is daunting. In UofS:Itf the teaching is embedded into the programme and so parents do not have to learn these skills themselves. Instead they need only to provide a quiet environment to work in; to load the programme onto a computer and familiarise themselves with the programme processes (either via helpsound or the pdf manual); to conduct a check-reading exercise every 2-3 weeks (hearing the student read a passage from the book provided); to provide encouragement and understanding.

Once the programme was ready we wanted to trial its use in the three different models listed above. This was not necessarily to prove that one model was better than the others, but to show the flexibility of its use and to understand the issues relating to each of the models so that we could advise parents appropriately.

The sample

Because real life never quite fits the plan, we found ourselves with a very short lead in time to identify our students; to get the necessary permissions and baseline testing completed and still have 10 weeks to work on the programme within the Summer term 07. Initially we planned to use 20 year 7 students from a school we were already working in using model 1, but in the event we found that they were not going to be ready in time and so we decided to find an additional 20 students ourselves. We did however include eight students from a model 2 project in Skipton.

We did not set out to find a specific range of students as the material would be on open sale and so anyone could access it. The criteria therefore was that their literacy fell within the Units of Sound range; that they had been identified as having a literacy need; that they had access to a PC at home; that they wanted to participate; that there was a parent or helper willing to support them. Although many of the students in this project had been identified as dyslexic, we deliberately did not make this a requirement as Units of Sound (the school/college programme) has always been used with a wide variety of

literacy needs which we wanted to duplicate here.

Allocation to model one was predetermined in that they had to be already using Units of Sound in school or in a Dyslexia Action centre. Allocation to the other two groups was on a random basis. The students we worked with came from:

- London Dyslexia Action centre (5)
- Bath Dyslexia Action centre (10)
- Primary school in Eastbourne (11)
- London Dyslexia Action centre assessment (10)
- Secondary school in Skipton (8)
- Miscellaneous - (9)

Note: the total number of useable records we ended up with was 53 although we conducted initial testing with 65 and contacted more than 80.

Comparison with other studies

To try to establish some level of expectation of results we need to look at results from comparable studies. An analysis of results having one year's tuition with the Dyslexia Institute across 3 centres (averaging between 30 and 45 hours of instruction) gave an increase of 6.4 SS points for reading and 4.5 for spelling (Rack and Ruddock 2002). Results from the SPELL-IT research are less clear cut but suggest something like a 2 SS point increase after 48 hours of specialist tuition. (Rack and Hatcher 2002). The results from the Home support programme alone in the SPELL-IT study are not specifically reported. Results from the Partnership for Literacy programme (unpublished to date) give progress rates of 7 SS points for the lowest 20% of children over 6 months during which they received tuition from TAs supported by a Dyslexia Action teacher.

When control groups are used it is sometimes possible to identify greater gains when the control group's scores actually go down during the intervention period, whereas the UofS:Itf research was not able to benefit from this type of analysis.

What should we expect?

Two of the models we are looking at here reflect a 'light touch' of support. Whilst model 1 includes specialist teaching, the bit of the support researched here is the add-on, again the 'light touch'. Although we produced plenty of record sheets, it is very difficult to find out how much time was spent on the programme at home and most seem to have followed the recommended minimum of one hour a week. So we are looking at about 10 hours of independent work, supported by a parent, over a three month period. In truth we should not expect very much, if any, actual progress in reading and spelling scores because the input is too little. We did expect an indication of whether or not the programme can fit into the home as a learning tool, and whether the information

given and the intrinsic design of the programme is sufficient to maintain interest and motivation over that period.

We also expected to find some differences in the data collected from the three different models with an expectation that model three would be the hardest to maintain and so should have the highest drop-out rate.

UofS:Itf is a blunter instrument than its school cousin with just 12 entry points to the programme (compared to a theoretical 148 in UofS). We were aware that for a child with a scattered profile in literacy who may be just 'hanging on' in key stage 2 or even 3 in school, but who still has poor automaticity with cvc words, UofS:Itf may place him at the beginning of the programme without the opportunity to 'jump' to a higher level quickly.

We also expected that for some students this way of working wouldn't be suitable at all – because *one size can never fit all!*

Model One: Units of Sound at home as well as in lessons

The sample

Twenty students agreed to take part in the research, although in the end only 18 results were included as two became uncontactable for the final testing. The students came from:

- London Dyslexia Action centre (5)
- Bath Dyslexia Action centre (10)
- Primary school in Eastbourne (3).

There were 12 male students and 6 female. Excluding the one adult taking part, the ages ranged from 8:1 to 13:11 years at the start of the project with an average (mean) age of 10:1 years.

The process

As the students from the London and Bath centres were already known to Dyslexia Action they were identified as suitable candidates by the centre Principals because:

- they were using Units of Sound as their primary literacy programme
- they were familiar with all the functions of the programme
- the staff thought they would benefit from the extra work at home
- they were known to have supportive parents who would be likely to co-operate with the project.

Similarly, the three students from the Eastbourne primary school were identified by the staff in the school.

Letters were sent to all of the parents with invitations to participate in the project. The project was also explained to their literacy teachers who were asked to ensure that

'homework' of Units of Sound pages were set each week.

Results

WRAT 4 Reading	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Pre-project	83	78-90	75-92
Post-project	88	82-95	80-97
	+5		

WRAT 4 Spelling	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Pre-project	83	77-91	75-93
Post-project	86	80-93	78-95
	+3		

WRAT 4 Reading Comprehension	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Pre-project	92	87-98	85-100
Post-project	97	91-103	89-105
	+5		

The initial Standard Score (SS) for reading ranged from 59 to 108; for spelling 63 to 113 and for reading comprehension 69-115 giving averages of 83, 83 and 92 respectively. The high scores of some students reflect the fact that some of these students were coming to the end of the time with Dyslexia Action and that a great deal of progress had already been gained. Not all students completed the reading comprehension test due to the time they can take to complete for a meticulous student, and that for others it was just too daunting: these were volunteers after all!

The results of the final testing showed nominal gains of 5 SS points on average for reading; 3 for spelling; and 5 for reading comprehension. However, as would be expected with such a short period of intervention, none of the gains are outside of the confidence levels given and so should be treated with caution. This means that although on paper average gains were recorded, they are all within the error limits for uncontrolled factors of a test such as how the student was feeling at the time, how he/she felt about being tested etc.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires given to the students and to the parents at the end of the project tell us what this cohort thought about working at home as well as in their weekly lessons.

Students Initially: 10 students responded to 'I want to take part because...' with positive expectations such as:

- Because it helps me to spell
- I want to learn more about reading and spelling
- It might help me.

Two however responded with:

- My Mum told me to
- My Mum said I was going to do it.

Parents also expected the exercise to be beneficial but gave a strong demonstration of their desire to do the best for their children. One said:

- After Dyslexia Action helping R so much it is nice to give something back.

Students finally: As expected this group had the least problems using the programme at home (because they were already familiar with it), although six reported difficulty in finding a quiet place to work in.

To the question 'Did the program seem like homework?' 8 replied yes and 7 no. A range of responses was:

- Didn't mind doing it
- It was similar to the way you have to sit down and do it
- Because I was doing it at home and not in the classroom
- I knew it would help me unlike some of my homework
- I like doing homework and UofS because it was fun.

We asked them which of the four programmes they preferred and 9 replied spelling, 5 reading, 3 memory and 0 dictation. We should bear in mind here that not all the students had started the memory or dictation programmes.

Finally we asked them if they would continue to use the program at home?

- yes definitely -3
- yes probably -5
- maybe -9
- don't think so -0

The comments to 'can you tell us what you think about using the program at home?' gave some insight into the issues behind these responses.

- It does help quite a lot because you can do it as many times as you want and it can be suited to your level.
- I found some of the words easy or OK to spell but then a hard one would come up that I didn't know how to do. I'd try changing it but couldn't (note - check-spelling screen only).
- I can spend time on patterns and words that are difficult but I might not go back over in the lesson situation. I can revise it until I've 'got it'. There are fewer distractions at home when I'm relaxed.
- Rather like homework.
- It's a good programme - in the top 3 of programmes like it that I've seen.
- I think it is a good way to improve because you are getting more help and if you want you could do it again for a long time. If I'd had this since I'd started

coming here (Dyslexia Action) I would be further ahead. Some kids don't like missing so much at school. I miss double Art every other week I want to come here because I know it helps me but sometimes I would rather be in school.

Discussion

This cohort is in many ways a special case because, mostly, they have already made a commitment to the work of Dyslexia Action (15 out of the 18) and so you would expect them to co-operate with this project and to do their best at home. There were some tensions between students and parents which perhaps would be less likely to be the case if this was the model used from the start of their lessons - rather than as an add-on part way through. There is some evidence that not having a teacher nearby made the students focus a little harder.

The comments made by the student about missing school in order to attend Dyslexia Action lessons goes to the heart of the reasons for providing a programme for the home: sometimes there is no alternative to withdrawal – but withdrawal can have its own long-term consequences.

Model Two: start-up sessions plus home use

The sample

21 students agreed to take part and in the end we had 20 useable records. The students came from:

- A secondary school near Skipton (8)
- London Centre assessments (7)
- Miscellaneous (5)

There were 13 male students and 7 female. The ages ranged from 7:8 to 12:11 at the start of the project with an average age of 11:0 years.

The process

In this model, as well as being given the baseline testing the students were also shown how to use the programme by a Dyslexia Action teacher, with the parent present as well. Because these introductory lessons were given over three sessions it also allowed all questions to be answered and any initial teething problems to be ironed out.

Results

Because model 2 effectively involved two separate projects we expected some difficulty in combining the results. Some of the parameters such as the amount of time the children had to work on the programme also varied. However, as we were not including the amount of time actually spent working on the programme in our calculations we decided that combining the results was still a worthwhile exercise. Also there are a number of factors which adversely affected the amount of time spent on the programme such as: access to a computer,

school exams and events, holidays, family commitments, motivation. Both projects adhered to the same common principles of:

- children and parents were shown how to use the programme over three sessions
- WRAT-4 was used for baseline and post testing
- the children were selected because they all showed difficulties with literacy.

With the model 2 cohort we also had further problems with the reading comprehension results and so we have not reported any. Firstly the Skipton group were not given the comprehension at all and so no figures are available for use. With the remaining twelve, five didn't take the test due to the same issues as reported for models 1 and 3, and another 4 petered out before finishing the final test ie they did not continue for 10 consecutive errors thus invalidating the results. We were then left with very few useable scores and so decided not to include them.

WRAT 4 Reading	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Pre-project	84	79-91	76-93
Post-project	90	84-97	82-99
	+6		

WRAT 4 Spelling	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Pre-project	85	79-93	76-95
Post-project	86	80-93	78-95
	+1		

The initial SS for reading ranged from 66 to 101 and for spelling from 67 to 105 giving averages of 84 for reading and 85 for spelling. Looking more closely at the children with high initial scores, they had been identified as underachieving by the school or a psychologist and so it was considered that they could achieve more. The final SS for reading ranged from 75 to 128 with an average of 90. For spelling the range was from 61-104 with an average of 86.

Nominally then there was a rate of increase by 6 SS points in reading and 1 in spelling – again bearing in mind the limitations of the confidence levels.

Questionnaires

Reasons for taking part were given as wanting to improve reading and spelling with, again, parents demonstrating a desire to help their children:

- It will enable me to have a better understanding and ability to help my daughter.
- I would like to find out about anything that would help my son succeed.

Mums feature in the motivation from the children also with:

- It should help and can do it with my Mum.

Only 2 reported finding difficulty in finding a quiet place to work and all but 4 found it easy to fulfil the target of one hour a week. The favourite programmes were split between reading and spelling (again most people didn't reach memory or dictation). 7 said they would definitely continue to use the programme, with 2 probably, 7 maybe and 0 for don't think so. *Note: 4 questionnaires were not available.*

Comments from the students included:

- I think it is a good idea – because I can do it in my own time without teachers.
- I think it was great and it helped me a lot to catch up with my class.
- I think it is quite good fun. I will continue when I am in secondary.
- It is very interesting.
- Isn't like homework not boring and I am learning to read and spell better.

But also :

- OK but very easy, maybe the level could be harder and more fun.
- Started to get boring, Mum encouraged me otherwise I'd have stopped.

There were more positive comments than negative.

The parents reported it easy to load the programme and spent between 0-2 hours learning how to use the programme (outside of the sessions with the teacher). They reported most children as being enthusiastic or co-operative when using the programme.

Further comments included:

- A enjoyed the programme. It has not only helped his literacy skills but also his confidence. It was something he could do, mostly on his own.
- The programme gives enough variety (reading, spelling, memory, dictation) for it not to be too boring, but it is still work.
- Excellent structured programme which has made improvements in M's reading and spelling, and most importantly improved his confidence. We are going to continue using the programme through the summer holidays.
- The programme is very good. It gives you a good idea as to where your child is on reading and problems she may have with spelling, gives them confidence. They can go at their own pace and you can give them encouragement every step of the way.

and:

- Sometimes we found it difficult to fit an hour a week in due to other commitments ie other children's activities, dancing shows and weddings.

but also:

- M found the memory part less fun.
- Was very motivated in the beginning and began to lose interest as time went on, although I did feel that the program was very beneficial.

Discussion

As the half-way house model this is the one where we had the greatest expectations, which on balance were fulfilled. Although there was quite minimal contact with the families compared with model 1, all but one of the students completed the programme for the research period and all felt there was sufficient support from Dyslexia Action. Again all families had the contact details of their teacher and could request additional support, including an extra lesson if required – although only one did. At first we anticipated the initial lessons taking place on consecutive weeks following the regular tuition model, whereas in fact we found that a wider gap was more beneficial. This meant that they were not left ‘on their own’ for as long as nine weeks as expected.

We found that many people had difficulty in making the three appointments and for baseline and final testing and many had to be rearranged. This is a good indication of how difficult it is for families to attend weekly tuition, irrespective of the financial aspects.

Model Three: stand alone home use

The sample

21 students agreed to take part and we finished with 15 useable results. The students came from:

- Primary school in Eastbourne - (8)
- London Dyslexia Action assessment - (3)
- Miscellaneous - (4).

There were 7 male students and 8 female. The ages ranged from 8:0 to 15:7 at the start of the project with an average age of 10:7 years.

Some of the students we ‘lost’ were doubtful from the start because their literacy was not that bad to begin with and given the ‘blunt instrument’ they would be using it was always going to be a challenge to get them to stay the course. Others, we lost contact with, even though we tried letter, email and phone. We can only surmise that they gave up or possibly – didn’t start.

The process

The students were given the baseline testing and the parents were given the bare minimum of information about the programme and given no guidance in its use. All the parents agreed to support their children in using the programme. The parents were also given full contact details of a Dyslexia Action staff member should they need extra support during the project term.

Results

WRAT 4	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Reading			
Pre-project	84	79-91	76-93
Post-project	88	82-95	80-97
	+4		

WRAT 4	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Spelling			
Pre-project	85	79-93	76-95
Post-project	86	80-93	78-95
	+1		

WRAT 4	Standard Score	85% confidence level	95% confidence level
Reading			
Comprehension			
Pre-project	90	85-96	83-98
Post-project	93	88-99	85-101
	+3		

Reading N = 15

Spelling N = 15

Comprehension N = 14

The initial SS for reading ranged from 71 - 92; for spelling the range was 71 -101; reading comprehension 74 - 116. The average SS for reading was 84; for spelling 85, for reading comprehension 90 (again with one student not tested).

Again although average progress was measured at 4 SS points for reading, 1 for spelling, 3 for reading comprehension, they are all well within the confidence limits and so we cannot be sure that absolute progress was made. It is interesting to note however that ALL the students recorded progress in reading on the day of testing.

Questionnaires

The students on the whole said they wanted to take part to improve their reading and spelling and again there was a strong desire to do anything that would help the children from the parents.

- Anything that can help my daughter and others is very important.
- I will do anything to benefit my child’s educational needs.
- I would like to help my son with his learning and development.

This group seemed to find it easier to find a quiet place to work in with 11 reporting no difficulties. Two had problems accessing a computer after the project had started and so moved to using a school computer - after school, instead.

7 parents said they spent between 0-2 hours learning how to use the programme to begin with; one spent

more than 6 hours and the rest didn't respond to the question and so it does look like we achieved our aim of making it easy to use.

14 used headphones always or sometimes; 9 used the recording feature; 7 found it easy to fulfil the target of one hour a week whilst 6 found that difficult. Although the intention was that parents would show the children how to use the program, 7 reported working it out themselves whilst 7 used audiohelp (not reported whether this was on their own or with a parent).

9 reported that it felt like homework (which it was!) although this was not necessarily negative:

- Because I was still learning it is like homework.
- Kind of seemed like work but nice.
- Because it was fun to do and homework isn't fun.
- No, because you work on a computer.
- No, really it just seemed as if I was doing something on the Internet for fun.

There were also negative comments here as well such as:

- It took too long to go on to the next level.
- It was boring.

Again spelling came out as the favourite programme with 7 votes, whilst reading had 3, memory and dictation 2. Again not all students would have accessed memory and dictation.

4 students said they would definitely continue to use the program; 4 answered yes probably; 4 maybe and 3 don't think so.

The further comments section reflected the fact that the programme had been given to the students 'cold' without any explanation or instruction:

- It took me some time on my own to understand how to work the programme.... No reward games.
- Could have had more interactive activities.
- It would feel like doing extra homework – neither good nor bad.

Others appeared to notice or sense progress was possible which led to more positive statements such as:

- It is really fun because it is a bit like school but a bit like fun and I'm learning stuff in fun way.
- I think it will help me in exams and in future life if I put more time to it instead of 10 minutes a day.
- I think it's nice to work at home as well as school and to spend time with my parents.
- I want to carry on because it's helping me.
- Sometimes I found it hard fitting it in but it was better than reading a book.

Comments from parents very much reflected those of the children and included:

- would have liked reward games
- J started to benefit as the programme got more difficult
- In the short time that G has been on the programme we have noticed a considerable difference in his spelling and reading. He has gained confidence.
- I feel that A has made progress by doing this programme.
- C was frustrated at first because he couldn't access the memory programme, but elated once he completed enough levels to do so.

Discussion

This was always going to be the most difficult group to conduct research with and so it proved. Although the model we were trying to test was the equivalent of people buying the programme from our website – of course this was not really the case. None of these parents had been seeking something that involved them doing the support themselves and so it is perhaps not surprising that some were reluctant to make a full commitment. This is not to say that their comments aren't valid. As teachers we instinctively want to explain and support – but with this model we had to stand back and leave things alone.

Conclusion and recommendations

This research covered a very short period of intervention and it was impossible to control all the parameters such as what really happened at home. There was no control group to measure what would have happened if there had been no intervention at all and the three groups were not matched for age or literacy levels. Although figures have been collected and calculated they should not be seen as the whole story – which is that **it is possible** to make use of the goodwill and time that resides at home in the journey towards literacy for all. We have also identified some useful key factors which could predict success in using the programme at home within the three models.

For positive outcomes we recommend that for all models:

- the student must have a PC/laptop at home
- the student needs access to the computer in a quiet environment
- the student needs to be motivated to improve literacy levels.

For the tuition + home model the student should also be:

- Familiar with the functions of UofS
- Comfortable in using the programme independently.

This model is the one that is most suitable for students with the most severe literacy difficulties who need a lot of support.

For the start up sessions model:

- There must be a parent or helper who is prepared to

support the student

- The student and parent/helper must be able to attend a Dyslexia Action centre or outpost for the initial sessions

For anyone unable to attend regular lessons this is worth considering as an alternative. The three initial sessions provided sufficient support to inspire confidence in the programme. This model could be extended to include occasional 'check-up' sessions to provide further support and reassurance. Some families may prefer more initial sessions so that they feel even more supported at the beginning. This model is flexible and can be adapted to meet individual circumstances.

For the stand-alone model:

- There must be a parent or helper who is prepared to support the student
- The student needs to be motivated and able to work without close supervision.

We have shown with this research that some students can succeed with this stand-alone model. Literacy intervention is by definition a complex process as it is only implemented when something has broken down in the normal education process. We are therefore, always likely to be dealing with conflicting emotions about tackling their literacy. They would really like the problem to just go away. Tackling literacy brings you face to face with the things you find the most difficult. It is inevitable that not everyone will be able to overcome these barriers on their own.

General conclusions

Ideally the tuition + home model would be used for the people with the most severe or entrenched literacy difficulties and the stand-alone model for those with the least – but life and economics don't always follow the ideal. UofS:Itf is not a miracle cure and neither is it a quick fix. A certain amount of perseverance will be needed by anyone using it to obtain substantial progress

just as you need to persevere with learning anything new. But this research project has shown that many students found the programme beneficial and useable at home with noticeable gains in literacy over a relatively short period of time of ten weeks.

Flexibility would appear to be the key ingredient that is needed for the home. Dyslexia Action (and home tutors) have tended to adopt the model of weekly tuition for an hour or more – sometimes for several years. Using UofS:Itf at home not only enables flexibility of timing – 10 minutes a day; 3 x 20 minutes in a week for instance, but perhaps getting away from the 'continual use' model which can encourage less urgency and focus, because the lessons will seemingly always be there.

Margaret Rooms

Margaret Rooms is Head of Educational Development at Dyslexia Action.

Thanks

Many people contributed to the work of this project and I would like to give my thanks to: Pauline Clayton, Fiona Hover, Sarah Creeth, Jo Mahler, John Rack, Patricia Rouse, teachers in the London and Bath Dyslexia Action centres, Langney Primary School, all the schools and teachers who supported the project and of course all the wonderful children and parents who took part. Our thanks also to the funders, especially The Equitable Trust and B-Sky-B and to Karen Dawson from Dyslexia Action fundraising department.

References

- Rack J and Hatcher J** (2002)
SPELLIT: Research Summary
Dyslexia Review Vol 14 No 1 pp6-10
- Rack J and Ruddock S** (2002)
Dyslexia Severity and Teaching Outcomes
Dyslexia Review Vol 13 No 2 pp7-10